



LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL MINUTES

OCTOBER 13, 2016

1. Call to Order
2. Land Acknowledgement
3. Approval of the Minutes
4. Adoption of the Agenda
5. Guest Speakers
 - a. Presentation of the 2015-2016 Audited Financial Statements
 - b. Presentation of the Alternative and Equitable Governance Researcher
 - c. Presentation on AVEQ
6. Question Period (5)
7. Report of the Steering Committee (5)
8. Announcements (5)
9. Old Business
10. New Business
 - a. Notice of Motion Regarding the Free Menstrual Hygiene Products Policy
 - b. Notice of Motion Regarding Free Menstrual Hygiene Products Fee and Health and Hygiene Products Fund Referenda Question
 - c. Notice of Motion Regarding Midnight Kitchen Existence Referendum Question

[Recording lost until this point]

VP Patterson: So Midnight Kitchen is one of the SSMU fifteen services. They need to write an existence referendum and they are proposing that they write a levy to increase their fee. They're also outlining what all of this money would be allocated towards. So going down to the be-it-resolved clause, which states the referendum question that will be asked: this is asking for the existence of the Midnight Kitchen, asking for a fee of \$3.35 per semester per student, which will be adjusted to inflation as you can see there. Understanding that if this is voted no, the Midnight Kitchen will no longer exist as a service, given that over 92% of their expenses are paid for with



student fees. So that is the first part of the question, and the second part is whether to allow them to use discretionary funding. Discretionary funding basically, here, means that the Midnight Kitchen is asking the students that the money that the students are paying in this fee could be allocated for funding for different initiative on campus that the Midnight Kitchen deems important, for example some discretionary funding in the past has gone to independent student groups like QPIRG, for example. Things that they find important, student activism, things along those lines. In steering, we have already had a discussion about separating this in order to have two questions on the ballot itself, so they if people would like to vote for their existence, they would be able to vote yes to that, but they don't have to vote to approve discretionary funding for MK. I hope that makes sense.

Councillor Chin: [Fixes the grammar] My actual question is, I realize that what you're presenting here is a fee increase, either the choice between a fee increase and just not existing, and the other possibility is maybe offering the same base fee for the existence, and then as a separate question, ask about whether students would support a fee increase of 10 cents per semester.

VP Patterson: So Midnight Kitchen did say that they would prefer having this be passed and then the increased fee makes sense in terms of inflation that has happened since the last time this was voted on. So that's why it was written this way; however I can consult with the Midnight Kitchen collective if they are friendly to the amendment to a separation into three question.

Councillor Sadikov: The fee is currently not indexed to inflation, is that correct? So has this proposed question received the approval of the office of the deputy provost?

Councillor Carolan: So we need to run this through legislative council before we send it off to the deputy provost and the student accounts people. I can tell you now that they do not like us indexing fees for inflation. The main reason is that it triples or multiplies by five depending of the term of the fee, administrated by the student accounts staff. Because that means that every year, they need to reinvest the fee, and increase the fee as per inflation for that year. That costs money, the staff that need to do that data entry, and honestly by the time the fee has gone by five years, I think it's much more reasonable to budget over those three to five years, on a level of money that you feel is necessary to sustain your service, and then have that charge as a flat rate over the three or five years, as opposed to indexing for inflation. And that's purely just to save the administrative burden that comes with indexing every year. That's a position that's held strongly by Student Accounts, and I also support that because I understand the funding that has to back up these administrative tasks. They will be notified after this is approved.

President Ger: Yeah, I think the question of whether or not it was previously indexed to inflation, it was previously indexed to inflation actually, that was a vote that happened previously, that's why in the whereas clause where it says \$3.25 and now it's \$3.35, that's because over time



inflation brought it up to \$3.35. However, as Niall said, the office of the DPSL doesn't want that anymore.

Councillor Chen: I'm just wondering if you could further explain why we need a referendum question in order to endorse discretionary funding?

VP Carolan: The reason why I think it's important that we separate the discretionary funding as opposed to the existence question, is that it does have an implication of student, based on them knowing where their money is going. So they could pay \$3.35 and several cents of that could be donated to another cause, that albeit is seen as worthwhile for MK's point of view, perhaps that individual student who supports MK may not support that other cause. That's why I think it's important that we separate the two, so that students understand that a portion of their fee will be going to an organization that they have no control over where that money goes.

Councillor Sadikov: This is something that I believe was decided upon last year when we reviewed the SSMU groups' internal regulations. Basically, discretionary funding has been allowed to other groups in the past, but it was brought up that this needed to be included in the referendum question, this is just something to be brought up, it's not really a change in the way that they actually operate. That said, according to the IRs, the question should include the maximum percentage of the fee that can be allocated, so that's something that should be added in there.

Councillor Chin: Just a difficult question to ask of any fee or fee increase proposals, which is that is it possible to provide council with the budget to justify \$3.35 per semester? And also, would it be possible to append that budget onto the referendum question when it is passed next meeting, so that all students will have access to it?

VP Patterson: That's a question that I will have to forward to Midnight Kitchen themselves, as it's their budget that they create, but that's something that I can speak to them about.

d. Notice of Motion Regarding Creation of Musicians Collective Fee

VP Patterson: The Musician's Collective is one of the other fifteen services that SSMU has, so previously something that VP Carolan and I discovered this summer during a budget meeting with the Musician's Collective, is that the Musician's Collective, first off, has existed since 2013, which is not that long in terms of service status. The previous years since it was granted service status, basically all the expenses incurred by the Musician's Collective were subsidized by the SSMU's operating budget. And typically, that would be about \$2,000 through the fiscal year out of SSMU's operating budget. So what we're proposing this year, mostly because the SSMU budget is not able to subsidize things like this, but also because this is a more sustainable way of



funding a service, we have proposed to create this fee for the Musician's Collective to ensure that the Musician's Collective has a sustainable source of funding and don't have to hinder the SSMU's operating budget.

VP Carolan: I just wanted to provide a little bit more clarification on the fee. So SSMU has been subsidizing the Musician's Collective year over year and Elaine is correct, the last subsidy that I was willing to provide was just over \$2,200. The reason why it's unsustainable is that the subsidy has been increasing year over year, and with an increased subsidy there is increased expenses, and then we are forced to continue subsidizing. I think that this service provides an awesome service to McGill students with the Jam Room, and as per their definition as a service, they're not able to charge students for use of that space, so whereas another club or private organization would definitely be charging for use of that space, they're not able to. So their only sources of revenue are open mic nights at Gerts and things like that. I have been discussing with them from the beginning of the year that they need to be more proactive with finding their own revenue sources as well, however to cover maintenance costs of the Jam space, which is a very big majority of what this modest fee will go towards, that's why they need it.

Councillor Chin: I'm really sorry to sound like a broken record, but would it be possible to include a budget to this fee proposal by the time of next meeting and have that budget appended to the question when it is brought forward to students?

VP Carolan: I apologize that it wasn't put on before, but I can also put on the budgets from back to when they were beginning as a service, to more clearly delineate the subsidies as well. Actually, I will ask the Musician's Collective if that's okay, because we have access to their financial statements but we should ask them.

Motion to recess.

e. Motion Regarding the Amendment of the Internal Regulations of Governance

VP Sobat: This is just adding those members-at-large provisions that were in the Accountable Leadership policy into the internal regulations, this was presented last council.

VP Magder: My only concern is that since the Environment Committee has limited members-at-large, that technically according to this rule, anyone who is a councilor could not sit on the Environment Committee even though literally any and unlimited number of students from the rest of McGill could sit on the Environment Committee, so I think that's kind of a shame and disappointing, because it's great.

VP Sobat: I feel like Environment Committee is an exception. If you have concerns about that, you can debate it.



Councilor Sadikov: I would like to move to amend this motion by striking clause D.

Councilor Chin: Would it be possible to motivate this amendment?

Councilor Sadikov: Yeah, the thing is just that these committees are quite small and if there are vacant seats then the councilor might be rectifying, it's quite likely that it's better to have more voting members just to avoid very small membership and single individuals swinging the vote easily. But beyond that, most of the committees operate by consensus anyways, or not with strict voting procedures and in which case, it wouldn't really matter either way. But if the councilors are going to be participating as a regular member it doesn't really make sense to me to isolate them in this way and I don't really see the benefits.

VP Sobat: I support that; I just didn't want to take anything out that was in the accountability policy, which I repealed without consultation.

Motion to amend the motion is called to question. Amendment passes. Motion is called to question. Motion passes.

f. Motion Regarding Electing Student Senators from the Faculty of Medicine and the School of Nursing

Councillor Chin: I'm presenting this motion because I want to change for the next electoral cycle how student senators are voted for in Medicine and Nursing. Traditionally how it happens is that the electoral process is administrated by elections SSMU, who has their own nomination and election deadlines. However, what I've noticed in Medicine and Nursing is that over the past two years, there has been either one or zero candidates going for either position and this year in particular, there was only one for Medicine and zero for Nursing. For the sake of greater student involvement and participation, I figured it would be easier to fold those elections into the elections for faculty associations, the student associations in each faculty so that this will boost the voter turnout and also the number of candidates interested in each position.

VP Sobat: I would just like to add that this option is available to all faculty associations; according to the internal regulations, the chief electoral officer should be informing faculty associations of that by November 1st, and then faculty associations have until December 1st to request that, so any of the next three council meetings this term, if there was a faculty association that wanted to do that moving forward, please get in touch.

Motion passes.

g. Motion Regarding Support for AMUSE Collective Bargaining



Claire: The job – uhm, I don't know if you worked with the work study website but it's from like '95 ish and uh the jobs stay up for a very long time so you're not quite sure if you're applying for a job that still exists. They told us, they promised us, 'we are fixing this issue. It's going to be done in Spring 2018.' How many of us are still going to be students in Spring 2018? So we just want this to be done a little quicker. Also, uh, the work study positions don't necessarily get posted, which means that people don't necessarily have access – what I mean by that when I say 'access' is that, if they don't know that the job exists, they can't necessarily apply to it. And so, the job will be given to the student from professors who've been here a long time, who they know. Thanks for asking that.

VP Sobat: Last question: I know something that I've heard a lot when it comes to particularly increasing the minimum wage I guess for the staff is like the total pool of funding available and how that results in less students being hired. Do you see that as a factor here? What kinds of impact could that size of an increase have on how many students could be hired? (1:25)

Claire: I'm not sure what you mean by this question

VP Sobat: So there's a – people have asked me if there's a set amount of money, and that if the minimum increases, does that mean that overall you can't hire as many students? Is that a concern?

Presenter: Not really. Right now its being done by students a lot more often because these jobs are jobs, in many cases, that used to be (inaudible), slowly moved away (inaudible) cause there were golden handshakes given, because there was a hiring freeze a couple years ago, so there are a lot more of these positions then there used to be, and a lot of students in these positions as it is much cheaper to hire students. What we have to do going forward is that we have to keep bugging the university to devote a higher percentage of its budget to student salaries. I'll answer a question that wasn't asked: where should the money come from? I think if you look at our administrators' salaries, you can see that there is a huge, huge discrepancy that doesn't necessarily have to be there.

Speaker: Councilor, did you have another question?

Councilor Cleveland: I have a follow up question in regards to the second part of Ethics 8.5. What student code are you looking for? As well, I guess that ties into number 2, that accurate job descriptions match. I didn't see anything that clarified what you're looking for specifically, and I want to see what's your input, do you have plans, and how do you justify inaccurate job descriptions?



Claire: So I'm not supposed to talk about really specific things about negotiations but I will say that we wanted to have a committee to be able to deal with these issues that active stakeholders have with work study. So that's for number 5. And number 2, we have a problem that on the membership list that we get every 5 months where job descriptions can be as vague as for student, student casual, casual, or reg. We don't know what any of these things mean. So an accurate job description would better serve our membership to describe what it is that they're signing up for, a certain amount so that there can be a certain amount of accountability on both sides.

Speaker: Great, do we have any questions at this time? Thank you Claire. We will move to vote on this motion. We're going to have discussion now.

Councilor Templer: I'd like to speak in favor of this motion, that there is a strong precedent in supporting campaigns like this throughout SSMU's history. Last year, SSMU endorsed the bargaining position of the **(inaudible)** community, so there's a strong precedent for this. I think that it's important that even if we ourselves cannot afford to pay our employees \$15 for their work, I think it's important that we support the employees of an organization which can afford this, and to work towards our own capacity for doing that in the future. Further, there are plenty students on campus who are members who support them and this bargaining procedure. Finally, I think it's important at McGill are argument for deregulation of tuition, wanting to increase tuition for students who need financial support. If the Constitution is going to go up, which McGill is trying to do, there should be a support structure for people who need it, and I think this would be a good step towards that. I very much support this motion and urge you to vote in favour.

Councilor Mansdoerfer: In regards that, I was originally planning to give consent to this vote, and then hearing from a lot of people over the last week, my initial assumption that it is an awesome motion with a lot of people we could support. I think it's really important to make sure that they're taken care of. I sat on the floor fellow committee last year for the IRC, so I understand how that is important. As I say that, I have issue with two parts, I think that we should take the time to think about this. First one would have to be part one, which I still don't agree that hiring priority should be happen for the hiring of a job, that would be very abstract on how to instigate that, very reasonable response to that but it just doesn't seem fair to me. And my second issue is the fourth part, \$15 minimum wage, an increase of minimum wage is great, but if, for example at Frostbite, they have a set amount of money for four jobs, the increase will cause a job loss. So instead of really increasing the amount of money for everyone available, you increase it for three people but then have one person take a hit. I don't know if this applies to other areas as well, if anyone else wants to clarify, but I'm worried that while you're improving the situation for 70% or 80%, this will effect hiring within an engineering setting.



VP Sobat: I don't believe Frostbite and AMUSE fall under the same umbrella; it's just McGill employees so not student association employees.

Councilor Century: First thing, I just wanted to say that I think that this is a great motion and a great idea that we've started to increase wages to living wages, but I do have my doubts about supporting a motion that makes us seem... the point is, if we can't pay our workers the same amount that we're endorsing, then what's the point? That's what I have to say about this.

Councilor Shi: I just have one concerns. So the first one is, are all the jobs getting the same payment?

VP Sobat: All the workers would be getting at least that; some of them would go higher.

Councilor Okome: I'd also like to speak on behalf of this motion, especially since I think SSMU has a responsibility to pay it's due support to students who work, between work study and people working for McGill, there are a bunch of students who don't have enough money for tuition every single year, especially with tuition going up. I think that we keep making comparisons to SSMU not being able to pay it's workers \$15, but McGill is not SSMU. McGill has money. We pay our tuition. McGill has a responsibility to student to pay them the correct wage. That's not an argument. SSMU also has a responsibility but because of budget cuts they aren't able to do that right now, and that's also because of McGill making us pay for things that we shouldn't.

VP Magder: Although I do feel that it's very important that we support these workers, I do feel very uncomfortable supporting Appendix A.1, just because I feel like this really does put up a barrier for a lot of members, and I don't feel comfortable supporting that because I do feel like that is a limitation. Going back to the \$15 minimum wage, I would find it personally very hard to go back to our workers and explain to them why we can't offer them \$15 minimum wage when we are supporting a motion, which is explicitly asking that for student workers. I do think that it's very important, but I do have other concerns, like the fact that its very possible that they might turn around and cut jobs as a response, that they would rather keep the paycheck of the executives rather than spend the money on these jobs, that is a real concern. I'm also very concerned that student fees may increase as a result of this. So the question I would like to ask is whether it's possible to support some parts of this motion without supporting the entire motion?

VP Sobat: In theory, it is. I think the motion was brought forward with the intention that there would be support for this stance in general. I actually really appreciate the concern over SSMU not also adopting a \$15 minimum wage, for example, it is not the argument that I was hearing in the past about this, there was a lot of concern about doing that and honestly if that is something that becomes important it can be looked at. One small part of the fee increase referendum last year was to look at that, which obviously failed; that doesn't mean that there couldn't be fee



increase in order to be able to do that for student workers. But this is a really great opportunity to be able to support more students on campus and it's also a building campaign that is garnering support across campus and across Montréal. To the issues that were raised with work-study: if work-study is seen as financial aid for students, then I think it's important that there be consistent access to work-study and since McGill is not upholding that, I think that it's a problem of McGill to make sure that they are offering enough opportunities to those students who qualify, but that doesn't mean only for one term. So I think in general there is more work to be done in terms of that, but I think that this is a good step in the right direction.

Councilor Cleveland: I would like to make a point about the minimum wage; while I understand why it seems hypocritical for SSMU to endorse priorities that we can't endorse ourselves, it should be pointed out that just because we are incapable of paying our employees a certain amount of money, does not mean that McGill is incapable of paying their employees that. It is unbelievable that McGill is unable their student employees \$15 minimum wage but are able to pay former principles millions of dollars. I understand the concern that it seems unreasonable, but I think topic comes up that SSMU's incapable of paying their employees that, that's something we can address moving forward. But just because we're supporting these priorities does not mean we're turning against out employees. Just because we aren't able to give rights in one area doesn't mean that we should say that the rest of McGill shouldn't provide those same rights. This minimum wage is not asking too much in my eyes, I think it's asking a very fair amount, especially on Councilor Sobat's point of work-study being used specifically as financial aid, and a financial aid councilor saying that work you do on work-study doesn't deserve extra money because that counts as money for them. If you are looking to receive money from the university and they don't give you money and they offer you work-study, you should receive as much money through doing work-study to have minimum wage. What I see as more likely is that the students working with SSMU will be more willing to work for the university, and that's the only detriment I see to this. And that's not enough to us not to support this motion.

Councilor Sadikov: I would like to speak in favor to this motion. Just to some of the concerns that were brought up, I agree with Councilor Sobat's points. It's important to contextualize this in the trend of increasing labor capitalization; this is something that's something extremely important to AMUSE, capitalization is basically an austerity measure, it's a way to pay workers less, and this is what makes people much less accessible, it's far better to work a job for three semesters instead of one, so I have shared concerns over this point. Further, as was brought up about the \$15 minimum wage, I think that we can endorse something like this in good faith because there is an understanding that we are in a very different position from McGill University; the limits in our capabilities largely come from the fact that so much of our student funds go toward the university. Furthermore our first priority is to support our members and since so many of our members belong to AMUSE, then it's natural that we would endorse something that is in their best interest. And to kind of expand on that point a little bit, these priorities have been set up by AMUSE, I think the union is best qualified to determine what the most important issues are for



the workers or student members, and as such I'm inclined to trust that these are the best interests of their members.

Councilor Zhou: My take on it is that I'm leaning towards Councilor Okome in that as SSMU, even though we don't have the ability to pay our own employees \$15, we still have as our top priority is the responsibility to the members of SSMU, the student population that we have to do everything in our capability to help them and in that, the most for AMUSE, because as has been said, a lot of their students are student workers and I feel like us endorsing this motion is within the scope of supporting students. One more thing, as a first year, for Appendix item A, for the hiring priority to people who have already done the job, I think that might be a barrier for especially newcomers to McGill, so first year students who might be looking for work-study. So just a little tidbit on that section.

VP Sobat: I don't want to rehash points that have been made, I just want to clarify: there has actually never been a motion or a mandate for or against the [?] campaign last year. There were discussions of what that would look like, and as well it was understood that if that passed, there would be discussions. But we didn't say anything explicitly against it or anything like that. So I would just encourage members to maybe think beyond the grey area of that campaign.

VP Magder: My question is that, at any point in the negotiations, has there been a contingency to ensure that when the wages are raised, they don't cross out additional jobs being offered? So, in negotiations, have you explicitly stated that when wages are raised, that won't come at the cost of other jobs being offered? The reason being is that although, I do agree with a lot of the other councilors, that it is very unfair that there are huge amounts of money being spent by this administration that could be cut back, I'm concerned that this administration would take an easier route and cut back jobs deemed as non-essential, just to give the appearance of agreeing when in reality they're just remaking the budget without making big changes.

VP Patterson cedes her time to Claire. Claire: The reason why I'm having trouble answering your question is because it's pretty complicated. So it's that departments have certain budgets to hire people, and certain budgets to do what they want with. They may hire someone for a month, and then that person will keep having to ask their supervisor, can I have another contract? Can I have another contract? Can I have another contract? Even if a lot of this happens, it seems like bad managerial planning. It seems like really silly, why would this ever happen. But it does and at some point, the answer is no. They don't know if they'll have a job next month; that's the nature of the system right now. The first part of your question, they are not all students. Like when I had an AMUSE job, I was not a student. I was a casual employee for a year, and then another year. So I wasn't a casual as a non-student doing a student job, I was a casual replacing a regular employee. Work-study is just for students, and some jobs are student-priority, so they'll be offered to students first.



VP Carolan: I just wanted to get a clarification on what you mean by priority to existing AMUSE members, does that mean that they have a first line refusal of the jobs, that it's mandated that the job has to offered to them and only after they decline it, should they provide separate candidates? Or is it on the basis that it's mandated that their application be reviewed with the rest of the candidates?

Claire: So the wording that we proposed is actually very weak compared to other worker's agreements with the university; it's if the job still exists and if the student is still eligible and if the department still needs it, then they will be first offered the job. But it's not within a hiring unit, or within a whole university, that they get priority for other jobs, no it's like this job that you had last semester, if it still exists then you should be able to get it next semester.

Councilor Mansdoerfer: A few keys points to bring up, I'll be brief. That point that was brought up about concern for first years, I think getting a foundation as a first year with work-study is really important, because then you can get a feel and a budget for how you'll be financially for the rest of university. [Brings up a situation in which somebody gets fired].

Claire: I really hope that they wouldn't be fired, but that's something that you can't help. But then my question to you is who would they hire to do that work? Because that work still needs to be done at the university. Weird things might happen, but if they were, the job would still need to be done. I don't mean to be dismissive, but as the population of a university grows, the work of a department also goes up.

Councilor Mehrotra: In terms of the point being brought up about the first years, there is a huge turn over in work-study since you can't work longer than three semesters, so that shouldn't be a huge problem.

VP Sobat: I can't find the number right now, but how many new AMUSE jobs have been created in the past three years, or like what percent?

Claire: In the last two years, we're pretty sure that there's been about a hundred more jobs, which is so much to the previous numbers.

Motion to call to question. This motion carries.

11. Reports by Committees

a. Funding Committee (10)

VP Carolan gives the report.



b. Club Committee (5)

No Clubs Committee meeting this week.

c. Executive Committee (5)

No Executive Committee meeting this week.

12. Councillor Reports

a. Councillor Anderson (2)

Councillor Anderson gives their report.

b. Councillor Sadikov (2)

Councillor Sadikov gives their report.

VP Sobat: I was wondering what were the changes to the names of the rooms put forward by students?

Councilor Sadikov: The amendment to the referendum in 2014 was not to rename the Jack Daniels Room and to rename the Champagne Room to the Chamber of Secrets. However, this was not allowed by the executives due to possible concerns over the lack of transparency by renaming the board room the Chamber of Secrets.

c. Councillor Thomas (2)

Councillor Thomas gives their report.

d. Councillor Gingrich-Hadley (2)

Councillor Gingrich-Hadley gives their report.

e. Councillor Templer (2)

Councillor Templer gives their report.

13. Executive Reports



a. VP University Affairs (5)

VP Sobat gives their report.

Councillor Sur: For the equity committee meeting, are you consulting with the groups on campus? For the event that you're planning?

VP Sobat: Definitely, I believe our committee members are mainly reaching out to specifically faculty association equity committee, but we're open to collaboration with any group that wants to get involved.

b. VP (Internal) (5)

VP Lawrie gives their report.

c. VP (Student Life) (5)

VP Patterson gives their report.

d. VP (Finance) (5)

VP Carolan gives their report.

VP Sobat: I heard that there might be some outstanding invoices owed to the SSMU by some faculty associations, could you speak to that?

VP Carolan: I'm not going to do a whole call-out right here, but I work with the accounting department to review the accounts receivable list, which is a big list of people and organizations which owe us money. So there are various faculty associations that are on those accounts, I will be following up with the individual councillors here about that.

e. VP (Operations) (5)

VP Madger gives their report.

f. President (5)

President Ger gives their report.

Councillor Sadikov: Could you speak more about the deal with SNAX?



Students' Society of McGill University

Tel: (514) 398-6800 Fax: (514) 398-7490 | ssmu.ca
3600 McTavish St., Suite 1200, Montréal, QC, H3A 0G3
Loisiré J'ouméréd, Kanaké'el-é'ka'ra'jibonni'vériouy

President Ger: There was outreach done by our kitchen manager to each one of the different faculty run organization to see if they would like to carry our products. SNAX had gotten back to us saying that they would be interested in having our products and we've started to work out a little deal there.

Councillor Anderson: Which products are you interested in trying out at SNAX?

President Ger: We actually asked the people at SNAX what they would like to try, and they wanted some sandwiches, cold pizza, and something else that I forget.

g. VP (External Affairs) (5)

VP Aird gives their report.

14. Confidential Session

15. Adjournment



Muna Tojiboeva, President

2017-08-09