

GENERAL ASSEMBLY PROCEDURES

BACKGROUND AND OPTIONS ANALYSIS

FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

BACKGROUND

- ▶ At the 2022 GA, a resolution was passed to review and update the GA Procedures.
- ▶ The Governance Department conducted a Survey in 2023 to get general feedback from Citizens on the GA process and procedures.
- ▶ An internal GA Working Group was established to review the GA Procedures and Survey results, and develop recommendations and options for consideration; then present the proposed revisions to Citizens at community consultations.
- ▶ Community Consultations were held in Whitehorse (twice), Takhini, Haines Junction, and Champagne. Zoom was made available for some of these.

S. 1.5 - GA Delegate Community Representation

- ▶ Option 1: Community Delegates (current process)
 - ▶ 5 delegates selected from 6 communities
- ▶ Option 2: Community Delegates AND Delegates-at-large
 - ▶ Smaller community delegations (3 delegates), and 12 delegates-at-large that represent citizens' interests generally and not a specific community
- ▶ Option 3: Delegates-at-large (no community delegates)
 - ▶ 30 delegates-at-large that represent citizens' interests generally

Option 1 – Community Delegates

Current Process

Pros

- ▶ Delegations meet with community to hear their concerns, and speak up on behalf of their community
- ▶ Existing process, 20+ years
- ▶ Ensures quorum is met

Cons

- ▶ Focus is on community-level issues and not high-level strategic direction for the Government
- ▶ Some Citizens do not feel represented by community delegations (e.g. out-of-territory, or don't agree with their community's delegates)
- ▶ Hard to find enough delegates; the delegate selection process is not effective
- ▶ Often have the same people as delegates
- ▶ Can be divisive, putting communities against each other

Option 2 – Community Delegates AND Delegates-at-large

Pros

- ▶ Keep community delegations for bringing forward community interests
- ▶ Might encourage more citizens to come forward by having delegate positions that don't represent a community
- ▶ Delegates-at-large can be focused on broader citizen issues and high-level strategic direction
- ▶ Less community delegates to select, so shouldn't have the same issue of not enough people at community meetings wanting to be delegates
- ▶ With random selection for the delegates-at-large, could see new citizens selected each term

Cons

- ▶ May still see the same people applying to be delegates, both in communities and as delegates-at-large
- ▶ May be some difficulty in transitioning at first, as citizens get used to the new delegate positions
- ▶ Issues with the community delegate selection process (e.g. meeting attendance) could continue

Option 3 – All Delegates-at-large

No Community Delegates

Pros

- ▶ Be more focused on broader citizen issues and high-level strategic direction
- ▶ Might encourage more citizens to come forward to be delegates
- ▶ Have new people as delegates, through random selection (not the same delegates every term)
- ▶ Simpler selection process (one process: citizens apply and randomly selected; don't have to have meetings)

Cons

- ▶ May be some difficulty in transitioning at first, as citizens get used to the new process
- ▶ The communities might not feel heard
 - ▶ however, delegates can still speak to community issues, and have other avenues for community issues to be heard (e.g. Community Town Hall meetings)

S. 1.8 – Resolutions Committee

- ▶ **Should Committee members be Citizens who are not Delegates?**
 - ▶ Then if committee meets during GA business, delegates are not being pulled away.
 - ▶ **Appoint the Resolutions Committee before the GA?**
 - ▶ Use the same application and appointment process as for other boards/committee

 - ▶ Option 1: Status Quo
 - ▶ Composition and Selection of the Resolutions Committee stays in the Rules of Order
- OR**
- ▶ Option 2: Move into the GA Procedures
 - ▶ Move the composition and selection of the Committee into the GA Procedures

Resolutions Committee

Should members be selected from Citizens who are not Delegates?

Pros

- ▶ Committee could meet while GA continues, without disrupting the GA
 - ▶ Delegates would not be pulled away from GA business
- ▶ Get more Citizens involved in the GA

Cons

- ▶ May not have enough Citizens at the GA willing to be on the Committee

Resolutions Committee

Should we appoint the Committee before the GA?

Pros

- ▶ Could start resolutions before the GA
 - ▶ Committee could hold sessions to help Citizens with resolutions before the GA
 - ▶ Prep resolutions before so have them ready at the GA, start reviewing resolutions sooner
- ▶ Have an existing application and appointment process that could be used

Cons

- ▶ Council would appoint the members of the Committee, not the GA
- ▶ Have issues finding citizens interested in being on Committees, so may not have enough people apply

Resolutions Committee

Options 1 and 2

Option 1: Rules of Order

- ▶ More flexible; can change the Rules of Order (including Resolutions Committee) before adopting them
- ▶ Try a new composition/process and change it at next GA if it doesn't work, until find a process that does work
- ▶ Be responsive to the needs of each GA

Option 2: GA Procedures

- ▶ Have Committee details all in one place; makes more sense in the Procedures
- ▶ Less flexible, requires GA to make a resolution to make changes to the Committee

Resolution Process – Submission Deadline

Option 1: Before the GA

Pros

- ▶ Could start preparing the resolutions before the GA, or as soon as Resolutions Committee is appointed
- ▶ Know how many resolutions there are and can plan time accordingly, or plan for more time if needed

Cons

- ▶ Citizens would need to be prepared before the GA
- ▶ Not able to submit any resolutions during GA, if business/discussions trigger ideas for a resolution

Resolution Process – Submission Deadline

Option 2: Keep the same but with no extensions

Pros

- ▶ Have a firm deadline, so Committee can have time to prep resolutions, and GA can plan sufficient time to review them
- ▶ Still have time during GA to submit resolutions, so can respond to things that come up during business/discussion
- ▶ Current process, so citizens are familiar with this deadline

Cons

- ▶ May still have more resolutions submitted than can get through during the scheduled time for the GA
- ▶ A lot of work for the Resolutions Committee to prepare resolutions for presentation, both during GA business and after hours

Resolution Process

Option 3: Limit the Number of Resolutions

Pros

- ▶ Ensure there is enough time at the GA to get through all resolutions
- ▶ Encourage citizens to think very strategically about what they submit as resolutions, what is most important

Cons

- ▶ Restrict Citizens' voices and what input/direction they give to the Government
- ▶ Need to determine a limit; if more resolutions submitted, then how to determine which resolutions are presented?

Resolution Process

Option 4: Have an Omnibus Resolution, if run out of time

Pros

- ▶ Able to accept all remaining resolutions, so the Government can still consider them
- ▶ Don't have to hold Special GAs to finish resolutions – saves on cost and scheduling issues

Cons

- ▶ Accepting resolutions without any discussion or GA approval of the content of the resolutions

THE END