# EGI Council – Terms-of-ReferenceComments from the EGI Council ToR Working Group on received input

The EGI Council ToR Working Group (WG) has been established in the EGI Council Meeting on 3 March 2010. It consists of the following persons:

* Dieter Kranzlmüller (Chairman)
* Jacko Koster
* Laura Perini

During the EGI Council Meeting on 8 June 2010, Version 0.6 of the draft EGI Council Terms-of-Reference has been presented by Dieter Kranzlmüller. Following a discussion in the plenary, input on this version has been requested until 20 July 2010.

The following input has been received:

* Steven Newhouse via e-Mail on 21 May 2010
* Bob Jones via e-Mail on 8 June 2010
* Arjen van Rijn via e-Mail on 15 June 2010

In addition, Jacko Koster took minutes from the discussion on 8 June 2010, which have also been considered as input.

This document describes how the WG considered each of the inputs in preparing the new revision of the EGI Council Terms-of-Reference.

# Input from Steven Newhouse via e-Mail on 21 May 2010:

**Question**: Could you please clarify/expand on the following points that have implications on the administration of EGI.eu.

1. Article 2.5. For other committees established here you require a clear mandate to be defined. You imply that there is a standing committee for each project that EGI,eu coordinates (even if that duty is taken on by the EB) without really declaring what the mandate of that committee is. As these will exist by definition could you please expand on what mandate you see this group as having?

**Reply from WG**: The mandate must be defined by the Council as stated in Article 2.1. We believe that this should be discussed and decided on a case-by-case basis, attributing to the different kinds of committees that may be considered. It is recommended to establish a corresponding document for each committee.

**Question**:

1. Article 3.3: This needs to be further qualified with respect to expectations. We are not able to provide facilities where full participation by anyone in the room can be assured at being heard by anyone on the phone. If this point can be satisfied by a speaker phone at the front of the room... fine. But I feel some level of 'best effort' needs to be introduced here because this can not be guaranteed.

**Reply from WG**: Indeed, the quality of remote participation may be out of hand of those organizing the meetings for various reasons. As such, we have added the following text to Article 3.3:
“… remote participation is made possible on a best effort basis, with no guarantees regarding quality.”

**Question**:

1. Article 3.5: The initial 3 days is very tight. Considering the complexity of the meetings it can take several days of back and forth between the minute taker, the second note taker (frequently me), and the chair to get a coherent set of minutes. 5 days would be more reasonable.

**Reply from WG**: We have changed everything to 5 working days instead of 3 working days.

**Question**:

1. Article 3.7: This needs to be qualified by what is public/confidential within the project and to respect the clauses of the project's consortium agreement. As it is the EB that has the management responsibility I feel that this right of access should be directed more at the EB having right of access (or the committee established to undertake this role) rather than the whole Council.

**Reply from WG:** EGI.eu belongs to the EGI Council. As such, the Council should have access to any information that EGI.eu is holding. We would propose to make the information available on request to the Council Chair at any point time and by individual Council members. The respective committee is responsible to provide an update inventory list of available documents.

# Input from Bob Jones via e-Mail on 8 June 2010:

**Remark**: The input from Bob Jones has been received as changes and comments to V0.6 of the ToR document. We have incorporated most of the cosmetic changes, and reply here to the questions concerning content.

**Question**: On Article 2: Clarify which bodies decide if EGI.eu will participate (coordinator or partner) in any specific project.

**Reply from WG**: We have changed Article 2.5 to include not only the role of coordinator of EGI.eu in a project, but also the role of partner. In addition, we specify that the EGI Council decides whether EGI.eu is allowed to participate in any specific project.

**Question**: On Article 3.8: The Council could see the minutes since they were attached to the Council agenda page but not the decisions or actions.

**Reply from WG**: We believe that the decisions should be available to the Council.

# Input from Arjen van Rijn via e-Mail on 15 June 2010:

**Question: A**rticle 1.2

The format for the participation letter has been distributed shortly after the Council meeting of 3 February 2010 in which we have adopted the Statutes of EGI.eu. You are right, that the Council never formally approved the format, although I did have the format checked in advance by our legal advisor. If we want to approve it formally (which is not really necessary, but isn't a bad idea either), I suggest we add the possibility of naming a second deputy.

**Reply from WG**: We concur with the views of Arjen van Rijn and recommend that the suggestion is followed during an upcoming EGI Council meeting. The official list of members and their deputies must be maintained by EGI.eu.

**Question: A**rticle 2.5

As already mentioned at the Council meeting I suggest that we reverse the order here: the Executive Board is by default the Committee as described above, unless the Council decides otherwise.

**Reply from WG:** We would like to leave it as it is, since we believe the Council must take this decision explicitly. Apart from making the decision explicit, the result should be identical.

**Question: A**rticle 3 (comment)

Yes, I believe it is useful to come to a standard meeting format for the Council agenda at some point in time.

**Reply from WG**: We have included a proposal on a standard meeting format as Article 3.1. This might need some updating after a few more EGI Council meetings, though.

# Input as noted down by Jacko Koster during the discussion on 8 June 2010:

**Question**:

1. Neil Geddes comments on how many deputies a member in the Council can have: It will be useful to establish a formal mailing list that includes more people than just the Council members. (Within each NGI or related funding agency, there may be people that do not attend the meetings of the Council but would like to be kept up-to-date.)

**Reply from WG**: Indeed, we believe that this is a useful idea and we propose to establish the Council list with only members of the Council and an additional Council-Information List which includes additional trustees from each NGI. It should be clear that the same confidentially rules as for the Council list apply to the Council-Information list.

**Question**:

1. On Article 2. Ludek Matyska states that there is a need to clarify who decides that EGI.eu will manage a new project; Mirco states that any engagement in any project must be approved by the Council.

Suggestion by Arjen: make Executive Board the default body for making these decisions. This also holds for cases where EGI.eu is project partner but not project coordinator. The Executive Board is empowered by the Council and their work stands/falls by reports to (and approval from) the Council.

**Reply from WG**: Resolving these comments is difficult as there are conflicting views. We propose to leave Article 2 in its current formulation for the moment, and to revisit this point after some time.

**Question**:

1. Article 3: Bob: The Council has access to the minutes of EB. Actions and decisions (Action: look at Article 3, point 8.)

**Reply from WG**: This request has been stated in the e-mail by Bob Jones from 8 June 2010 and is addressed above.