

TO **FEZANA Executive**
FEZANA Member Associations

FROM FEZANA World Body Working Group
Sarosh Collector. <scollector@collectordart.com>,<saroshjc@aol.com>
Khorshed Jungalwala, Chair <kayj@ziplink.net>,<kfj@concins.com>
Farrokh Mistree <farrokh.mistree@eudoramail.com>
Gev Nentin <gevnentin@aol.com>
Rohinton Rivetna <Rivetna@aol.com>

SUBJECT FEZANA World Body Working Group: Interim Report 2

DATE January 12, 2003. Revised March 4, 2003

PREAMBLE

In the past the WG has circulated a Summary of its activities and a Report with the supporting documentation and WG commentary. The FEZANA World Body Working Group has been directed by the FEZANA Executive to circulate only the summary of its reports to the FEZANA Member Associations. The summary and the full report is to be placed on the FEZANA web site in due course. In the interim, please contact Khorshed Jungalwala to obtain electronic copies of these documents.

The WG issued an Interim Report dated September 2, 2002 in which the WG summarized its activities from June to August 2002. The report has been circulated and is also available from <http://www.fezana.org/wbwg/>

In the WG Interim Report 2 we focus on two items, namely,

- The communication between the WZO and the FEZANA World Body Working Group.
- Communication between the FEZANA Executive and the FEZANA World Body Working Group.

For previous reports issued by the WG please contact Khorshed Jungalwala or download from <http://www.fezana.org/wbwg/>

In the next report the WG will report on its analysis of the WCZF2002 model and the meeting in Mumbai.

SUMMARY OF WG ACTIVITIES – SEPTEMBER TO DECEMBER 2002**Communication between WZO and the FEZANA World Body Working Group**

Summary from Interim Report 1 dated September 2, 2002

1. On July 12, 2002, the WG finalized a list of queries which was sent to WZO officers for clarification and
2. On July 25, 2002, the WG received from WZO a revised draft of the new constitution (WZO 2001 Ltd.). This charter is included in full in this document.
3. On August 6, 2002, the WG acknowledged the receipt of the WZO 2001 Ltd. Charter.
4. On August 12, 2002, we received a letter from Rumi Sethna politely declining to respond to the Clarifications we sought in our email dated July 12, 2002.
5. On August 21, 2002 the WG responded to Rumi Sethna requesting him again to respond to our clarifications. We also cautioned him with regard to the path he had set out for the WZO post WZO International Board Meeting.
6. The WG completed studying the Charter of WZO 2001 Ltd. that we received from Rumi Sethna on July 25, 2002 and sought additional clarifications of this new charter on August 20, 2002.
7. On August 27, 2002 WZO sent a letter to all FEZANA Member Associations, FEZANA officers, along with specific individuals a letter and the WZO 2001 Ltd Charter.
8. On August 30, 2002, the WG received another letter from Rumi declining to document any responses to the queries previously presented.

For details please visit http://www.fezana.org/wbwg/p3intrpt_090202.pdf or email Khorshed Jungalwala for a copy of the WG Interim Report 1 dated September 2, 2002.

Summary of communication between WZO and the FEZANA World Body Working Group September 1 to December 31, 2002

9. On September 5, 2002, Darayus S. Motiwala on behalf of Rumi Sethna forwarded the letter addressed to Khorshed Jungalwala dated August 30, 2002 to the World Zarathushti community. **(See Item 1, Pages 4 and 5)**
10. The WG decided to drastically reduce the number of clarifications requested. It decided to focus those items that had been identified by various members of the North American Zarathushti community as being "Show Stoppers." After careful analysis the WG identified five Show Stoppers (all pertaining to the WZO2001 Ltd. Charter) and decided to request a response from the WZO on these. This request was sent to the WZO on October 19, 2002. **(See Item 2, Pages 6 - 9)**
11. On October 27, 2002 Rumi Sethna on behalf of WZO acknowledged receipt of the WG communication and declined to respond to each of the five show stoppers. **(See Item 3, Pages 10- 11)**
12. Khorshed Jungalwala has had several telephone conversations with representatives of the WZO and other organizations. The WZO representatives include Rumi Sethna, Mehrwan Boyce, Adi Davar and others in an effort to explain the WG's intentions and to get the WZO to respond to the requests for clarification.
13. On November 3, 2002 Khorshed Jungalwala acknowledged the email dated October 27, 2002 and clarified a miscommunication from Mehrwan Boyce to Rumi Sethna vis a vis their telephone conversation. **(See Item 4, Pages 12 - 13)**

The supporting documentation and additional commentary is included in the WG Interim Report 2. Please contact Khorshed Jungalwala to get it.

Commentary

The WG repeats its position, namely,

- all models that it has analyzed to date are workable and none is perfect.
- the WG will not be recommending a particular model; it will offer for consideration all models that it deems to be workable with the final decision being made by elected officials.

With this as background it is the considered opinion of the WG that the WZO2001 Ltd. Charter has at least five limitations (identified earlier as Show Stoppers). The WG cautions that it is premature to rule out the WZO2001 Ltd. Charter until the strengths and weaknesses of the competing models are identified.

The leadership of the WZO met in late September 2002 to discuss and ratify the WZO2001 Ltd. Charter. The WG has been informed verbally that the WZO intends to make slight modifications to the WZO2001 Ltd Charter and register it in 2003. In the interest of having only one World Body the WG has cautioned WZO against this course of action.

Communication between the FEZANA Executive and the FEZANA World Body Working Group.

14. Firdosh Mehta has been in communication with Rumi Sethna and others on the World Body issue. On August 14, 2002, with no input from members of the WG he sent an email seeking clarification on Clause 71 of the WZO2001 Ltd. Charter. Rustom Dubash responded on August 27, 2002. This exchange was sent verbatim by the WG to the FEZANA Community on October 6, 2002. **(See Item 5, Pages 14 - 17)**

The Indian Government has scheduled a meeting for all Non-Resident Indians in January 2003. The WG learned that a number of members of the Zarathushti community from overseas will be present at this meeting and that a meeting of the officers of various representative Zoroastrian organizations of the world is planned for January 21 and 22, 2003 in Mumbai. It occurred to us that January 20, 2003 would be an opportune time for people interested in furthering the World Body issue to meet for face to face discussions in Mumbai prior to the Meeting of Leaders on January 21 and 22.

Since the meeting on January 20, 2003 would have been a formal event, with the FEZANA World Body Working Group providing leadership the WG thought it prudent to request the FEZANA Executive to review the letter and give its OK for transmittal. This request was sent on November 9, 2002. **(See Item 6, Pages 18 and 20)**

The FEZANA Executive decided to vote against the meeting proposed for January 20, 2003 and Firdosh Mehta informed the WG formally of this decision on December 9, 2002.

15. On November 13, 2002 via a teleconference, Firdosh Mehta informed the WG that he had received a Resolution calling for the dissolution of the WG and the transference of its activities to the FEZANA Executive under the FEZANA President's leadership. On November 22, 2002, the WG received a list of Directives from Firdosh Mehta on behalf of the FEZANA Executive. As per the mandate given to the WG in May 2002 the FEZANA Executive is empowered to issue directives to the Working Group. The WG's initial limited response was not acceptable to Firdosh Mehta. Accordingly, the Working Group responded to these Directives in full on December 5, 2002: The WG has agreed to those directive that were keeping with its May 2001 mandate, sought clarification wrt others, and modifications wrt those that were not in harmony with the mandate. No response has been received from the FEZANA Executive. **(See Item 7, Pages 21 - 27)**
16. On December 15, 2002, Firdosh Mehta sent the WG Response to the FEZANA Executive Directives to the sponsor of the Resolution with a recommendation that the Resolution be withdrawn. As far as we know the Resolution has not been withdrawn.

The supporting documentation and additional commentary is included in the WG Interim Report 2. Please contact Khorshed Jungalwala to get it.

Wrt the meeting in Mumbai on January 20, 2003

On December 15, 2002 the WG sent Firdosh Mehta the following **(See Item 8, Pages 30 - 31)**

"The WG recognizes the value of having a FEZANA presence at this Meeting of Leaders in Mumbai and wishes all on the FEZANA delegation well and offers them whatever support they need by way of World Body related briefings/clarifications of WG positions.

Out of domestic political necessity, the **WG reluctantly affirms that all members of the FEZANA delegation must do so in their own individual capacity as community leaders / observers and none are authorized to speak on behalf the FEZANA World Body Working Group. "**

CLOSING

The WG has completed its analysis and has offered its considered opinion with respect to the WZO Model. The WG has completed a first pass of the analysis of the WCZF2002 Model put forward by ZAH in September 2002. The WG sincerely regrets that it has been unable to respond to the ZAH sooner.

The WG is currently working on two items:

- developing options for consideration that might mitigate the impact of the show stoppers in the WZO 2001 Ltd Charter.
- finalizing a preliminary analysis of the WCZF2002 Model sent to the WG in September 2002.

The WG plans to report on these two issues by the end of January 2003.

Please feel free to direct your comments to both Khorshed Jungalwala and Firdosh Mehta.

CORRESPONDENCE SUMMARY

ITEM 1 – WZO AND THE FEZANA WORLD BODY WORKING GROUP – SEPTEMBER 5, 2002

The WG had sent two requests for clarification of the WZO Charter to Rumi Sethna. On August 30, 2002, Rumi Sethna on behalf of the WZO declined to respond to the WG's second request for clarification dated August 21, 2002. On September 5, 2002, Darayus S. Motiwala on behalf of Rumi Sethna forwarded the letter addressed to Khorshed Jungalwala dated August 30, 2002 to the World Zarathushti community. For completeness this letter is reproduced in this report.

My dear Khorshed:

Many thanks for your two emails of 21 August.

I had sincerely hoped that you and your WG colleagues, whom I deeply respect, would respond constructively by proposing some specific verbal changes to the WZO 2001 draft, which could allow the WG to recommend that it would be in FEZANA's interests to join the restructured WZO.

I can appreciate that your Montreal AGM's resolution places the WG in a dilemma. Indeed, it is a humanly impossible task to be the author of the mischief-making new model for a world body, which the WG itself promoted earlier this year, and, at the same time, now serve as an objective arbiter between that model and other ones. I can also sympathise with the frustration the WG must feel, that while many Zarathustis, associations and regions world-wide - including most FEZANA members at the FEZANA-WZO meeting in NY in April last year - developed a consensus on the principles and details of WZO 2001/WZO Foundation proposal, not a shred of it is evident even on the basic principles of WG's new model, not even from India or UK much less any FEZANA member. That, is sadly clear from your own May report to FEZANA!

But are these any reasons for your emails to reveal so much bias against the idea of FEZANA joining a restructured WZO? Any objective FEZANA member will easily recognise it from the legalistic and inquisitorial tone of WG's queries, which friendly expressions of Navroz and Khordad Sal greetings can barely disguise? Was it also necessary to limit your understanding to the few documents mentioned in your emails, and ignore the many written communications circulated world-wide for some years explaining WZO's restructuring principles and details, and the innumerable verbal explanations given at length in meetings since 1997 to FEZANA representatives, including with three members of the WG and past FEZANA Presidents?

As regards the several pages of the WG's twice-repeated queries, was it necessary to add queries relating to the very compromises insisted upon by FEZANA's representative, Prof. Irani in November 2000, on its behalf? For example, the qualifications of Individual Members (CI. 9(a)), or participation of interested Federation Members in Individual Council's work - based on the same one vote like every Individual Member (CI. 9 (e)), or deletion of a specific time period within which associations in a region must form a federation (CI 6A)? Was it necessary to query the compromise proposed by your present President Firdosh Mehta and accepted by those at the said NY meeting, that the qualifications for membership be left as Prof. Irani negotiated (CI. 9(a)), but that a region/association should have the autonomy to decide if its proposed candidate for election to either Council meets its definition of a Zarathusti (CI 13A & 23 A).

In making so many repeated, and added, queries, the WG has apparently confused itself. I am afraid, that might end-up by confusing FEZANA members. But perhaps WG might be following your President Truman's thought, that when you don't want others to join in a proposal, it is best to confuse them!

If despite many years of explanation of the restructured WZO's principles and details, including at the NY meeting which all WG members joined, you continue to pose several pages of queries repeated in different ways, it simply suggests that either one really does not understand them, or one refuses to understand. I would be the last to suggest the latter of such wise persons on the WG. But if it is the former, then it clearly suggests that no amount of written clarifications will ever suffice, but give rise to more queries. Hence, my dear friend, is it not wiser to sit face to face as long as it takes to clarify all that you want, once and for all?

I have made this offer twice, to be turned down twice by you. Let me now make it for a third time! If you are serious about finding solutions that could allow the WG to recommend that FEZANA members join WZO restructured as proposed, than please come soon to London,. Let us sit and clarify everything together, before I go to my International Board in late September. Otherwise Khorshed, please end this infructuous exchange of repetitive correspondence, as it seems to be leading the WG or WZO nowhere.

Warmest regards to you and all your WG members,

Yours sincerely,

Rumi P. Sethna
Chairman, WZO
August 30, 2002

ITEM 2 – WG REQUEST FOR CLARIFICATION 3 – OCTOBER 19, 2002

Upon receipt of the communication dated August 30, 2002 the WG decided to drastically reduce the number of clarifications requested. It decided to focus those items that had been identified by various members of the North American Zarathushti community as being "Show Stoppers." After careful analysis the WG identified five Show Stoppers (all pertaining to the WZO2001 Ltd. Charter) and decided to request a response from the WZO on these. These showstoppers were culled from the WG Request for Clarifications I and II and in some cases modified.

From: [KHORSHED JUNGALWALA](#)

To: [RUMI SETHNA](#) ; [Rustam Dubash](#) ; [Darayus S Motivala](#)

Cc: [FIRDOSH MEHTA](#) ; [ROHINTON RIVETNA](#) ; [SAROSH COLLECTOR](#) ; saroshjc@aol.com ;

[FARROKH MISTREE](#) ; [FARROKH MISTREE](#) ; [GEV NENTIN](#) ; [Gev Nentin](#)

Sent: Saturday, October 19, 2002 10:10 PM

Subject: WG - WZO Clarification III

Dear Rumi:

I understand that you have found the WG's earlier requests for clarification to be long and repetitious. To circumvent these two impediments:

- the WG has identified 5 Core Questions which require 10 Yes / No Answers and
- the Questions have been formulated so that the Answers to all Questions, from the WG perspective, are in the affirmative.

Of course, please feel free to provide additional information.

The WG is planning to issue its Report to the FEZANA Member Associations at the end of October 2002. Accordingly, we would be most grateful for a response by October 28, 2002. If you need more time please do inform the WG.

As in the past, your response to the WG will be included in the WG's Report to the community and this Report will be placed on the FEZANA web.

With best wishes,

Khorshed F. Jungalwala
on behalf of the FEZANA World Body Working Group

TO **Rumi Sethna, President WZO**

FROM FEZANA World Body Working Group

Sarosh Collector.	<scollector@collectordart.com>,<saroshjc@aol.com>
Khorshed Jungalwala, Chair	<kayj@ziplink.net>,<kfj@concins.com>
Farrokh Mistree	<farrokh.mistree@eudoramail.com>
Gev Nentin	<gevnentin@aol.com>
Rohinton Rivetna	<Rivetna@aol.com>

Copy to Firdosh Mehta, President FEZANA

SUBJECT Request for Clarification on WZO2001 - III

DATE October 19, 2002

PREAMBLE

You are in possession of the following:

- WG Requests for Clarifications I and II dated July 9, 2002 and August 6, 2002.
- WG Interim Report dated September 8, 2002.
- WG Communication between Firdosh Mehta and WZO dated September 27, 2002.

The WG is in receipt of the following communication:

- May 14, letter to Framroze Patel, sent by Darayus Motiwala on June 20, 2002.
- August 12, letter with the WZO 2001 LTD. Charter from WZO, sent by Darayus Motiwala the same day.
- September 5, letter from WZO, sent by Darayus Motiwala the same day.

The June 20, 2002 communication has been included in the WG Interim Report. All of the preceding were sent directly by WZO to FEZANA Member Associations. They will also be included in full in the forthcoming WG Phase Three Report.

The WG has been mandated, along with other directives, by the FEZANA Member Associations at the FEZANA AGM in May 2002 to advise them with respect to "Deal Breakers." Accordingly, in light of your response to our request for clarifications in the past we are posing FIVE Core Questions which require TEN Yes / No answers. The questions have been formulated so that the answers to all questions, from the WG perspective, are in the affirmative. In the event you wish to expand on the answer, additional comments will be useful. If the WG does not hear back from you it will be assumed that you agree with the WG's interpretations of WZO2001 Ltd. and will write the report to the FEZANA Community accordingly.

The WG is planning to issue its report to the FEZANA Member Associations at the end of October 2002. Accordingly, we would be grateful for a response by October 23, 2002. If you need more time please do inform the WG.

POTENTIAL SHOWSTOPPERS

The following showstoppers have been culled from the WG Request for Clarifications I and II and in some cases modified. These, in the opinion, of the WG are judged to be the **major** showstoppers.

Question 1

Voting structure at the General Body meeting. WG Clarification I – Question 9.

Question 2

Membership Structure. WG Clarification I – Question 15.

Question 3

Membership of the Council of Federations. WG Clarification II – Question 25.

Question 4

Qualification of Individual Members. WG Clarification II – Question 28.

Question 5

From letter of Rumi Sethna and Rustam Dubash dated May 23, 2001. WG Phase One Report. Pages 12 through 15.

SHOWSTOPPER 1 – VOTING STRUCTURE AT THE GENERAL BODY MEETING

At the WZO General Body Meetings:

- Individual/Association Members of WZO get 1 vote, and
- Federation Members of WZO get 1 vote per 500 persons.
- The total number of Individual votes is normalized to be equal to the total number of Federation votes.

Question 1aScenario A: Let us say all the Federation Members are present at a Special Meeting of the WZO General Body, and have, collectively, 282 total votes.

- Since the quorum is 500, only 218 Individual Members need to be present (in person or by Closed Proxy).
- The votes cast by the 218 Individual Members are normalized upwards to equal a total of 282 votes (or one may normalize the 282 votes downward to equate to the 218 Individual votes – the resulting proportion should be the same). This means that the 218 Individual Members have an equal voice and equal voting power as *all* the Federations of the world, representing over 200,000 population.

Is the preceding correct? Yes / No. If No kindly explain briefly.

Question 1bScenario B: Let us take a scenario at an Annual General Meeting of WZO. The quorum here is 300 (and only 100 for an adjourned meeting). Let us say all the Federation Members are present and have, collectively, 282 votes. Since the quorum is 300, it means that only 18 Individual Members need to be present (in person or by ballot). The votes cast by these 18 Individual Members are normalized upwards to equal a total of 282. This means that JUST 18 Individual Members have an equal voice and equal voting power as all the Federations of the world. For General Meetings only a simple majority is needed to pass.

Is the preceding correct? Yes / No. If No kindly explain briefly.

Question 1c: Scenario C: Let us say only one Region (Africa, with 3 votes) is present at the Annual General body meeting. And 1000 Individual Members are there in person or by ballot. According to the WZO2001 Ltd. one Region's 3 votes will be normalized upwards to equal 282 qualifying Federation votes and the 1,000 individual votes will be normalized down to 282 qualifying Federation votes.

Is the preceding correct? Yes / No. If No kindly explain briefly.

SHOWSTOPPER 2 - MEMBERSHIP STRUCTURE

Individuals (with one vote), Associations (with one vote) and Federations (with one vote per 500) can all become members of WZO with voting rights

Question 2 - Consider the following scenario.

- - Say Mr. X is an Individual Member of WZO.
- - Mr. X is also a member of his local Association, ZAGNY.
- - And ZAGNY is a member of the Federation, FEZANA.
- If Mr. X, ZAGNY and FEZANA are all members of WZO, this means that Mr. X's voice is heard 3 times – as an Individual Member, again (albeit diluted) through ZAGNY, and a third time (albeit even further diluted) , through FEZANA.

Is the preceding correct? Yes / No. If No kindly explain briefly.

SHOWSTOPPER 3– MEMBERSHIP OF COUNCIL OF FEDERATIONS

Clause 6A “Any Zarathusti association or anjuman in a region where a federation has **either** not been formed or has not become a Federation Member of the WZO 2001 can become a Federation Member, provided after joining it undertakes to pursue, within a reasonable period of time, which period can be extended as the situation warrants, a dialogue with other ones in the region to be followed by concrete steps to establish a federation for that region.”

Clause 6B “Any Zarathusti association or anjuman in any region which has been registered as an ordinary or permanent association member of The World Zoroastrian Organisation prior to the incorporation of WZO 2001.”

Question 3a: FEZANA Member Associations – ZAC and ZAGNY are members of the current WZO. If FEZANA joins WZO 2001 Ltd. then ZAC and ZAGNY would cease to have membership in WZO 2001 Ltd.

Is the preceding correct? Yes / No. If No kindly explain briefly.

Question 3b: FEZANA Member Associations ZAC - ZAGNY are members of the current WZO. If FEZANA opts NOT to join WZO 2001 Ltd. - as per Clause 6B these FEZANA Member Associations would become members of the WZO 2001 Ltd. Council of Federations and continue to be members as long as FEZANA did not join.

Is the preceding correct? Yes / No. If No kindly explain briefly.

Question 3c: As per the WZO2001 Ltd, Charter any association is entitled to become a member of the Council of Individuals, regardless of there being representation for the Association or Federation at the Council of Federations. This membership would be separate and apart from the membership in COF. Now as a member of the COI, the Association will be recognized as an “individual member”, similar to other “individuals”. For purposes of votes, this Association will have only ONE vote and not the number of votes proportional to the internal membership of that Association.

Is the preceding correct? Yes / No. If No kindly explain briefly.

SHOWSTOPPER 4 - QUALIFICATION OF INDIVIDUAL MEMBERS

Clause 9(a) " ... persons born into and/or **professing** the Zarathusti faith;

Article 24 ... office bearers of the Council of Individuals "shall be professed Zarathushtis

Question 4a: What is meant by “professing” the Zarathushti faith? The dictionary meaning of "professes" is "to affirm faith in or allegiance to (a religion, God, etc.)". Using that meaning, anyone can "profess" the Zarathushti faith by just saying I am a Zarathushti. Accordingly, a person who just professes to be a Zarathushti is eligible to become a member of the Council of Individuals and is eligible to be an Office Bearer of the Council of Individuals and of the WZO.

Is the preceding correct? Yes / No. If No kindly explain briefly.

Question 4b: Ali Jafarey "professes" to be a Zarathushti and is one of founders of the Zoroastrian Assembly. In keeping with the previous logic Ali Jafarey would be considered qualified for membership of the Council of Individuals eligible to be an Office Bearer of the Council of Individuals and of the WZO.¹

Is the preceding correct? Yes / No. If No kindly explain briefly.

SHOWSTOPPER 5 – DEAL BREAKERS

Question 5 - Rumi Sethna and Rustam Dubash in letter dated May 23, 2001 identified two deal breakers:

4.2 (i) The Council of Individuals (COI) and the Council of Federations (COF) must have equal representation on the International Board - each Council must have 16 representatives

(ii) At AGM's and Special General Meetings (including those for changing the constitution), there must remain parity of voting between Federation and Individual members.

The WG has taken a look at the WZO2001 Ltd Charter. As per Clause 71 in the WZO2001 Ltd, in the opinion of the WG preceding two deal breakers are still deal breakers from the perspective of WZO.

Is the preceding correct? Yes / No. If No kindly explain briefly.

¹ Clarification: This question has been raised by various people on numerous occasions in connection with the WZO Model and all other models that the WG has studied. The WG intent was to address this question head-on for ALL models that it considered. The WG regrets and apologizes to Ali Jafarey on the inclusion of his name in this request for clarification.

ITEM 3 – WZO RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR CLARIFICATION 3 – OCTOBER 27, 2002

On October 27, 2002 Rumi Sethna on behalf of the WZO acknowledged receipt of the WG communication and declined to respond to each of the five “show stoppers” identified in WG Request for Clarification 3.

From: [Rumi Sethna](#)

To: [KHORSHEJ JUNGALWALA](#)

Cc: [Rustom S Dubash](#) ; [Firdosh Mehta](#) ; [Darayus S Motivala](#) ; [Sam Bhiwandiwalla](#) ; [Meherwan Boyce](#)

Sent: Sunday, October 27, 2002 5:20 PM

Subject: Reply to your email

Dear Khorshed

I enclose a reply to your email.

Rumi

27th. October 2002

My dear Khorshed:

Many thanks for your October 19 and 20 emails. I must congratulate the WG on its ingenuity in rehashing all its old queries in a relatively briefer manner. In substance, nevertheless, they still remain the same.

Since you ask in your emails, may I say that it would be quite wrong for WG to assume the responses it has itself implied in its queries. Hence, you would be misleading FEZANA members, if it draws conclusions based on such implied responses.

It is clear to me that the WG's difficulty, and the repetitive queries stemming from it, lie in its continuing conviction that the community's world body must be based on the hierarchical organizational structure which most modern corporations and communities have long since discarded. WZO has explained repeatedly, including at its April 2001 meeting in NY with FEZANA members and even in my May 14, 2002 response to the WG's 1st Report, that the organizational model for our restructuring is a completely DIFFERENT one. It is predicated on the modern concept, now favored by many forward-looking institutions. Under it, each constituency within an institution is entrusted with different aspects of the institution's responsibilities which it can best handle, empowered with independence to deliver them, and their effective delivery to its constituency, to each other and to the institution ensured through matrix management.

I am afraid, that until the WG realizes that WZO's organizational concept is fundamentally different from WG's hierarchical one, it will keep generating the same old queries which are relevant to its own model, not that of WZO's.

Regions like Iran, Europe, Pakistan and Singapore have understood, and accepted, WZO's organizational model and the details of the WZO 2001 arrangements based thereon. So has our entire International Board at its meeting last month, including new elected trustees to whom all this was quite new. I have no doubt that respected Zarathusthis on the WG will similarly understand, if they choose to understand it with an open mind.

To try and help in that direction, let me again extend my hand of friendship and co-operation by inviting you to London at your early convenience. Let us both sit in a friendly and relaxed atmosphere, to understand the basic fundamentals of the WZO model. Let us then proceed to clarify any and all your queries to your heart's content, since simple "yes" and "no" responses demanded in your emails can, in these circumstances, prove to be so misleading.

Why are you not coming to clarify matters face to face, at first hand? By doing so, both of us can end these exchanges which are becoming tiresome not only to both of us, but must be even more so to all FEZANA members and others around the world who might still have the patience to read them.

With warmest regards,

Yours sincerely,

Rumi Sethna
Chairperson, WZO

PS Since dictating the above I have just spoken to Meherwan Boyce who informed me that you would be able to recommend WZO draft constitution if the Federations have a 70% majority. As you are aware and have been since the meeting in New York that this would not be possible and would be a deal breaker. Please Khorshed if this is the case than we are all wasting our valuable time which I would rather spend on WZO.
RUMI

ITEM 4 – WG RESPONSE TO WZO – NOVEMBER 3, 2002

On November 3, 2002 Khorshed Jungalwala on behalf of the WG acknowledged the email dated October 27, 2002 from Rumi Sethna and clarified a miscommunication from Mehrwan Boyce to Rumi Sethna via a vis their telephone conversation. Meherwan Boyce and Rumi Sethna spoke to Khorshed Jungalwala on the phone and acknowledged the correctness of Khorshed's position.

From: [KHORSHED JUNGALWALA](#)

To: [Rumi Sethna](#)

Cc: [Rustom S Dubash](#) ; [Firdosh Mehta](#) ; [Darayus S Motivala](#) ; [Sam Bhiwandiwalla](#) ; [Meherwan Boyce](#) ; [ROHINTON RIVETNA](#) ; [SAROSH COLLECTOR](#) ; [FARROKH MISTREE](#) ; [GEV NENTIN](#) ; kfj@concins.com ; saroshjc@aol.com ; [Gev Nentin](#) ; [FARROKH MISTREE](#)

Sent: Sunday, November 03, 2002 10:54 AM

Subject: WG - Acknowledgment of Rumi Sethna's letter 10.27.02.

Dear Rumi:

On behalf of the FEZANA World Body Working Group I acknowledge your letter dated October 27, 2002 which was sent in response to the WG Request for Clarification III.

Conversation with Meherwan Boyce

I have briefed members of the WG in all details pertaining to my conversation with Meherwan Boyce on October 24, 2002.

I have informed the WG:

- that Meherwan and I had an open and pleasant conversation;
- that **one of the several items** discussed was the issue of inequitable voting on the Council of Individuals and the Council of Federations;
- that Meherwan volunteered to intervene and help move the communication along; I encouraged him to communicate the WG position to you;
- that I made it clear to Meherwan that the inequitable voting structure was **one of the five "showstoppers"** that the WG had identified in its Request for Clarification III;
- that Meherwan should encourage you to respond to the WG's requests for clarification **in writing**.

In your letter you state *"that you [Khorshed] would be able to recommend WZO draft constitution if the Federations have a 70% majority"*.

I have briefed the WG that the material in quotes is incorrect.

As you know the WG is not mandated to negotiate with any entity. The WG's role is to analyze information it solicits and receives and publish its analysis in the form of reports. Accordingly, I wish to make absolutely clear that at no point was there any indication on my part that I personally would recommend the WZO draft constitution if the 70% majority for the Federations is acceded to by WZO, since this action would violate the mandate that the WG has been given.

WG's response

The WG discussed your letter dated October 27, 2002 at its teleconference on October 28, 2002. The salient points pertaining to you at this time are:

- As has been the WG's practice your letter will be included in full in the next WG Report and will be placed on the FEZANA Web.
- The WG is not mandated to negotiate and in this context a correction pertaining to the statement in quotes will be included in the next report.
- The WG will include its analysis of your response to the WG's request for clarifications.
- The WG repeats that the questions referenced in Request for Clarification III are but a subset of the questions embodied in Request for Clarification I and II.

With best wishes,

Khorshed F. Jungalwala
on behalf of the FEZANA World Body Working Group

ITEM 5 – FIRDOSH MEHTA'S COMMUNICATION WITH WZO – NOVEMBER 3, 2002

Firdosh Mehta has been in communication with Rumi Sethna and others on the World Body issue. On August 14, 2002, with no input from members of the WG he sent an email seeking clarification on Clause 71 of the WZO2001 Ltd. Charter. Rustom Dubash responded on August 27, 2002. This exchange was sent verbatim by the WG to the FEZANA Community on October 6, 2002.

Sent: Sunday, October 06, 2002 10:08 PM

Subject: WG - COMMUNICATION BETWEEN FIRDOSH MEHTA & WZO

TO FEZANA Executive

FEZANA Member Associations

FROM FEZANA World Body Working Group

Sarosh Collector.

Khorshed F. Jungalwala, Chair

Farrokh Mistree

Gev Nentin

Rohinton Rivetna

SUBJECT Communication between Firdosh Mehta and WZO

DATE October 6, 2002

Preamble

In the WG Interim Report June - August 2002 we had stated the following:

"We were made aware by Firdosh about communication he has initiated with WZO in his *personal* capacity. We were also copied on WZO response to his written communications. This is a direct communication between Firdosh and WZO, not involving the WG and hence it is not included in this Interim Report."

This email

We have been requested by Firdosh Mehta on behalf of the FEZANA Executive to forward the communication between Firdosh Mehta and the WZO.

"I understand that there are many other issues and requested questions that WG has put forth to WZO, and they have not responded to your satisfaction. I am not trying to reflect anything about that on either party. All I am trying to do is that the AGM mandate included the issue of response from WZO on particularly "DEAL BREAKER" clauses, and Clause 71 is one of the most important ones, as we all clearly know and understand. That is why our members should be informed. If the members don't like or like the reply from WZO, then let them be the judge of that".

The WG will in the near future send out its analysis of all the WZO showstoppers including this one.

Best wishes,

Khorshed F. Jungalwala

on behalf of the FEZANA World Body Working Group

=====

Material sent for circulation by Firdosh Mehta, President of FEZANA

=====

----- Original Message -----

From: "Firdosh Mehta" <firdosh.mehta@primus.ca>

To: "Khorshed Jungalwala (Work)" <kfj@concins.com>; "Khorshed Jungalwala" <kayj@ziplink.net>

Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2002 10:02 PM

Subject: Fw: CLAUSE 71

Dear Khorshed,

Based on Rustam Dubash's email confirmation below, you may include my question and his answer in your WG report as described below.

Thanks, Firdosh.

----- Original Message -----

From: "Rustam Dubash" <dubashrs@penningtons.co.uk>

To: "Firdosh Mehta" <firdosh.mehta@primus.ca>

Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2002 7:46 AM

Subject: RE: CLAUSE 71

Dear Firdosh,

I have no objection to my response being included in a WG report.

Regards

Rustam S Dubash

From: Firdosh Mehta[SMTP:firdosh.mehta@primus.ca]

Sent: 28 August 2002 03:09

To: Rustam Dubash; 'KHORSHED JUNGALWALA'

Cc: 'RUMI SETHNA'; 'RUMI SETHNA OFFICE'

Subject: Re: CLAUSE 71

Dear Rustam,

I am glad that you have explained the Clause 71 issue as per your email.

The WB_WG, chaired by Khorshed Jungalwala is working on a report that is due in a few days. If it is okay with you and Rumi, I can request her to include my question and your reply in her next report. Do I have your okay to do so? I think this will greatly benefit what she is trying to do.

Regards, Firdosh.

----- Original Message -----

From: "Rustam Dubash" <dubashrs@penningtons.co.uk>

To: "Firdosh Mehta" <firdosh.mehta@primus.ca>; "KHORSHED JUNGALWALA" <kayj@ziplink.net>

Cc: "RUMI SETHNA" <rumisethna@tinyworld.co.uk>; "RUMI SETHNA OFFICE" <rumi@sherwoods.uk.com>

Sent: Tuesday, August 27, 2002 11:16 AM

Subject: RE: CLAUSE 71

Dear Firdosh,

Clause 71.

As you will be aware, annual general meetings of companies are held once a year where there is election of directors, accounts approved, appointment of auditors and nothing controversial is discussed. The substantive matter referred to in clause 71 are matters which in the UK are referred to as special resolutions which require a 75% majority -one example being amending the memorandum or articles - see clause 60. You will see from this clause that there is a specified way of dealing with it and ballot votes are counted. This gives all members a good opportunity to consider matters of "substance".

It is very likely that more than 282 individuals will vote either personally or by ballot and therefore if anything, due to equalisation they are the ones to lose out not the Federations!!

75% of 564 votes (282 for each council) means 423.

If say all the individuals say yes then it still needs

(A) both India and Iran to say yes;

(B) India or Iran and both North America and Europe to say yes; if say, Europe and India say no, then all the remainder need to say yes for the vote to pass. Therefore in my view the Federations do have a big say because if they all vote yes, they need to only persuade 50% of the individuals to vote with them. I think there are enough safeguards.

Yours sincerely,

Rustam.

From: Firdosh Mehta[SMTP:firdosh.mehta@primus.ca]

Sent: 14 August 2002 14:41

To: Rumi Sethna (W); Rumi Sethna (H)

Cc: Khorshed Jungalwala (Work); Khorshed Jungalwala; Rustam Dubash

Subject: CLAUSE 71

Dear Rumi,

I have received M & A of Association for WZO 2001 Limited.

Doc. # 477074 Rev. 25/07/2002.

The FEZANA WB-WG has also received it.

I have read this document and I can comment upon the following issues.

This brings me to the issue of Clause 71.

I understand that it is very important and crucial for WZO, after modifying their Articles of Association, to suit many requests from various areas of the world, except for the equal parity of votes for both Councils at the level when they come together.

Even though I can see the need for WZO to insist on that requirement, I would like to urge you to understand that this is the one MAJOR bone of contention for many FEZANA Member Associations who feel that if all Regions are participating and represented in a meeting where the two Councils come together, i.e. 16 representatives of the Federation Council carrying 282 votes, to face off with say 30 individuals representing the Individuals Council, and would by virtue of Clause 71 exercise the same number of 282 votes.

The argument that the meeting where the two Boards come together would be innocuous, needs to be revisited as line 5 of Clause 21, clearly indicates, "QUORUM for any meeting of WZO 2001 or for decision on ANY SUBSTANTIVE MATTER", hence, QUORUM and ANY SUBSTANTIVE MATTER are difficult to perceive as "innocuous".

The number of Votes carried by the Council of Individuals should be somewhat proportional to their numbers, even though it could be a "higher Proportion" than 1 per 500.

THIS DISPARITY GUARANTEES THE INDIVIDUALS COUNCIL (NO MATTER HOW MANY INDIVIDUAL MEMBERS ATTEND A GIVEN MEETING), AN ASSURED 50% OF THE DECISION MAKING PROCESS, MAKING IT LOOK LIKE IT WOULD BE COMPLETELY UNFAIR TO THE ATTENDEES FROM THE FEDERATION COUNCIL WHO MAY BE REPRESENTING THOUSANDS OF INDIVIDUALS.

THIS APPARENT OR REAL LOPSIDED DECISION MAKING PROCESS IS GOING TO GIVE WZO A HARD TIME TOWARDS ACCEPTANCE BY MANY AROUND THE WORLD. I FOR ONE KNOW THAT QUITE A FEW ASSOCIATIONS IN FEZANA CANNOT SWALLOW THIS PILL, AND I AM SURE THERE ARE OTHER ASSOCIATIONS WITH SIMILAR FEELINGS AROUND THE WORLD.

IF THIS PERCEPTION IS IN ERROR, OR A MISUNDERSTANDING OF THE WORKINGS AS ENSHRINED IN THIS REVISED DRAFT, THEN IT WOULD HELP IF WZO DID SOME EXPLAINING REGARDING THE POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE ASPECTS OF THIS REQUIREMENT.

Please understand that my above candid response is neither for or against WZO 2001, or in promoting or otherwise thereof. This is an honest assessment, as an individual member of the community, even though I understand I could be in error. However, the important thing is that if I am in error, then I am not the only one, and WZO needs to clarify this in a more global perspective. Perhaps this was adequately explained at the New York meeting in April 2001, which I unfortunately missed attending.

I have copied Mrs. Khorshed Jungalwala, the Chair of the FEZANA World Body Working Group, so that the WB-WG is kept informed of our communication.

Respectfully, Firdosh.

~~~~~

**ITEM 6 – WG REQUEST TO FEZANA EXECUTIVE WRT MEETING IN MUMBAI – NOVEMBER 9, 2002**

The following request was turned down by the FEZANA Executive. The WG decided to forego organizing this meeting; [see Item 8, Page 27](#).

**From:** [KHORSHED JUNGALWALA](#)

**To:** [FIRDOSH MEHTA](#) ; [MAHRUKH MOTAFRAM](#) ; [RASHID MEHIN](#) ; [ARNAVAZ SETHNA](#) ;

[FARROKH MISTREE](#)

**Cc:** [ROHINTON RIVETNA](#) ; [SAROSH COLLECTOR](#) ; [saroshjc@aol.com](mailto:saroshjc@aol.com) ; [FARROKH MISTREE](#) ; [GEV](#)

[NENTIN](#) ; [Gev Nentin](mailto:Gev.Nentin) ; [kfj@concins.com](mailto:kfj@concins.com)

**Sent:** Saturday, November 09, 2002 7:54 PM

**Subject:** Meeting of World Body Working Groups in India - January 2003

TO:

The FEZANA Executive:

Dear Firdosh, Mahrukh, Rashid, Arnavaz and Farrokh:

The attached letter will be going out to various heads of Zarathushti organizations and individuals worldwide.

The Working Group requests the FEZANA Executive to review the letter and give its OK for me to send it out by November 18. Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions regarding the letter.

Best wishes,

Khorshed

on behalf of FEZANA World Body Working Group

---

MEETING OF WORLD BODY WORKING GROUPS IN INDIA

January 2003

TO Presidents of Zarathushti Organizations around the World  
President, World Zoroastrian Organization

FROM FEZANA World Body Working Group  
Sarosh Collector.  
Khorshed Jungalwala, Chair  
Farrokh Mistree  
Gev Nentin  
Rohinton Rivetna

COPY TO Firdosh Mehta, President FEZANA  
Mino Shroff, Trustee BPP

SUBJECT Meeting of World Body Working Groups

DATE November 18, 2002

Greetings to all.

The Indian Government has scheduled a meeting for all Non Resident Indians in January 2003. We have learned that a number of members of the Zarathushti community from overseas will be present at this meeting. We have also learned that a meeting of the officers of various representative Zoroastrian organizations of the world is planned for January 21 and 22, 2003 in Mumbai. It occurs to us that January 20, 2003 might be an

opportune time for people interested in furthering the World Body issue to meet for face to face discussions in Mumbai.

The decision as to the final structure of the World Body that would be acceptable to each entity FEZANA is clearly under the jurisdiction of each entity, just as in the case of FEZANA, it will be the responsibility of the FEZANA Executive and FEZANA Member Associations.

Clearly, progress towards the creation of the World Body at this meeting will hinge on three items, namely, the objectives, the agenda and the preparation that each person who attends has made for this meeting.

### **Principal Objectives**

1. Establish a comfortable working relationship between people who wish to be involved in bringing convergence to the World Body issue.
2. Establish a workable schedule that results in convergence.
3. Identify who does what by when.

### **Tentative Agenda - Key Points**

1. Introduction - Terms of Reference, Method of Operation and Process of Analysis of FEZANA World Body WG.

Introduction by other WGs as to methodology they are using or intend to use.

2. Characteristics of an Ideal World Body.  
Discuss and seek consensus on the characteristics of an Ideal World Body.
3. Report on Analysis of Models by FEZANA World Body WG, WZO, ZAH, WZCF and Two Chamber models.  
Report by other WGs as to any analysis they may have done, and reports they may have distributed.  
Exchange of information as to questions that have been raised regards to each of the models.  
Exchange of information as to ideas and items that could enhance and improve each of the models. Such information is to be collected and subsequently analyzed by each of the WG's, on their own.
4. Process of Communication  
Identify the process to be followed wrt exchange information and analyses, for purposes of review (amongst each other) and dissemination to each other's constituencies.
5. Schedule  
Establish a time-table that includes the evolution of various models to a point where the various federation and/or organization members can make a rational and knowledgeable choice.
6. Comment  
The preceding agenda is tentative. Please feel free to suggest additions. Material available for preparation.

As indicated earlier, success at this meeting is dependent upon the preparation that each person who attends has made for this meeting.

The FEZANA World Body Working Group was established in May 2001. It has issued some reports. These may be downloaded from <http://www.fezana.org>. The FEZANA WG is not an advocacy group. It analyzes information and issues reports to the North American Zarathushti Community. Based on our North American experience we suggest that that there is merit in all WGs adopting this position.

### **Action items**

Time is of the essence if we are indeed going to meet in Bombay in January 2003. Accordingly, we request you to respond to Khorshed Jungalwala <kayj@ziplink.net> and Firdosh Mehta <firdosh.mehta@primus.ca> by November 30, 2002.

- 1 Can we count on your organization being represented at this meeting?
- 2 Who are the members of your World Body Working Group? ... names and e-mail addresses please.
- 3 What modifications / additions would you like to make to the agenda?

Our President Firdosh Mehta whose encouragement and support has been invaluable wishes to convey his special greetings to all and has indicated to us that he is looking forward to meeting you in Mumbai.

Gev, Farrokh, Rohinton and Sarosh join me in wishing you the very best.

Khorshed F. Jungalwala  
on behalf of the FEZANA World Body Working Group

=====

**ITEM 7 – FEZANA EXECUTIVE DIRECTIVES AND WG RESPONSE**

On November 22, 2002, the WG received a list of Directives from Firdosh Mehta on behalf of the FEZANA Executive. As per the mandate given to the WG in May 2002 the FEZANA Executive is empowered to issue directives to the Working Group. The WG's initial limited response was not acceptable to Firdosh Mehta; Point 1 of the full response. Accordingly, the Working Group responded to these Directives in full on December 5, 2002. The WG has agreed to those directive that were keeping with its May 2001 mandate, sought clarification wrt others, and modifications wrt those that were not in harmony with the mandate.

The cover emails of the two communications are followed by the FEZANA Executive Directives<sup>2</sup> including the response of the WG. **The original directives received from Firdosh Mehta are shown in bold.** The directives to which the WG has agreed to is shown using the Courier font.

From: "Firdosh Mehta" <firdosh.mehta@primus.ca>  
 To: "Gev Nentin" <gev.nentin@chase.com>,  
 "Sarosh J. Collector" <Saroshjc@aol.com>,  
 "Rohinton Rivetna" <Rivetna@aol.com>,  
 "Farrokh Mistree Exec" <farrokh.mistree@me.gatech.edu>,  
 "Farrokh Mistree" <farrokh.mistree@eudoramail.com>,  
 "Khorshed Jungalwala \ (Work\)" <kfj@concins.com>,  
 "Khorshed Jungalwala" <kayj@ziplink.net>  
 Cc: "Rashid Mehin" <rmehin@yahoo.com>, "Mahrukh Motafram" <mahrukh@aol.com>,  
 "Arnavaz H. Sethna" <ahsethna@yahoo.com>  
 Subject: WB-WG  
 Date: Thu, 21 Nov 2002 23:44:52 -0700  
 X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.50.4133.2400  
 X-Scanned-By: MIMEDefang 2.19 (www.roaringpenguin.com/mimedefang)

Dear Khorshed, Rohinton, Gev, Sarosh, and Farrokh.

At the conclusion of my Teleconference with the WG, which was very congenial and businesslike, The Working Group requested the Executive to formally send them in writing the Directives and Spell out the Mandate, which the Executive would like them to work on and the results expected within a time schedule.

I have formulated a list of items that I have reviewed with Arnavaz, Mahrukh and Rashid. This is attached as a Word File.

We request the Working Group to deliberate on them and inform us if you wish to continue under the revised Mandate.

I have tried to maintain the essence of the Mandate of Montreal AGM as best as I could, so that we do not nullify some of the good effort put in by The WG.

Please review the attached file and let me know by Sunday 24th Nov. 02, evening, 9:00 p.m. my time, of the course of action you wish to pursue.

Sorry for such a tight schedule, please do your best.

Regards, Firdosh.

---

**From:** [KHORSHED JUNGALWALA](#)  
**To:** [FIRDOSH MEHTA](#)

---

<sup>2</sup> Farrokh Mistree is an elected member of the FEZANA Executive and an appointed member of the WG. He was kept out of the FEZANA Executive loop vis a vis the discussion pertaining to or the creation of these FEZANA Executive Directives.

**Cc:** [ROHINTON RIVETNA](#) ; [SAROSH COLLECTOR](#) ; [saroshjc@aol.com](mailto:saroshjc@aol.com) ; [FARROKH MISTREE](#) ; [FARROKH MISTREE](#) ; [GEV NENTIN](#) ; [Gev Nentin](#)  
**Sent:** Thursday, December 05, 2002 8:26 PM  
**Subject:** WG - Fezana Executive Directives 12.5.02

To  
Firdosh Mehta, President FEZANA

From  
FEZANA World Body Working Group

SUBJECT  
FEZANA Executive Directives

DATE  
December 5, 2002

As per your request by telephone to both Rohinton and me, I am attaching the WG's response to each of the Executive Directives dated November 20, 2002.

The WG looks forward to a quick resolution of all outstanding issues through dialog so that it can get back to doing the work it is mandated to do.

With best wishes from Gev, Farrokh, Rohinton, Sarosh and me.

Khorshed F. Jungalwala  
on behalf of the FEZANA World Body Working Group

---

#### **EXECUTIVE DIRECTIVES TO THE "WB - WG " as of 20th Nov. 2002.**

**WG Preamble:** As per the mandate issued to the WG at the FEZANA AGM in Montreal, the WG recognizes the authority of the FEZANA Executive to issue directives to it. The WG is responding to the Executive Directives dated November 20, 2002 in the spirit of cooperation, affirming Point 1 enumerated. Comments are included to make the directives more effective and not with the view of critiquing them; please receive the comments in this light. The WG looks forward to a quick resolution all outstanding issues through dialog so that it can get back to doing the work it is mandated to do. The WG suggests that the resulting directives be viewed as a "living document", that is, one that is temporal in that the directives are likely to evolve over time as new insights are gleaned and experience is gained in working together towards the same objective.

**1. The WB - WG and the Executive will work more closely with each other in a supportive and responsive manner. Firdosh will be included on all communication within the Members of WB - WG, and will be apprised on all actions conducted by the WB - WG. Firdosh, in turn, will keep the FEZANA Executive informed and apprised.**

**WG Agreed.** The WG recommends that the FEZANA Executive appoint Firdosh Mehta as a fully vested member of the FEZANA World Body Working Group with voice, vote and responsibility to operate under the mandate given to the WG in May 2002. Specifically Firdosh,

- to be vested with full voice, one vote and full responsibility as are other members of the WG;
- to fully participate in all discussions and e-mail exchanges of the WG,
- to fully participate in all decisions and initiatives undertaken by the WG,
- to fully participate in deciding both strategic and tactical issues facing the WG.

The WG requests the FEZANA Executive to affirm that KJ will continue as Chair of the WG.

*WG Comment:* The WG welcomes Firdosh in the strong belief that he will make the WG stronger, the task of the WG easier, and allow the WG to continue its activities under the mandate it received in May 2002. The WG expectations for Firdosh are high, namely, that of keeping the FEZANA Executive appropriately appraised for WG activities, and adding value to the WG by sharing his knowledge, information pertaining to communications with individuals, FEZANA Member Associations, etc.

**2. The WB - WG will access any sources to acquire information pertaining towards developing a World Body that will be acceptable to most Regions and will try and minimize the number of such Models so that upon convergence, only one or two Models will be presented to the Executive and Members of FEZANA.**

*WG Position:* The WG requests the FEZANA Executive to reconsider this directive. The WG's intention is to develop only those models that are in its judgement - highly workable. These models will be presented to the Executive, FEZANA Member Associations and other world entities. Placing an arbitrary number on the number of models that can or should be presented is, in the opinion of the WG, counter productive.

**3. All outgoing reports will be first sent to the Executive, and after review and comments by the Executive, will be presented to FEZANA Member Associations only, and not be sent to other distributions. Reports may be put on the FEZANA web site for any interested parties to peruse.**

*WG Position:* This directive seeks a change in the mandate that the WG has been given. There are two parts to it:

- vetting by the FEZANA Executive
- only sent to FEZANA Members.

#### **VETTING BY THE FEZANA EXECUTIVE**

The Montreal mandate makes no reference to sending all outgoing reports first to the Executive for their review and comments. Two members of the Executive (Firdosh and Farrokh) will have access to information, volunteer comments, etc. as equal members of the WG prior to distribution of Reports. We trust that this will provide adequate oversight. The WG requests the FEZANA Executive to amend this directive placing confidence in two of its members who will serve on the WG.

#### **DISTRIBUTION OF WG REPORTS**

The Montreal mandate does not specify that only FEZANA Members receive the Report and updates. During its work in the past year and a half, the WG has received valuable input from other world entities as well, and as we progress, their understanding will help us all in our efforts to present a model acceptable to all.

There are two principles at work here; (1) one is that we are in the process of CREATING a model or a system which finds consensus with all members of FEZANA and our other partners; and (2) we cannot work in a vacuum; we must work together, with all of our partners worldwide, be it the WZO model, or any other model. None of us want any members of our worldwide family to make choices which will leave a section of our community behind. Without involving others in the process, no advancement can take place, and no amount of convincing will ever make them accept a solution that they have been excluded from participating in its development.

Looking at it from a different perspective, the WG's communication with entities/people outside of FEZANA is what has caused some in the North American community a degree of undue concern. The concern is that we may be "pushing" models to others that the North American community and FEZANA have not yet accepted. At no stage will the WG be involved in pushing or promoting any one model.

The WG requests the FEZANA Executive to reconsider this directive and work with the WG bring about a solution.

**4. Reports will be short, maximum five (5) pages, summarizing the work done by the Committee over every quarter. Attachments sent by other organizations should be forwarded in their entirety to the Executive for further distribution to FEZANA Members Associations by the Executive.**

*WG Agreed.* There is a difference between Reports and Report Summaries. Report Summaries that are sent to FEZANA Members will be short. In the opinion of the WG, Reports need to be comprehensive and in keeping with the need for transparency of operation open for all to see.

WG Request for Clarification: "Attachments ..." the WG requests clarification on this directive ... is every attachment received to be immediately forwarded to the Executive and FEZANA Members?

**5. With the assistance of the Executive and the Survey Committee, Member Associations should be contacted to find out acceptance of some fundamental issues and concepts by which the WB - WG can understand the needs of the populace and work towards results that are requested by most of the Associations.**

*WG Agreed.* The WG looks forward to working with the FEZANA Survey Committee in developing the survey questions and polling the FEZANA Community.

*WG Comment:* The devil will be in questions that are used. The results of the survey may not produce any immediate answers, but it will democratize the process in a positive way. Although it is difficult for the WG to determine who is or is not knowledgeable regarding the subject matter, it is still helpful to solicit input from individuals who have gone through the preceding Reports. It may also be that those same individuals are already leaning one way or the other, which may provide a biased input.

**6. Farrokh's role on the WB - WG, as well as on the Executive is recognized, and in order to facilitate smoother discourse and avoid any semblance of conflict of interest, it is acknowledged that Farrokh has volunteered to provide information assistance to the Executive, but not necessarily take a direct role in the Executive proceedings towards the WB - WG role. Farrokh will continue to take an active part in the WB - WG.**

*WG Position:* The WG requests the FEZANA Executive to remove this directive to the WG. This is an issue for the FEZANA Executive to work through not the WG.

*FM Comment:* Farrokh has volunteered not vote in WG related issues at the FEZANA Executive. He does reserve the right to change his position on this issue. As a member of the FEZANA Executive he requests that he be included in all discussions undertaken (and communications) by the FEZANA Executive pertaining to the World Body.

**7. Firdosh will play a more active role in communication with other World Organizations and Leaders, and facilitate the work of the WB - WG to provide Executive support and contact and keep the WB - WG apprised of all such activity, by informing Khorshed.**

*WG Agreed.* This is a presidential prerogative that Firdosh wishes to exercise and which the WG believes will be exercised with due consideration.

*WG Comment:* This is a step in the right direction as long as it is in keeping with Point 1. Firdosh's communications with other World Organizations and Leaders should be supportive of the WG agenda and should be coordinated with the WG activities / communication involving the same World Organizations and Leaders.

**8. Firdosh will actively pursue dialogue with WZO along with any member of the WB - WG that is necessary to continue communication with Rumi Sethna and Rustam Dubash with the intention of encouraging WZO to incorporate the requests and requirements of FEZANA Member Associations as**

**far as possible, to try and come up with one World Body under the auspices of WZO, provided they are willing to incorporate these requirements to the best of their ability.**

**WG Agreed.** This is a presidential prerogative which Firdosh wishes to exercise and which the WG believes will be exercised with due diligence and care without supposition that all FEZANA members favor a particular model.

*WG Comment:* This is a step in the right direction as long as it is in keeping with Point 1. The principle of bringing about a consensus must take precedence in all such initiatives. Reaching consensus on a model by getting everyone involved in the process should be of prime importance.

**9. Firdosh can pursue with WZO for acquiring a response to the letter to WZO with the 9 points shown as possible "deal breakers". However, in the future such requests to any other Regional organizations, including the WZO will be first reviewed by the Executive to provide input into the matter from historical and information perspectives.**

**WG Agreed** that Firdosh approach WZO to elicit a response to the 9 points shown as possible deal breakers.

*WG Comment:* The WG requests the FEZANA Executive to reconsider and withdraw other aspects covered in Directive 9. RR has the longest and most important historical perspective and information. He is on the WG, and provides the most input in this instance. The FEZANA Executive should be kept informed etc., however, providing the historical and information perspective can be provided by Rohinton who has been on this issue the longest.

**10. No reference to any persons or individuals shall be made, even if they are in the form of an example, unless they are indicated in a general and generic way without utilizing any names. Names of individuals shall only be used if there is any specific response to communications with that individual.**

**WG Agreed.** The WG stands corrected.

**11. Short reports should indicate that further information would be available to interested parties from the Chair of the WB - WG.**

**WG Agreed.** The Chair of the WG and the FEZANA Website will be additional sources of information.

**12. The WB – WG, along with Firdosh, will work closely with the proponents of the combined WCZF and ZAH Model that is now tabled as a WCZF 2002 draft and obtain consent from the originators of those two to make presentation of one being the revised Model.**

**WG Agreed.** Combining WCZF model and the ZAH model into the new WCZF 2002 model makes complete sense and should be pursued accordingly. ZAH has already stated their preference. If the architects of WCZF agree then this is totally acceptable.

**13. At this point in time, the 2 Chamber Model (2CM) could be more distracting and cause more confusion since it does not have the detailed version worked out. However, if some Members of the WB – WG wish to continue working on it, they may do so with the intent of providing a backup for convergence in the future, in case neither WZO 2001 nor WCZF 2002 materialize into a general consensus of FEZANA Members.**

**This should only be presented to the FEZANA Member Associations for review after extensive development is undertaken to present it as a workable draft, only after the acceptance of the Executive is obtained prior to such presentation. In fact, the experience gained while dialoguing on WZO 2001 and WCZF 2002 should be utilized towards inclusion in 2CM Model, if such experience indicates that it will lead to convergence and general acceptance.**

*WG Position:* The WG requests the FEZANA Executive to transform this directive into a suggestion. The preceding directive seeks to change the mandate given to the WG by the FEZANA Member Associations. It undermines a fundamental element of the approach taken by the WG.

*WG Comment:* Much has been made of the 2-Chamber Model by people in some circles in North America. The following is offered by way of clarification: The 2CM has not been on the WG radar screen since the Phase One Report. The 2CM was conceived in the spirit of bringing about consensus. The WG conceived it as an overarching bridge between all models. It is hoped that good dialog in the spirit of appreciative inquiry will flush out the thoughts and perhaps demonstrate whether it is a viable model or not. Any accommodation that can be made to respect these sentiments would be very much appreciated.

The 2CM will see the light of day only as the other two models are developed and discussed. The 2CM at present can be utilized as a tool to have the proponents of the two other models see some things in a different light. There are many options available in the 2CM, which can be utilized as is, or with modifications to bring the other models closer to the ideal. This would then automatically negate the need to develop the “meat” of the WG model. However, if we are unable to keep the model on the table during discussions, we will never learn of it’s shortcomings, nor could we educate others of it’s strengths, so that we could help the other models to evolve.

**14. One or a maximum of two choices of Models, with possible recommended options, shall be submitted to the Executive after India meeting so that the Executive can review and respond with corrections and subsequently send the Model(s) to the FEZANA Member Associations, giving them sufficient notice prior to the next AGM in Boston on 24/25th May 2003, to decide.**

*WG Position:* The WG will present the pros and cons of models that in its judgment are workable without recommending one for acceptance by the FEZANA Member Associations. We know from past experience that a time table has not worked.

*WG Comment:* The WG re-iterates the futility of making people come to a decision by vote on such an important issue. Ideally, the issue MUST be decided by consensus, if any decision is to be accepted by ALL, and that acceptance is expected to last for any length of time. This directive is contrary to the approach that the WG has taken to try and arrive at a consensus.

**The Executive would like the WB - WG to review the above and respond positively to incorporate the above into their future activity.**

**Of course, this does not preclude the WB - WG to indulge in any action towards the formation of one World Body in ways that are not indicated above. However, those would only be pursued after reviewing them with the Executive, and acquiring the Executive acceptance by continuing to communicate with the Executive through the office of the President.**

*WG Position:* “However.....the President” This is not in keeping with the mandate given to the WG. As per Point 1 Firdosh is to be a member of the WG with voice, vote and responsibility. Two members of the FEZANA Executive are in effect members of the WG with voice and vote. The WG requests the FEZANA Executive to reword that directive to reflect that in the light of two members of the FEZANA Executive being on the WG that adequate oversight is in place.

*WG Comment:* If the WG reaches an accommodation on all the above points, then the above paragraph is moot, and only seems to confuse the issue. However, if the paragraph purports to say that the WG will always take direction from the Executive, and can only do that which the Executive approves, then this is a violation of the WG's independence.

**Knowing that WZO has refused to either attend the Regional Leaders meeting in Mumbai on January 21st - 22nd, 2003 or the POSSIBLE meeting of the Individuals of different Regions involved in World Body matters on January 20, it appears that there is no need for this meeting on January 20. However, Khorshed and Sarosh are welcome to attend the meeting on January 21 and 22. When the item of**

**World Body comes up on the Agenda, they will be given full opportunity to address the gathering and present the workings of the FEZANA WB-WG. This presentation will be written up and reviewed by the WB-WG and Executive jointly prior to the meeting. If there are any impromptu side meetings of different individuals during that time to discuss World Body matters, Firdosh will invite Khorshed and Sarosh to participate as best as possible, and same will be endeavored by Khorshed and Sarosh.**

*WG Position:* The WG submits that its intent for calling the meeting on January 20, 2003 has not been made clear to the members of the FEZANA Executive. The WG encourages all members of the FEZANA Executive to seek specific clarifications from the WG and for the FEZANA Executive to reconsider its decision based on the clarification provided.

*WG Comment:* The WG does not agree with the notion that there is no need for the January 20 meeting. There are other members of the world community present there who we could talk to and convince to accept our analysis, and or listen to any contradictions other may see in our analysis. Also, there will be members of WZO (Dinshaw Tamboly, and Dadi Engineer), with whom we could meet and discuss issues, to arrive at some accommodation and plan of progress as per Dinshaw's letter to the WG. .

**From the point of view of explaining the WCZF 2002 and / or the 2CM, it is felt that Sarosh's presence will be very valuable along with Khorshed's.**

*WG Position:* It is the WG's opinion that the January 20, meeting will provide the platform for World Body discussions and explanations on neutral ground. The WG may make itself available for answering questions when called upon during the January 21 & 22 meeting.

**Upon return journey from this meeting, Firdosh will endeavor to have a face to face meeting with Rumi and Rustam of WZO on January 31 or February 1, and the accompaniment of Khorshed and Sarosh to this meeting is highly desired and most welcomed. Firdosh will also try to meet Dorab Mistry and Rusi Dalal of ZTFE from similar points of view and again the accompaniment of Khorshed and Sarosh is desired and welcomed.**

**WG Agreed.** Firdosh's meeting with people in the UK is a step in the right direction.

*WG Comment.* Any member of the WG may accompany Firdosh for a face to face meeting with WZO or ZTFE leaders on the return journey. (However, it will not be possible for Khorshed to stop in UK during that time frame).

**Needless to say, Rohinton is welcome to be there at any of these meetings mentioned above.**

**The Executive very much welcomes the WB-WG, to recognize the pulse of our membership and work closely with the Executive to turn this into a win-win situation for all of us. If our common goal is the service of our membership, then this should be easily achievable.**

**Thanking you.**

**Yours sincerely,**

**Firdosh Mehta - FEZANA President  
for and on behalf of the Executive Officers**

**ITEM 8 – WG POSITION WRT MEETING ON JANUARY 20, 2003 IN MUMBAI, INDIA**

The WG's position vis a vis the Meeting of Leaders on January 21 and 22, 2003 in Mumbai, India and the meeting on January 20, 2003 is spelled out in the email sent to Firdosh Mehta on December 15, 2002.

TO

Firdosh Mehta, President FEZANA

FROM

FEZANA World Body Working Group

SUBJECTS

The ZAQ Resolution

Meeting in Mumbai on January 20, 2003

DATE

December 14, 2002

**Meeting in Mumbai on January 20, 2003**

The request for endorsement by the WG to host the January 20, 2003 meeting has been turned down by the FEZANA Executive. Firdosh in his email dated December 9, 2002 has indicated that despite of the negative response from the FEZANA Executive the WG may proceed under its own May 2002 mandate (if it so chose) to call the meeting on January 20, 2003 in Mumbai.

It is the considered opinion of the WG that, in light of the questions raised vis a vis the interpretation of the mandate, it is politically unwise for the WG to proceed with the January 20, 2003 meeting in Mumbai without a formal endorsement of such action by the FEZANA Executive.

**Meeting of Leaders on January 21 and 22, 2003**

The WG is mindful of the potential benefits of hosting the meeting on January 20, 2003. As indicated above, it has reluctantly decided to forego the benefits of arranging it under its own May 2002 mandate.

But all is not lost.

The WG recognizes the value of having a FEZANA presence at this Meeting of Leaders in Mumbai and wishes all on the FEZANA delegation well and offers them whatever support they need by way of World Body related briefings/clarifications of WG positions.

Out of domestic political necessity, the WG reluctantly affirms that all members of the FEZANA delegation must do so in their own individual capacity as community leaders / observers and none are authorized to speak on behalf the FEZANA World Body Working Group.

**Next steps**

The WG has been forced to deal with domestic political issues over the past few months thereby mitigating its progress. The WG plans to get back to focusing on core issues which include, issuing another interim report shortly; and proceed in its efforts to analyze, and develop the models on the table with the objective of submitting a consolidated report for consideration by the FEZANA Member Associations.

In order to ensure that there is no misunderstanding vis a vis this email please feel free to call me so I may respond to any queries that you may have.

With best wishes from Gev, Farrokh, Rohinton, Sarosh and me.

Khorshed F. Jungalwala

on behalf of the FEZANA World Body Working Group

=====