CFP Constitution/Bylaws & Procedures
Minutes
November 10, 2010

The CFP Constitution/Bylaws & Procedures Committee conference telephone meeting was called to order at 1:30 eastern time by Chair Ruth Hendy.

The following members were present: Aggie Hale, Vicki Everly, Bill Hardister, Terry Levee, Frank Ferko, Lee Cornman, and Ruth Hendy. Cassandra Mitchell and Mary Cartagena joined the meeting in progress.

Workgroup Reports.
A. Conference Membership Definitions. Frank Ferko reported the following:

1) There are five types of regulatory members: federal government, state government, local (including tribal), U.S. territories & districts, and regulatory associations such as ISSC, PMO, AFDO, NACHO.

2) Academia members

3) There are 8 proposed types of industry members: Retail food stores, food service, vending, processing, distribution and logistics, agriculture, providers, and media.

4) Consumers

ACTION Item: Frank, Vicki, and Terry agreed to work on explanations (definitions) of the types of industry groups. Ruth agreed to assist with crafting language for proposed bylaws amendments.

B. Committee Membership Size. Lee Cornman reported that she had researched committee membership criteria of organizations similar to CFP. Some of the committees of those organizations had defined members; this was particularly true for standing committees. Some of the committees had minimum size requirements. Ruth relayed the concerns expressed by the author of the Issue relating to maximum committee size and non-participation by committee members.

The CB&P committee agreed that a Council Committee is a committee that reports to one of the three CFP councils. A Standing Committee is a committee that is established by the CFP Constitution.

The CB&P committee discussed that a Council Committee have a chair, vice chair, 3 industry members, 3 regulatory members, and 3 at-large members.

ACTION Item: Lee, Terry, and Ruth will work on language concerning the composition of Council Committees.

C. Scope of Committee Activities. Vicki explained that the Council Committee sometimes have difficulties knowing the boundaries of what the committee may and may not do. Vicki and Aggie stated that the problem seems to be a lack of training for Council chairs and Committee chairs on the role and responsibilities of those two positions. The CB&P committee discussed various methods of providing training, either at the biennial meeting, by a web-based training, or through a “webinar” type training. The CB&P committee discussion covered that the duties of the Standing Committees are listed in the CFP Procedures.
**ACTION Item:** The workgroup will work on a recommendation to the Executive Board that if selected as a Council Chair or Committee chair, the individual would complete a leadership training session.

**D. Classification of the Terms “Conference” and “Biennial Meeting” in the CFP Constitution.**

1) Lee, Vicki, and Cassandra have completed the review of the terms in the Constitution and Bylaws. Ruth forwarded the versions with notation where “conference” should be changed to “biennial meeting” to the entire CB&P committee. If, upon review, the full CB&P committee is in agreement, the recommendation to make the changes will be presented to the Executive Board at the April Board meeting. Vicki, as Issues Chair, said that these changes in wording could be submitted to the 2012 biennial meeting as one issue.

2) The CB&P committee discussed if the committee has the authority to make typographical corrections to the Constitution without having to submit it as an issue to Council II.

**ACTION Item:** Ruth said that she would do the research to determine an answer to that question.

3) The CB&P committee discussed moving the preface to the constitution to a different section (as an appendix) or to the Procedures.

**E. Disposition of Extracted Issues.** Bill reported that his research had identified 5 options that be can be taken by the Executive Board in determining the disposition of an issue when the Assembly of Delegates had not accepted the “No Action” recommendation from a Council

1) The Assembly of Delegates’ rejection of the recommendation could be construed as an approval of the Issue as submitted.

2) The Executive Board may establish a committee to research and bring the Issue back to the Conference.

3) The Executive Board may refer the Issue to the appropriate federal agency along with background information.

4) The Executive Board could have a requirement that the Assembly of Delegates provide the reasons for the rejection of a “No Action” recommendation.

5) **ACTION Item:** Bill and Vicki will review the disposition of rejected “No Action” Issues from past biennial meetings.

**F. Executive Board Approval of Policy and Procedures Changes.** Ruth reported that nothing has been done at this time with this charge.

There was no new business.

The next telephone committee call will be on January 5, 2011 at 1:30 eastern time.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:30 pm.