# Issue 354 – 48th crm-sig meeting

GB presented his HW (an outline of the [text](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1qFCzMCuKWGBlsudP8xbDuAXaExd8bAFg4BZBBCWrPnY/edit) on how to raise an issue and the process whereby to resolve it).

It is a rather long text, and it corresponds to a first draft that needs to be discussed. Not a finalized document.

**DISCUSSION**:

1. **Recordings**

OE: there should be a section in the document about the purpose they serve and how they are to be used, how long they will be stored for, to what degree they will be available. Germany has very strict laws regarding what can be recorded etc. Especially in the current circumstances where people have been confined to their homes and it is not a given that they have a designated work area or meeting room, being recorded in their personal space invades their privacy.

TV: the recordings are not shared with outsiders or even sig members not involved in preparing the meeting minutes. They are

OE: still it should be put in writing. What are the circumstances of the recordings –i.e., minutes keeping. There might be reasons to have hybrid meetings in the future, in which case we might end up recording part of the conversation. Which means that we should in principle explain what use the recordings can be put to etc.

CEO: maybe add a clause that “as soon as the minutes are accepted, the recordings are deleted”.

MD: OE’s concerns are legitimate; in fact in the 47th sig meeting (which was the first socially distanced meeting we have had through zoom) we had laid out these rules at the meet and greet but it did not occur to us to put them in writing.

1. **Issue processing:**
	1. **MD:** an **issue can be raised by everyone** by sending an **email on the sig list** or by bringing it up during a meeting. The new issue formulation does not have to be made by a sig member (i.e., the person raising the issue does not have to be the spokesperson of a CRM-sig member institution);
	2. **MD:** the **issue formulation has to offer sufficient background** –especially examples illustrating the problem;
	3. **MD:** the issue **can be decided once it has been formulated in a yes/no question**. If it can never be formulated in a decidable form, then it ultimately has to be dropped;
	4. a rule that we should try to adhere to, is that issues are published **two weeks before a sig meeting at the latest** –even though we almost never do that;
	5. **MD:** **e-vote procedure**. Any sig member can call for an e-vote, any sig member can exercise the right to veto. Vetoed decisions have to be discussed in a face-to-face (or virtual) meeting.
		* **GB**: Email votes the outcome of which gets ratified over a sig meeting: should we do continue doing that or should we switch to just presenting the outcome of the e-mail votes to the sig over the meetings? Because we end up voting twice for each decision or undoing decisions.
		* **MD**: this is a misunderstanding; we should definitely stop doing that. A decision we have reached cannot be undone in the context of the same issue. It should be decided in the context of a different issue, formulated as stated in the process.
	6. **GB: Majority vote –**we have opted for that by principle, but we can reconsider the outcome of a vote if there are serious objections to a proposed solution. Vetoes can do that.
		* **PR**: Also, if there is a majority vote but the total number of votes is non-representative of the sig members, then we should not implement proposed solution before we have reached a broader consensus.
		* **GB**: symbolic vs. actual votes –where do we stand on that? Do we allow non-members veto decisions?
		* **MD**: in principle, the right to veto should only be exercised by sig members.
	7. **Long-term issue management**: it would be nice at the end of the sig to get the stats of issues opened, issues resolved and closed, issues paused, and issues dropped, to be able to understand how the workflow proceeds.