

GSG Assembly Meeting August 13, 2003

Outline and Summary

1. Call to Order

2. Social Chair's and Transportation & Parking Report (upcoming events, new parking regulations, ZIPcars)

3. Approval of Previous Minutes

4. Officers' Reports

1. Treasurer's Report; funding requests: A funding request (\$100) by Princeton Capoeira was granted. The request (\$45) by the Queer Graduate Caucus (QGC), tabled in July, was debated, and funding was granted.

2. Chair's Report

5. Committee Reports

1. Health-Care (task-force on health and well-being)
2. Information Technology (OIT guidelines, wiring of Butler)
3. Housing (room draw)
4. International Students' Concerns (POPT survey)

6. Other Business

1. Standing Rules: The proposal of standing rules introduced in the previous meeting was approved (with one additional rule).
2. Interlude
3. GESO petition: A request (by title="Graduate Employees and Students Organization">GESO of Yale) for endorsement of a petition was discussed.
4. Elections Committee: The officer elections committee was appointed.

7. Scheduling of Next Meeting and Adjournment: The next meeting will be on September 10.

Attendance

Officers present: Assistant Chair Eric A. Adelizzi; Parliamentary Secretary Leonard F. Pease III, also acting as chair; Corresponding Secretary Nicole Esparza; Press Secretary Meredith Safran; Recording Secretary João Pedro Boavida; Treasurer Eitan Bonderover; Social Chair

Sinéad Mac Namara.

Representatives present: Aleksandar Donev, ACM; Huiyan Yang, proxy for Anita Adhitya, AOS; Sinéad Mac Namara, CEE; Eric Adelizzi, proxy for Jack Tinsley, CHE; Jia Su, CHM; Jessica H. Clark, CLA; Gregory D. O'Mullan, EEB; Fei Sun, ELE; Meredith Safran, proxy for Kerry Bystrom, ENG; Juliet O'Brien, FIT; Meredith Galanter Hastings, GEO; Brendan McAndrew, MAE; João Pedro Boavida, proxy for Lior Silberman, MAT; Michael Ludkovski, ORF; Jason Casellas, proxy for Andrew Erickson, POL; David R. Smith, PPL; Kim Montgomery, PSY; Nicole Esparza, SOC.

Delegates present: Fei Sun, Association of Chinese Students and Scholars (ACSS); Huiyan Yang, Butler Apartments; Eric Adelizzi, proxy for Lior Silberman, Graduate College (GC); Radhika Wijetunge, Lawrence Apartments; Leonard F. Pease III, Off-Campus; Heather White, Women's Center.

Councilors present: Huiyan Yang (AOS), CPUC; Leonard F. Pease III (CHE), CPUC Priorities Committee; Jason Casellas (POL), CPUC Rights and Rules Committee.

Others present: Lei Xu (ELE), chair of the International Students' Concerns Committee; Lisa M. Sherov, GC residence life coordinator; Ian Parrish (PPL); Samir Succar (ELE), Princeton Capoeira.

Representatives absent: Riaz Tejani, ANT; Brigitta A. Lee, EAS; Tanjim Hossain, ECO; Michael K. House, GER; Karoline Cook, HIS; David Shrom, MOL; Tamar Friedmann, PHY; Patrick Gerland, OPR; Philippa Townsend, REL; Cole M. Crittenden, SLA; Leslie A. Medema, WWS.

Delegates absent: Aderemi Artis, Black Graduate Caucus (BGC); Weining Man, Council of International Graduate Students (CIGS).

These representative seats were vacant: ARC; ART; AST; COM; COS; MUS; NES; PHI; SPO.

These delegate seats were vacant: Hibben/Magie Apartments; Millstone Apartments.

Minutes

I. Call to order

The Assembly of the Graduate Student Government held its regular monthly meeting on August 13, 2003, at Frist 309. Acting Chair Leonard Pease called the meeting to order at about 6:05pm.

II. Social Chair's and Transportation & Parking Report

As Sinéad Mac Namara had to leave soon, Mr. Pease asked her to report at the beginning of the meeting.

Ms. Mac Namara reported first in her capacity as social chair. She apologized for not organizing a Summer event, and explained that she had been forced to be out of town twice. She then reported on the preparations for the coming First Chance Dance. The event will be similar to last year's, and will be held either on September 19 (Friday) or September 20 (Saturday), in the Carl A. Fields Center. Volunteers to help are welcome. She also reported on a meeting she had had with Aleksandar Donev (also member of the QGC) to jointly plan the Valentine's Dance (in February). Last February, the GSG and the QGC had held two events on the same day, and it was thought that it would be better to have a joint event. Ms. Mac Namara invited questions; there being none...

...she reported in her capacity as chair of the Transportation and Parking Committee. She noted that the new parking regulations [[\] proposed by the administration had been already sent to students. There had been no major complaints. Answering a question by David Smith, Ms. Mac Namara clarified that students working at Forrestal Campus would indeed be allowed to park on-campus without restrictions. Ms. Mac Namara then reported that the shuttle would be back in early September, with a schedule similar to the recent one. There was the prospect of a third bus, and of major changes within a few months. In answer to questions, Ms. Mac Namara clarified that the initial schedule might differ from the previous one in that the stop at Lot 10](..../06/#Va)

might be moved; and that (considering the previous experience) she didn't expect the exact schedule to be known or announced more than a few days in advance.

Ms. Mac Namara also reported that she had just come from a meeting to discuss the use of ZIPcars on-campus. By making a \$300 deposit, people can join ZIPcars. There are ZIPcars in Princeton (one at the Dinky, one at the Institute for Advanced Studies, and one in Hulfish Street), as well as in New York, Boston, and Washington DC. People can book a specific car on the internet, for a specified amount of time, at \$8/hour. Their ZIPcar card is a proxcard to open the car during that period. The cars have gas cards, and the program includes car insurance. MIT and Tufts University partnered with ZIPcar in order to get lower access fees for students. The University is planning on doing the same, and the fee for a student to join would be about \$20. The GSG would be useful in advertising this new option. Ms. Mac Namara observed that ZIPcars are made available according to demand. If something like 300 graduate students were interested in joining, we might well get additional cars, and at locations convenient to graduate student residences. Mr. Donev volunteered to help. It was observed that, if a car was to be added, the choice of model would consider residents' preferences. It was suggested that a station-wagon might be the most useful.

III. Approval of Previous Minutes

Recording Secretary João Pedro Boavida observed that he tried to make the minutes more concise, and that included having moved some supporting documents to separate files, linked from the main text. He observed there were three minor errors, there was a serious mistake (pointed out by Mr. Pease) on the description of a PriComm request, and there was a case (in another PriComm discussion), pointed out by Fei Sun, where Mr. Sun's statements might be misconstrued. Furthermore, there had been a request by Greening Princeton to include their email exchanges with Eric Adelizzi (respecting Mr. Adelizzi's opinion in the minutes) in the minutes, there had been a request by Aderemi Artis, and several requests by Mr. Sun.

The several amendments were discussed: the five first points mentioned by Mr. Boavida (all passed), one amendment proposed by Mr. Sun on the PriComm requests to Frist (passed),

another amendment by Mr. Sun on the ELE Representative elections (passed), another amendment by Mr. Sun on the PriComm discussion (on whether we were only voting on whether to support the requests; passed, with a change proposed by Mr. Boavida and accepted by Mr. Sun), a request by Mr. Sun to include all supporting documents at the end of the minutes instead of as separate files (a motion was made to reject this amendment, and passed), another amendment by Mr. Sun on his opinions when discussing the minutes (passed), Mr. Artis's request for his departure from the room to be noted (this request was divided in two parts, the first of which was approved, and the second denied), and a request by Mr. Sun to remove a parenthetical comment (this request was not seconded). At this point (6:45pm), Mr. Smith moved (and was seconded by Mr. Adelizzi) to approve the minutes as they stood, including the amendments already passed. Mr. Sun observed that he still wanted to introduce more amendments, Mr. Smith advised him that in that case he should vote "no". Heather White asked for debate to be closed. Mr. Smith's motion was voted upon, and passed unanimously. The minutes were thus approved as amended.

IV. Officers' Reports

A. Treasurer's Report

Treasurer Eitan Bonderover had sent his report in advance of the meeting.

The first request had been made by Princeton Capoeira. Due to his relationship with that organization, Mr. Bonderover excused himself from giving a recommendation, and asked Samir Succar to present the request. Mr. Succar explained that Princeton Capoeira wanted to buy a percussion ensemble. Princeton Capoeira runs an Afro-Brazilian class in Dillon gym, and holds performances and cultural events. There are about 30 graduate students involved. The group needs funding for instruments and mallets, and was asking \$100 from the GSG. Mr. Succar explained that they had not registered the request with the Graduate School, because it was not a specific event (which would need registration), but really only the acquisition of general supplies. Michael Ludkovski asked for what period of time the request applied, to what Mr. Succar replied that it depended on how long the instruments lasted. Mr. Adelizzi asked where the instruments would be kept, to what Mr. Succar replied that they would be kept at his home. Mr. Succar also observed that the group was

currently running a \$200 deficit. Ms. White moved to approve the funding.

MOTION: to fund Princeton Capoeira by \$100. PASSED unanimously.

The next request had been tabled in the previous meeting [[href=" ../07/#IIIc-qgc"](../07/#IIIc-qgc)>Minutes 7.9.2003, III.C]. It referred to the QGC Summer barbecue. Mr. Bonderover stated that funding for that event had been approved two meetings ago [[href=" ../06/#IIIb-qgc"](../06/#IIIb-qgc)>Minutes 6.1.2003, III.B]. However, more people than expected showed up: 25 were expected, an extra 15 came. So, they were asking an additional \$45. Mr. Bonderover observed that it had never happened that a group came asking for funding after the event, and that we might create a bad precedent. So, he tried to consider points pro and against such funding. (As it would be impossible to do justice to Mr. Bonderover's considerations, and they are detailed in his advance report, the recording secretary will refer the reader to said report.) Debate ensued.

Juliet O'Brien observed that the GSG is happy to accept that groups return funding (when it turns out to have not been needed), so we could as well accept that a group asks for extra funding. Meredith Galanter-Hastings observed that, although it's good that more people than expected showed up, we want to be as open as possible and encourage groups to make realistic estimates, and shouldn't set a bad precedent. Nicole Esparza observed that on the other hand there was a risk of encouraging groups to over-estimate attendance. Mr. Adelizzi agreed that we should be wary of such requests, but he thought that in this case the QGC had made a good-faith underestimation, and shouldn't be penalized. However, he would vote against this funding request, for Jack Tinsley (whom Mr. Adelizzi was proxying) had instructed him to do so. On post-funding, Mr. Tinsley had stated (Mr. Adelizzi read) that "...no other organizations allow such funding, but the idea did strike me as different. I think we should force the organizations on campus to organize themselves and make sure funding requests are submitted before the event. I oppose the QGC request or any others that come in after the fact." Mr. Donev stated that the QGC could actually have overestimated the attendance, and then not use all funding asked. However, if they had done so only the QGC and the GSG treasurer would know that not all funding had been needed. So, the QGC had chosen to act in a more transparent way. Meredith Safran stated that in theory she would agree with the concern of creating a precedent, and vote against such funding. However, she thought that any requests of the same nature would certainly be debated carefully. Moreover, the QGC had not previous experience organizing

an event of that nature. So, she thought funding should be granted in this specific case.

Kim Montgomery observed that the different angles Mr. Bonderover had considered were actually good guidelines, and suggested that they be preserved for future reference. Mr. Bonderover stated that he would actually propose later in the meeting [see section [VI.A](#VIa) below] a standing rule codifying those guidelines. Mr. Sun asked whether the GSG would be the only funder or there were other funders. Mr. Donev stated the GSG was the only funder. Mr. Sun observed that if that were not the case, they could ask for extra funding from the other co-sponsors. In fact, Mr. Sun pointed out, in those cases groups could actually have difficulty using the original receipts to ask funding to more than one co-sponsor. Mr. Bonderover observed that the original receipts were required by the Graduate School (and that's why the GSG asked for them); as other co-sponsors would require the originals for the same reason there would never be a problem (for the Graduate School would always have access to them). Moreover, when not needing all the funding, groups typically returned any excess first to the GSG. Ms. Hastings moved to grant the funding.

MOTION: to grant QGC's request for the full amount of \$45. PASSED with two opposed.

B. Chair's Report

Chair Bill Jordan could not be present (for family reasons) and had asked Mr. Pease to tell Assembly that the Executive Committee had met with President Tilghman two weeks before, and with Dean Russel one week before. Both discussions had been productive. The topics were housing and post-enrollment. As to housing, the administration was proactively looking into increasing the supply, and there was some indication of new developments, and also of renovations at Butler. Also, there was interest in knowing students' preferences and what students can afford. As to post-enrollment, there was interest in determining how effective the introduction of DCC status had been. So, the Executive Committee would prepare a survey on these topics to help systematize this information.

V. Committees' Reports

Ms. Esparza stated that Brigitta Lee had written stating that she couldn't come to the meeting to present the report of the Campus Relations Committee.

A. Health-Care

Ms. Esparza reported that the GSG had been asked to find volunteers for the Task-Force on Health and Well-Being. The message had been forwarded to Assembly and there were already eight volunteers, some of them without any previous involvement with the GSG. The charge of the task-force included considering childcare options, and there were three students with children among the volunteers. Mr. Donev, noting that there were more volunteers than needed, asked Ms. Esparza how (and whether) the GSG would select the committee members; Ms. Esparza replied that she would submit all of the names and the administration would select them.

B. Information Technology

Mr. Bonderover reported that he was participating in a OIT committee that is reviewing the OIT Guidelines (available at <
><http://www.princeton.edu/~policy/Guidelines.pdf>>). There had been additions on peer-to-peer file-sharing (for example, electronic evidence of illegal activity on campus must be sent to the proper authorities). There are also sections regarding access to the data left by terminated employees; this may affect a very small number of graduate students.

Mr. Bonderover also reported that the wiring of Butler [href="..03/#IVd">Minutes 3.12.2003, IV.D] was expected to be completed by September 9. Ms. Montgomery had heard that people were already being charged, as the rents had been increased and the DormNet charges had been included already. Ms. Safran suggested that maybe it was more appropriate to let the Butler Committee take the lead on that issue. Mr. Bonderover agreed, but added that he would look into it as well.

Finally, Mr. Bonderover had been asked for volunteers for a group who will discuss information technology in the University. He is trying to get more details, and will send

them to Assembly.

C. Housing

Mr. Adelizzi reported on a recent meeting of the Housing Committee. He will soon step down as a chair, and a new chair will be needed. There had also been a meeting with people in the housing department to discuss plans to simplify the room draws. The housing department is willing to accept the plan, and is trying to determine potential problems with implementing it in practice. The plan must be approved by the Graduate School and the director of housing.

D. International Students' Concerns

Lei Xu stated that the committee was still working on the survey on the Princeton Oral Proficiency Test [[Minutes 7.9.2003, V.E](#)]. The survey is being set up by the Princeton Survey Research Center, and there have been some delays.

VI. Other Business

A. Standing Rules

Discussion moved on to the standing rules. In the previous month [[Minutes 7.9.2003, VI](#)], the Executive Committee had proposed new standing rules, to replace the existing ones, which were not accessible in one single place. However, they were not to be discussed in July, but only in August.

As had been promised before, Mr. Bonderover proposed an additional rule on repeated funding, to be added at the end of section III:

Having already approved funding for an event, the Treasurer and the GSG will not honor any further requests for funding for the same event. However, the GSG

Assembly may vote to do so by simple majority. Any organization that wishes to request further funding for an event after funding for that event has been approved shall submit a funding request in the same manner and following all the rules and by-laws as all other funding requests.

When considering whether to approve funding for an event which has already been funded, the GSG Assembly may use the following guidelines:

- a. When comparing the amount of money requested to the number of graduate students at the event, the total of all funding requests concerning an event shall be compared to the number of graduate students attending, not just the funding request in question.
- b. The GSG Assembly shall decide whether another event could be funded with the amount requested.
- c. The Treasurer shall examine the Treasury's records and present to the GSG Assembly any evidence which suggests that:
 - i. the organization has made a habit of asking for further funding after funding has already been approved for the same event;
 - ii. the organization is irresponsible with its planning of events;
 - iii. the organization regularly disregards the GSG's rules, by-laws and constitution.

Jessica Clark asked whether the first sentence did not preclude consideration of the request. Mr. Bonderover clarified that was not the intent. Mr. Pease observed that a simple majority can decide to ignore any rule, and so the rules actually only codify guidelines, and do not restrict any decisions. Mr. Bonderover moved (and was seconded by Mr. Donev) to include

this rule among the standing rules. The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Sun asked whether amendments could be submitted, and stated that he didn't know the rules were to be put to a vote in this meeting. Ms. Safran stated that he could offer any amendments, and that she distinctly recalled that it had been announced one month ago that the standing rules were to be put to a vote.

Mr. Sun called Assembly's attention to rule 2 of section I, on audio recordings. For the reader's convenience, said rule is quoted here:

2. The Recording Secretary shall be empowered to make audio recordings of the proceedings of the Assembly, provided that:

A. Any member of the Assembly may object to the recording of a particular statement or item of business, which shall not be thus recorded, and

B. The Recording Secretary may not share such recordings of Assembly meetings without permission of the Assembly.

Mr. Sun asked what was permission of Assembly (referred in paragraph B). Mr. Pease stated that it meant a regular decision, either by vote or unanimous consent. Mr. Sun considered that rule was inappropriate, for GSG meetings are open to everybody, and the GSG is not a secret organization. Thus, the recording secretary is in a privileged position compared to other members. He thought that any interested member should have access to the recordings. Mr. Pease asked whether Mr. Sun wanted to propose a concrete amendment; Mr. Sun stated he had not thought about that. Mr. Bonderover compared the situation with normal notes, which the secretary doesn't have to share. The minutes are the public record. Ms. Esparza observed that the rule only referred to audio recordings, and that any member could object to a recording. Mr. Adelizzi explained that when the rule had been approved [Minutes 1.26.2000, Item 2] some people had been concerned about being quoted out of context. Mr. Sun suggested then that a rule could be added stating that the recording should be used only to write the minutes, and proposed the following text:

The recordings shall only be used for the purpose of writing the minutes.

Then, Mr. Sun moved to add "except the people attending the meeting in question" to paragraph B. Ian Parrish stated that he thought Mr. Sun's intent was to have the meetings tape-recorded so that he could complain about the minutes. Mr. Sun stated that people should be allowed to access the recordings. A vote on Mr. Sun's motion was held; only one person was in favor. Mr. Sun further attempted to move that a paragraph be added:

C. The tapes should be kept till the minutes are approved. However, there was no second. Rather, Mr. Smith moved to approve the rules as they stood (including Mr. Bonderover's addition). Mr. Sun objected, for he wanted to propose further amendments. Messrs. Pease and Adelizzi stated that rules can be amended either with a simple majority (if there is advance notice) or a 2/3-vote.

MOTION: to approve the proposal of standing rules (including Mr. Bonderover's) amendment. PASSED with one opposed.

After Mr. Pease announced the motion had carried, Mr. Sun questioned the presence of a quorum. Mr. Pease called the roll, and concluded that only 11 active Representatives were present, when quorum was 13. He declared a quorum was not present. Mr. Boavida asked a point of order: considering that the quorum call had been made after the result of the vote had been announced, wasn't it the case that the vote was still valid? Mr. Pease deemed the point well taken, and reaffirmed that the motion had carried.

B. Interlude

While calling the roll, Mr. Pease concluded that the following Representatives were present: Ms. Mac Namara (CEE, proxied by Mr. Bonderover), Mr. Tinsley (CHE, proxied by Mr. Adelizzi), Ms. Clark (CLA), Mr. Sun (ELE), Kerry Bystrom (ENG, proxied by Ms. Safran), Ms. O'Brien (FIT), Mr. McAndrew (MAE), Mr. Silberman (MAT, proxied by Mr. Boavida), Ms. Montgomery (PSY), Ms. Esparza (SOC), Mr. Smith (PPL).

Mr. Pease stated that there being no quorum, Assembly could only set the time for the next meeting, and adjourn. Mr. Adelizzi suggested that an extraordinary meeting could be called sometime next week. However, it was not clear whether people could make it. Mr.

Adelizzi suggested that we could take a recess of a few minutes to try to find more people to come back to the meeting and reestablish quorum. The idea was accepted, Mr. Pease declared a recess, and several people left the room to pursue that goal.

After a few minutes, Ms. White and Mr. Donev had been found, and returned to the meeting. Ms. White observed that she had been the REL Representative in the past, and offered to proxy her Representative. At the same time, she asked Radhika Wijetunge to be her proxy as Voting Delegate of the Women's Center. Thus, the roll call was completed with the following people: Mr. Donev (ACM), Philippa Townsend (REL, proxied by Ms. White), Ms. Wijetunge (Women's Center Delegate). Mr. Pease recognized a quorum was present, called the meeting to order, and asked whether there were objections to the presence of a quorum. There being none, he proceeded with the agenda. It was 7:50pm.

C. GESO petition

Ms. Wijetunge stated that the Graduate Employee and Student Organization (GESO), from Yale University, had prepared a petition about the changes in immigration procedures. The petition was to be sent to the President of the U.S.A., the Secretaries of State and Homeland Security, and university presidents. They had asked for GSG's endorsement, and the Executive Committee had asked the International Students' Concerns Committee to provide an opinion. Mr. Xu had brought a slide with the petition, and explained some points. One problem that some international students face is that, when going to conferences (for example) in Europe, they need to go to Canada to apply for a renewal of the visa. Visits to the family may also be problematic. Incoming students are being subjected to background checks, and the ensuing delays.

Mr. Sun stated that although immigration regulations can be construed as a political issue, it's also true that the international students at Princeton are over 40% of the graduate student population. Although the GSG Constitution excludes support of political causes [Constitution, IX.8], the legislative intent explains that the problem is that funding political causes might have tax implications. However, he observed that no funding was involved, and exemplified that the USG had recently held a referendum to support diversity in higher education. He suggested that this petition was not different. Ms. White moved (and was

seconded) to endorse the petition.

Ms. Wijetunge explained that the committee had found the concerns expressed in the petition valid. For example, four Princeton graduate students had had delays of two to six months in visa processing. However, the issues to be addressed are not accurately portrayed, and the petition is partly political. For example, there is mention of a SEVIS fee; that fee is University-specific, and Princeton is not charging such fee. As to students having trouble going outside the country, it doesn't apply to all students. Moreover, the visa is a traveling document, and only needs to be renewed if people leave the country. She thought the petition was badly worded and vague. Mr. Donev stated that he would follow the committee's advice on whether or not to endorse a petition, and felt that Ms. Wijetunge was recommending against endorsement. Ms. Safran stated that she believed GESO was asking for GSG's signature, and also for GSG to collect students' signatures. Ms. Wijetunge observed that about 200 universities had been asked to participate. She added that the petition also asked University presidents to express their opinion. Ms. Wijetunge observed that President Tilghman had already expressed her opinion about this to the Congress.

Ms. O'Brien stated that she had experienced delays too. She further stated that she agreed with the concerns in principle, but suggested that it might be more appropriate for the GSG to write a different letter. Mr. Pease observed that the idea of an amicus brief had been floated. He also observed that Mr. Adelizzi (who had left, and left a proxy) had left three pages of objections to the petition. Mr. Boavida stated that he had tried to understand what exactly were the limits of "political causes". He had consulted Rights, Rules and Responsibilities, and got the impression that the guidelines suggest it consists in trying to influence policy outside the University. He added that one reason for the GSG not to get involved with political causes is that, when the Constitution was ratified by the student body, we got a mandate which excludes political activity. As an alternative, maybe University administrators could make good use of a resolution in favor of their efforts.

Mr. Donev observed that there was no hope of getting a polished decision in the remaining time (we had to leave the room at 8pm), and moved to table discussion till the next meeting, so that the committee has time to formulate a concrete proposal. Ms. White asked Assembly's consent to withdraw her previous motion (to endorse the petition), and it was granted. Mr. Donev's motion was seconded and vote upon:

MOTION: to table discussion of the GESO petition till the next meeting. PASSED unanimously.

GESO's petition will be deposited in the archives with these minutes.

D. Elections Committee

Mr. Pease wished to form the Elections Committee for the next officers' elections to be held in the Spring. He explained that he wanted to plan well in advance in order to avoid the problems with the previous election. He had asked Mr. Silberman whether he would be willing to serve, and he had agreed. However, Assembly had to ratify the committee, and at least one further volunteer was needed. Ms. Clark also volunteered.

MOTION: to create the Officer Elections Committee, with Ms. Clark, Mr. Pease and Mr. Silberman as members. PASSED unanimously.

VII. Scheduling of Next Meeting and Adjournment

Mr. Pease announced the next meeting was scheduled for September 10, at 6pm. However, it was not yet possible to reserve a room, and so the location was not known. The meeting was adjourned at 8pm.

Submitted 8.25.2003,

João Pedro Boavida Recording Secretary

Amended and approved 9.10.2003.