

Discussion Paper

MEMBER FEEDBACK



INTERNATIONAL UNION OF PHLEBOLOGY

Level 5, 7 Help St, Chatswood NSW 2067, Australia

Email: uip@uipmail.org Website: www.uip-phlebology.org

Contents

UIP EXECUTIVE STRUCTURE	3
UIP ADMINISTRATION	4
UIP MEMBER SOCIETIES	5
BACKGROUND	7
CONSTITUTIONAL REVISION PROCESS	9
DISCUSSION TOPICS	12
Executive Committee Composition	12
Executive Committee Terms	12
Executive Committee Re-election	12
General Council Membership	13
General Council Voting Procedures	13
Membership of the UIP	13
Congresses and Events	14
CONSULTATION PROCESS	15
Topic 1 Executive Committee Composition	16
Topic 2 Executive Committee Terms	28
Topic 3 Executive Committee Re-election	37
Topic 4 General Council Membership	48
Topic 5 General Council Voting Procedures	59
Topic 6 Membership of the UIP	70
Topic 7 Congresses and Events	79
Appendix A- Existing Constitution of the UIP	85

UIP EXECUTIVE STRUCTURE

EXECUTIVE BOARD

President

Kurosh Parsi

Treasurer

Paul Thibault

Education Committee Chair

Oscar Bottini

Immediate Past President

Nick Morrison

Assistant General Secretary

Malay Patel

Vice Presidents

Victor Canata

Sergio Giancesini

Lowell Kabnick

Dong-Ik Kim

Lorenzo Tessari

General Secretary

Mark Meissner

Scientific Committee Chair

Alun Davies

COMMITTEES

Communications and Public Relations

Victor Canata (Chair)

Sergio Giancesini

Melisa Lopez

Antonios Gasparis

Ravul Jindal

Neil Khilnani

Zaza Lazarashvili

Luis Leon

Armando Mansilha

Giovanni Mosti

Johann Christof Ragg

Pauline

Raymond-Martimbeau

Luis Rodriguez Reyes

Roberto Simkin

Wassila Taha Elkashishi

Jorge Hernando Ulloa

Tomasz Urbanek

Shenming Wang

Mark Whiteley

Takashi Yamaki

Congresses and Events

Lowell Kabnick (Chair)

Oscar Bottini

Alun Davies

Science and Research

Alun Davies (Chair)

Zong Chen

Devendra Dekiwadia

Suat Dognaci

Nicos Labropoulos

Fedor Lurie

Makoto Mo

Hernan Bauza Moreno

Marc Vuylsteke

Igor Zolotukhin

Education and Training

Oscar Bottini (Chair)

Janna Bentley

Willy Chi

Jose Antonio Diaz

WORKING GROUPS AND TASK FORCES

Conflict Resolution Task Force

Paul Thibault (Chair)

UIP President

Legal practitioners

Sergio Giancesini

Engagement Working Group

Sergio Giancesini (Chair)

Larisa Chernukha

Juan Chunga Pietro

Bahar Fazeli

Ahmed Gaweesh

Veronika Golovina

Ernesto Intriago

Shantonu Kumar Ghosh

Lucy McKinnon

Maxim Shaydakov

Mandy Wong

Constitutional Reform Task Force

Mark Meissner (Chair)

Victor Canata

UIP ADMINISTRATION

Executive Director

Dr David Connor

execdirector@uipmail.org



Communications Officer

Melisa Lopez

communications@uipmail.org



Core PCO (MCI)

Judy Kingston

Judy.Kingston@mci-group.com



Legal Counsel

Jessica Simmonds

Director

Simmonds Legal

1A Murray St

Tamworth NSW 2340

Australia

info@simmondslegal.com.au



Legal Consultants

James Hill

Senior Associate

PiperAlderman

Michael Coker

Principal

PiperAlderman

UIP MEMBER SOCIETIES

BY COUNTRY and REGION

Argentina

Argentinian College of Venous and Lymphatic Surgery

Argentinian Society of Phlebology and Lymphology

Bonaerense Society Of Phlebology and Lymphology

Cordoba Civil Association of Phlebology and Lymphology

Rosario Association of Phlebology and Lymphology

Phlebology and Lymphology Association of the Province of Buenos Aires

Asia

Asian Venous Forum

Australia and New Zealand

Australasian College of Phlebology

Australia and New Zealand Society of Phlebology

Austria

Austrian Society of Phlebology and Angiology, Dermatology

Balkans

Balkan Venous Forum

Baltic

Baltic Society of Phlebology

Benelux- Belgium, Netherlands, Luxemburg

Benelux Society of Phlebology

Bolivia

Bolivian Scientific Community of Phlebology and Lymphology

Brazil

Brazilian Society of Phlebology and Lymphology

Bulgaria

Bulgarian Society of Endovascular, Vascular Surgery and Angiology

Canada

Canadian Society of Phlebology

Chile

Chilean Phlebology and Lymphology Foundation

Chilean Society of Phlebology and Lymphology

China

Chinese Association of Phlebology

Colombia

Colombian Association of Angiology and Vascular Surgery

Costa Rica

Costa Rican Association of Vascular Surgeons

Czech Republic

Czech Society of Phlebology

Cuba

Cuban Society of Angiology and Vascular Surgery

Dominican Republic

Dominican Society of Vascular and Endovascular Surgery

Ecuador

Ecuadorian Society of Phlebology and Lymphology and Microcirculation

El Salvador

Phlebology and Endovascular Therapy Association of El Salvador

Egypt

Egyptian Venous Forum

Vascular Society of Egypt

Europe

European Venous Forum

France

French Society of Phlebology

Georgia

Georgian Association of Angiologists and Vascular Surgeons

Germany

German Society of Phlebology

Greece

Hellenic Phlebological Society

Hungary

Hungarian Venous Forum

India

Venous Association of India

Indonesia

Indonesian Venous Forum

International

International Compression Club

Iran

Iranian College of Vascular Surgeons

Italy

Italian Association of Phlebology

Italian College of Phlebology

Italian Society of Clinical and Experimental Phlebology

Italian Society of Phlebology

Italian Society of Phlebology and Lymphology

Japan

Japanese Society of Phlebology

Kazakhstan

Kazakh Society of Phlebology

Korean Republic

Korean Society of Phlebology

Latin American Region

Latin American Venous Forum

Mexico

Mexican Academy of Phlebology and Lymphology

Mexican College of Phlebology

Mexican Society of Angiology,
Vascular and Endovascular
Surgery

Pan American Region

Pan-American Society of
Phlebology and Lymphology

Paraguay

Paraguayan Society of
Phlebology

Peru

Peruvian Society of Phlebology
and Lymphology

Poland

Polish Phlebological Society

Portugal

Portuguese Society of Angiology
and Vascular Surgery

Romania

Romanian Society of Phlebology

Russian Federation

National College of Phlebology
(Russia)

Russian Phlebological
Association

Saint Petersburg Society of
Phlebology

Scandinavia

Scandinavian Venous Forum

Serbia

Serbian College of Phlebology

Singapore

Singapore Society of Vascular
and Endovascular Surgery

Slovenia

Slovenian Phlebological Society

Spain

Spanish Chapter of Phlebology
and Lymphology

Switzerland

Swiss Society of Phlebology

Thailand

Thai Phlebology Society

Thai Vascular Association

Turkey

Turkish Society of Phlebology

Uruguay

Uruguayan Society of
Phlebology and Lymphology

USA

American Vein and Lymphatic
Society

American Venous Forum

Ukraine

Association of the Vascular
Surgeons, Phlebologists and
Angiologists of Ukraine

United Kingdom

Venous Forum of the Royal
Society of Medicine

Venezuela

Venezuelan Society of
Phlebology and Lymphology



BACKGROUND

The UIP constitution was written several decades ago and is flawed with inconsistencies, shortcomings and outdated concepts and in desperate need of transformation into a modern document. The original constitution was written in French and translated over time to English going through piecemeal changes. The initial English translation was far from optimal and the small changes that occurred over time made the document inconsistent in language and content. The changes, although important, have not been comprehensive and the UIP continues to deal with chronic complex issues that remain unresolved within the current constitution.

Acknowledging these ongoing issues, the UIP Executive Committee (EC) has undertaken a constitution reform process by forming a *Constitutional Reform Task Force* with members selected from the EC to conduct a comprehensive review of the constitution. This committee has been meeting on a regular basis almost week by week and has identified a large number of important issues within the constitution that require clarification, amendments and re-writing. In addition, legal opinion has been sought from two independent law firms, both of which have advised that the UIP constitution is not legally compliant and is effectively a historic document of no legal standing. The legal review has revealed significant shortcomings that would potentially expose the organisation to liability. This means that in addition to the wish list of changes, there is a legal requirement to change the constitution of the UIP to ensure compliance.

An example of how other international medical societies operate is the International Society on Thrombosis and Haemostasis (ISTH), which is registered as an incorporated, non profit organization for educational, scientific and charitable purposes under the laws of the State of North Carolina in the United States of America. In terms of its constitution, their bylaws may be amended or repealed and new Bylaws may be adopted by the affirmative vote of the lesser of two-thirds of the votes cast at a meeting of the members conducted or a majority of the votes of all members entitled to vote. Amendments to the Bylaws may be initiated either by Council or by a proposal in writing to Council by a minimum of fifty members representing a minimum of three different

countries. The proposed amendments, together with the Council's recommendation, shall be communicated to each member of the Society at least thirty days before the deadline of a vote. The communication shall state that the purpose, or one of the purposes, of the meeting is to consider the proposed amendment and contain or be accompanied by a copy or summary of the amendment.

This *Discussion Paper* is the first step in the review process of the constitution. The purpose of this Discussion Paper is to canvas the issues by providing a framework and providing arguments for and against any proposed change. The Discussion paper has classified the issues into the terms, composition and re-election of the executive committee, membership of the General Council (GC), voting procedures of the GC and membership of the UIP. Submissions are sought from all stakeholders which includes the member societies of the UIP, the UIP past presidents and members of Honour. The responses will help the UIP develop a better understanding of both the issues and problems at hand and potential remedies and solutions if required. The document will be available online in the member portal for constant consultation and eventual comments.

CONSTITUTIONAL REVISION PROCESS

The process of constitutional reform is a rather lengthy project and will involve seeking and implementing legal opinion at every stage of the process to ensure the amendments are compliant with the applicable local laws. We will make sure that our member societies are engaged and informed right through the process. The *Road Map* to the UIP constitutional changes is described in Figure 1.

Figure 1. The Timeline of the Revision Process



The revision process has been as follows:

February 2020- ongoing

Revisions by the UIP special committee Constitutional Reform Committee (CRC)

September 2020 - ongoing

Revisions by the UIP Executive Committee

August 2021

UIP General Council Informal Briefing (Americas- 31 August 2021)

September 2021

UIP General Council Informal Briefing (Europe/Asia- 3 September 2021)

UIP General Council Meeting (25-27 September 2021)

Presentation of *topics* to the UIP General Council

September-October 2021

Further Legal reviews

Further revisions by the CRC and EC

December 2021

Circulation of *the Discussion Paper* to summarise the *topics* and potential remedies to the General Council.

Request for written submissions from member societies and other stakeholders with regards to the topics and any proposed remedies. Submission Deadline 1 February, 2022 extended to 1 March, 2022.

February 2022

Further Legal reviews

Member societies feedback

March 2022

Submission deadline (1 March 2022- extended from 1 Feb 2022)

UIP General Council Meeting (5 March 2022)

- Revision of the proposed changes and member societies submissions

Nominations for the EC positions open (11 March 2022)

May 2022

UIP General Council Meeting (7 May 2022)

- Revision of the proposed new constitution

June 2022

Nominations for the EC positions close (11 June 2022)

August 2022

UIP General Council Meeting (20 August 2022)

September 2022

UIP General Council Meeting (Monday 12 September 2022)

- Istanbul, Turkey

Execution of the new Constitution

DISCUSSION TOPICS

1. Executive Committee Composition

- 1.1. Should the position of Assistant Secretary be maintained?
- 1.2. Should UIP introduce- in place of Assistant Secretary- the position of “Chair Congresses and Events”?
- 1.3. Vice Presidents- should the name “Vice President” be changed to “Regional Representative”?
- 1.4. Vice Presidents- Should UIP introduce a new dedicated Vice President position for Africa?
- 1.5. Vice Presidents- Should UIP introduce a new dedicated Vice President position for Central America?
- 1.6. Vice Presidents- Should VPs be elected by the entire GC or by their respective regions?

2. Executive Committee Terms

- 2.1. Term of the current Executive Committee- to be terminated in 2021 or continue till 2022?
- 2.2. Should the term of the UIP President be synchronised with the UIP EC?
- 2.3. Should the term of the Executive Committee be reduced to two years?
- 2.4. Should the EC be able to remove an elected member, if that member fails to contribute to the organisation, due to gross misconduct, or failing fiduciary duties?
- 2.5. Should the term of the President Elect and Past President roles also be reduced to 1 year?

3. Executive Committee Re-election

- 3.1. The President currently cannot be re-elected. Should this change?
- 3.2. The General Secretary currently can be re-elected. Should this change?
- 3.3. The Treasurer currently can be re-elected. Should this change?
- 3.4. The Assistant Secretary currently can be re-elected. Should this change?
- 3.5. The Vice Presidents currently cannot be re-elected. Should this change?
- 3.6. The Chair of the Science Committee currently can be re-elected. Should this change?
- 3.7. The Chair of the Education Committee currently can be re-elected. Should this change?

4. General Council Membership

- 4.1. Can GC meetings occur online?
- 4.2. Should a secure online voting be conducted during the GC meetings?

- 4.3. Should proxy voting be allowed?
- 4.4. Should the General Council composition include members of the past ECs?
- 4.5. Should the General Council composition include “Members of Honour”?
- 4.6. Should the General Council composition include past Presidents?

5. General Council Voting Procedures

- 5.1. Should voting in the GC meetings be by secret ballot or open?
- 5.2. Voting allocation: Is the current system of 2 votes per country fair?
- 5.3. Voting allocation: Is the current system of 1 vote for the first member society from the member country and sharing of the vote with any other member societies from that country fair?
- 5.4. Should there be 1 vote per member society but raise the membership bar and limit the maximum number of members from a country?

6. Membership of the UIP

- 6.1. What should be the benchmark phlebology component of the member society activities? Should it be predominantly phlebology or a percentage (currently 50% venous) ?
- 6.2. Should formal registration of societies in their respective countries be mandatory for full membership of the UIP?
- 6.3. Should proof of ongoing organisational activity be mandatory for maintaining full membership of the UIP?
- 6.4. Should the UIP accept individual members? If yes, what should be the minimum qualification for an applicant?
- 6.5. Should the UIP limit its membership to “national” societies? If yes, should it not accept applications from non-national, city-based societies?

7. Congresses and Events

- 7.1. Should the frequency of the UIP World Congress remain at every 2 years or should it be held on an annual basis?
- 7.2. Should a regional (previously ‘Chapter’) meeting be held in the odd years?
- 7.3. Should the UIP organise a hands-on workshop in different parts of the world in the odd years?

CONSULTATION PROCESS

The UIP invites the member societies, interested individuals and organisations to provide written submissions in response to any of the issues raised in this Discussion Paper. Contributors may choose to identify themselves. Some of the questions are legal and technical in nature. It is not expected that all stakeholders will be in a position to respond to all discussion questions.

Submissions should be sent:

- By email to execdirector@uipmail.org
- By mail to Level 5, 7 Help Street, Chatswood, NSW, 2081, Australia

by **1 March 2022**.

Submissions may be published on the UIP Website, unless you specifically ask us not to do so.



Topic 1 Executive Committee Composition



BACKGROUND

The first topic discussed in this paper is the Executive Committee Composition. This includes questions regarding positions currently in the committee, specifically the replacing of current positions, the renaming of current positions, voting requirements for positions, and the introduction of new positions.

The main articles from the current UIP Constitution that govern this issue include:

Article 12.3 dictates that the Executive Committee is part of the General Council.

Article 13 explains the general composition of the Executive Committee.

Articles 18 and 19 describes the composition and functioning of the Executive Committee

Articles 20 and 21 go into detail about the President and its role in the Executive Committee.

Article 22 goes into detail about the Vice President and its role in the Executive Committee.

Article 23 goes into detail about the General Secretary and Assistant Secretary and their roles in the Executive Committee.

Article 24 goes into detail about the treasurer and its role in the Executive Committee.

Article 25 goes into detail about the Chairs of Scientific and Educational Committees and their role in the Executive Committee.

These particular issues require an analysis of the positions within the Executive Committee of the UIP, and whether the creation, rebranding, and replacing of certain positions would benefit the UIP. A look into the voting procedures for the members of the Executive Committee is also necessary to allow for a more modern approach for the Executive Committee. An updated analysis into how the Executive Committee represents the UIP as a whole will be very beneficial for the UIP.

Overall, the analysis of these issues can lead to a better understanding of the Executive Committee, what each role brings to the UIP, as well as updating how the Executive Committee can represent the needs and values that the UIP currently holds, in a more contemporary sense.

Article 12

The General Council comprises:

1. The President of the International Union of Phlebology
2. The Past President or the President Elect
3. The Executive Committee
4. The President of each Member Society together with one member from each of them
5. The Associate Members, as defined in Article 6, numbering one per society
6. The Honorary Members
7. The Emeritus Presidents

Article 13

The Executive Committee comprises the President, the Past President and the President Elect, the 5 Vice-Presidents, the General Secretary, the Assistant Secretary, the Treasurer, the Chair of Scientific Committee and the Chair of Education Committee.

The chair of Scientific Committee and the chair of Education Committee take part of meetings of Executive Committee and of General Council with voting rights.

PRESIDENT

Article 20

1. The President is elected by the General Council Meeting during a World Congress.
2. The President's term of office is 4 years and is not renewable.
3. The General Council, at its General Council Meeting, elects its next President — the President Elect – who will take up office 2 years later, but who will immediately become a member of the General Council and of the Executive Committee as President Elect.
4. The President who has ended his/her 4 year term of office is designated Past President and remains on the General Council and on the Executive Committee for 2 years as Past President.
5. During the first two years of his/her term of office, the President will have the assistance of the Past President and, during the last two years, the assistance of the President Elect.
6. Past Presidents or Presidents Elect will be consultative members of the Executive Committee, with no voting rights, during their term of office as Past President or President Elect.
7. In the event of impediment or death of the President, he/she will be replaced immediately by the President Elect who will complete the President's term of office before beginning his/her own. An election of President Elect will take place at the General council meeting during the next World Congress.
8. In the event of impediment or death of one of the members of the Executive Committee, he/she can be replaced by an election at the General Council meeting during the next World Congress
9. The President will only vote when a deciding vote is required.

Article 21

1. The President represents the UIP and chairs all its meetings.
2. The President can mandate a representative if he/she is not available.

VICE – PRESIDENTS

Article 22

The 5 Vice-Presidents are elected for one, non-renewable 4-year term by secret ballot at the General Council Meeting.

They assist the President and replace him/her at his/her request.

The Vice-Presidents have the right to vote on the General Council and on the Executive Committee.

GENERAL SECRETARY and ASSISTANT SECRETARY

Article 23

The General Secretary and the Assistant Secretary are elected for a 4 year renewable term at a Council Meeting by secret ballot.

With the President and by approval of the Executive Committee, the General Secretary draws up the Agenda of the General Council meetings and records the minutes of these meetings.

They invite applications for the different Executive Committee positions and convene the members of the General Council and of the Executive Committee to the meetings, within the deadlines set out in the Internal Regulations.

The General Secretary and the Assistant Secretary have the right to vote on the General Council and on the Executive Committee.

TREASURER

Article 24

The Treasurer is elected for a 4 year renewable term by secret ballot at a General Council Meeting.

The Treasurer will first present a financial report to the Executive Committee and after approval by the Executive Committee, he/she will send the report to all members of the General Council prior to its next meeting.

He/She authorizes the expenses.

The Treasurer is responsible for the proper management of the finances of the UIP as well as for collecting membership fees.

The Treasurer has the right to vote on the General Council and on the Executive Committee.

CHAIRS OF SCIENTIFIC AND EDUCATIONAL COMMITTEES

Article 25

The chairs of Scientific and Education Committees are elected for a 4 year renewable term by secret ballot at a General Council Meeting

The chairs have right to vote and take part of Executive Committee and General Council.

Topic 1- Executive Committee Composition

1.1. Should the position of Assistant Secretary be maintained?

BACKGROUND

While our previous and current Assistant Secretaries have served the UIP greatly, the role of Assistant Secretary is becoming less important in the day-to-day functioning of the UIP. Many of the roles assumed by the Assistant Secretary are currently being performed by the General Secretary and the UIP Administration. In addition, with the automation of UIP membership fees, member society applications and updating membership details on the new UIP website, this position has less relevance to the UIP.

The proposal is for the Assistant Secretary position to not be renewed in future Executive Boards. This would allow a space on the UIP Executive for a new position, such as the *Chair of Congresses and Events*.

Given that the President only has a casting vote when voting is deadlocked, replacing this position with a new Chairperson position would preserve the balance in the committee voting.

ISSUES

- Is there still a role for the Assistant Secretary in the UIP?
- Should this position be removed?
- Should this position be removed only if replaced by another committee Chair, such as the *Chair of Congresses and Events*?

On the one hand, removing the Assistant Secretary position would leave a vacant spot on the Executive that can be filled by a new position, such as the *Chair of Congresses and Events*.

However, there may be unforeseen circumstances where the General Secretary may be unable to fulfill their duties or should there be an unforeseen increase in the General Secretary duties, there may not be the capacity to cover this workload.

In terms of alternative options, this position could simply be removed and not replaced by a new position. The position could be retained, but the Assistant Secretary given more responsibility that is not currently in the scope of the current position.

1.1. Should the position of Assistant Secretary be maintained?

MEMBER FEEDBACK

Maintain Assistant Secretary

- **Austrian Society:** should be maintained

Remove

- **AUS and NZ:** abolish position
- **American Venous Forum:** no

Remove and Replace

- **Balkan Venous Forum:** this position should be removed and replaced by another committee chair e.g. Chair of Congresses
- **German Society of Phlebology:** I am not as involved as to comprehend, if the assistant secretary is necessary or not, but if you feel like it, I am ok with the change to a new "Chair of Congresses and Events"
- **Benelux Society of Phlebology:** Agree to remove the position of the assistant secretary.
- **Ecuadorian Society:** I am not as involved as to comprehend, if the assistant secretary is necessary or not, but if you feel like it, I am ok with the change to a new "Chair of Congresses and Events"
- **Iranian College:** In our opinion, the position of assistant secretary should be replaced by chair of congresses and events.
- **UIP Treasurer:** No. it is superfluous. Agree with the proposition to replace it with Chair of Congresses and Events. This would remain a re-electable position.

1.2. Should UIP introduce- in place of Assistant Secretary- the position of “Chair Congresses and Events”?

BACKGROUND

The UIP has increased the frequency and involvement in the organisation and functioning of its World Congresses. It would make sense to formally establish a permanent *Congresses and Events Committee*, with the Chair of the committee elected as a full member of the UIP Executive.

This committee and its chair will improve the overall quality and consistency of the UIP meetings from congress to congress. It will also assist in attracting sponsorship for UIP congresses and meetings.

The aim of this committee would be

- a) To oversee the bidding process for the UIP congresses;
- b) To create a common structure for the congress scientific program, general council meetings and social functions;
- c) Proactively interact with industry to maintain sponsorship for the activities of the UIP;
- d) To oversee the activities of the Local Organising Committee and the Core-PCO (Core professional conference organiser).

This committee is currently chaired by Dr Lowell Kabnick (Vice-President) following appointment by the President and approval by the Executive. The proposal is to have this position elected by the General Council and the candidate elected as a full member of the Executive Committee.

ISSUES

- Should the UIP introduce- in place of Assistant Secretary- the position of *Chair Congresses and Events*?
- In order to maintain the balance in Executive numbers, should this position still be created if the position of Assistant Secretary not be renewed?
- Should the Chair of this committee be a renewable position?

On the one hand, the election of this chair would be performed by the General Council rather than appointment by the UIP Executive. This would increase the transparency of this appointment and allow the Vice-President to focus on their region rather than having to perform multiple roles for the UIP.

On the other hand the increased numbers of the UIP Executive may lead to more expenses for the UIP.

An alternative could be to retain the current system where the Chair of Congresses and Events is appointed by the President and approved by the Executive, most likely appointed from a member of the Executive Committee. This would however rely upon the member performing two roles of the UIP.

1.2. Should UIP introduce- in place of Assistant Secretary- the position of “Chair Congresses and Events”?

MEMBER FEEDBACK

YES:

- **Austrian Society:** should be introduced and should be renewable
- **AUS and NZ:** introduce the position of Congresses and Events Coordinator and it should be renewable

NO: no responses

1.3. Vice Presidents- should the name “Vice President” be changed to “Regional Representative”?

BACKGROUND

In many countries and organisations, the term “Vice-President” refers to an individual who is directly below the President in rank. However, the UIP has 5 Vice-President’s whose role is not necessarily to serve as the “Deputy” for the President, but to represent the interests of the region for which they represent.

The proposal is for the term “Vice President” to be changed to an alternative term that truly reflects their role in representing a region.

ISSUES

- Should the term “Vice-President” be changed to another term that more appropriately reflects the description of the position?
- What should the name be changed to (for example, “Regional Representative)?
- This would mean that the role for the individual as the representative for their region becomes truly defined in the constitution.

On the one hand, the term "Vice President" does not correctly describe the position. However, the ‘Regional Representative’ term may be defining the position too narrowly.

An alternative could be the use of the modern general term of "Board Member", and the duties of a Board Member would include regional representation.

The UIP welcomes any suggestions or alternatives that the General Council feels can address this issue.

Some Alternatives:

<i>Regional Representative</i>
<i>Regional Ambassador</i>
<i>Regional Councilor</i>

1.3. Vice Presidents- should the name “Vice President” be changed to “Regional Representative”?

MEMBER FEEDBACK

YES:

- **Balkan Venous Forum:** regional representative
- **German Society of Phlebology:** I understand perfectly the point with the regional representatives and feel like this is a better denomination than the Vice President. Board member is perfect, too, thus I think, you could denominate them Board member.
- **Ecuadorian Society:** Accordingly, it may be called a regional representative.

NO:

- **Austrian Society:** keep VP
- **AUS and NZ:** VP term to be retained but they still act in a regional capacity

1.4. Vice Presidents- Should UIP introduce a new dedicated Vice President position for Africa?

BACKGROUND

The UIP currently has 5 Vice-Presidents that are assigned at the beginning of their term to represent different regions of the world. These regional representations are not determined by the GC but assigned by the Executive.

The current Vice President that represents parts of Europe is also representing the only African member country we currently have, Egypt. The UIP currently has only 2 societies from Africa, both from Egypt and the remainder of Africa is currently unrepresented in the UIP. Introducing a dedicated Vice-President for Africa would be an important step towards encouraging already existing African societies to join the UIP, as well as assisting countries without a current society with forming a society.

ISSUES

- Should UIP introduce a dedicated position for the Vice-President (Africa)?

On the one hand, the UIP currently has two societies from Africa and therefore does not serve this continent adequately. Introducing a dedicated Vice-President for Africa would allow for representation of the continent in the UIP. The representative would be ideally suited to reach out to countries in Africa, encouraging and assisting them to form a society in their country and to join the UIP.

However, as the UIP currently only has 2 societies from Africa, this Vice-President would only represent the interests of only 2 societies until the UIP admits more societies from the region. In addition, if representation of the UIP is decided by continents, then Oceania could express a claim that they are entitled to representation for their continent (there are currently only 2 societies in Oceania).

An alternative could be that the UIP recognise a Vice-President representing Asia, Africa and Oceania OR retain the current representation by Europe.

1.4. Vice Presidents- Should UIP introduce a new dedicated Vice President position for Africa?

MEMBER FEEDBACK

1 VP FOR CENTRAL AMERICA; 1 VP FOR NORTH AMERICA

- **American Venous Forum:** yes

1 VP FOR NORTH AND CENTRAL AMERICA

- **Balkan Venous Forum:** combine the representation of Central American member societies with that of North America

2 VPs FOR SOUTH AND CENTRAL AMERICA

- **Benelux:** yes
- **German Society:** prone to this option
- **UIP Treasurer:** agree with this suggestion. create a Latin American region represented by 2 VPs

NO INTRODUCTION

- **AUS and NZ:** Central America has 8 countries and 185 million population and a few UIP member societies. They seem to not want to be included in the North or South America responsible vice president. But I do not think numbers dictate a separate board representation. They have to choose.
- **Austrian Society:** should not be introduced , the continent is already represented twice. Central American countries should choose by whom they want to be represented
- **Iranian College:** Depends on the regional societies opinion (North, central and south america)

1.5. Vice Presidents- Should UIP introduce a new dedicated Vice President position for Central America?

BACKGROUND

The UIP has 4 Central American member countries (Costa Rica, Cuba, El Salvador, Dominican Republic) represented by 4 member societies. The UIP has also received membership applications from other Central American countries with the potential for member societies to increase in the near future. The representation of Central American member countries by a UIP Vice President has been a controversial matter with arguments for representation to be done by both North and South American Vice Presidents.

Meanwhile, there are 10 South American member countries with 18 societies, all represented by one Vice President, Dr Victor Canata.

However, the 3 North American countries are members of the UIP (USA, Canada and Mexico) with 6 societies represented by one Vice President, Dr Lowell Kabnick.

Finally, we have 32 European/African countries with 33 societies represented by two Vice Presidents. Asia/Oceania has 11 member countries with 13 member societies represented by one Vice President.

ISSUES

It has been argued that each UIP Vice President is managing on average 13-18 societies with the exception of the North American VP who seems to have a relatively lighter load (6 societies) and hence it makes sense to combine the representation of Central American member societies with that of North America bringing the total to 10 societies.

The counter-argument has been that such a move would ignore the cultural links of Central America with that of South America.

Region	Country	Society	Vice President
North America	3	6	1
South America	10	18	1
Europe/Africa	32	33	2
Asia/Oceania	11	13	1
Central America	4	4	TBD

OPTIONS

1.5. Vice Presidents- Should UIP introduce a new dedicated Vice President position for Central America?

- **Option 1-** Central American member societies to be serviced by the Vice President representing South America.
 - This would add an additional 4 members (and possibly more members in future) to the region making the total of societies 22, an unacceptable and disproportionate number compared to other regions.
- **Option 2-** Harmonising the Vice-President workload by joining Central American societies with North America.
 - This will be a logical choice considering the small number of member societies in the North American region which already includes Mexico, another Latin American member.
 - However, this is not a favorite solution as perceived by Central American members who prefer to be grouped with South America given the historical and linguistic links.
 - It would be counter-argued that the cultural or linguistic differences amongst the members do not influence the activities of the Vice President in any way given that similar differences exist in Asia and Europe amongst member societies that have different linguistic and cultural backgrounds.
- **Option 3-** Create a Central American region represented by its own Vice President.
 - Counter-argument would be that the small number of societies (currently 4) does not justify a Vice President.
- **Option 4-** Create a Latin American region represented by two Vice Presidents.
 - Having Central American societies be grouped with South American societies will provide for cultural and linguistic links. This can also be beneficial as these societies grouped together add up to a number close to that of Europe's, which means that these societies can also be represented by 2 Vice Presidents (as Europe does too).

1.5. Vice Presidents- Should UIP introduce a new dedicated Vice President position for Central America?

MEMBER FEEDBACK

YES:

- **Benelux:** Agree to introduce in the future a 'regional councilar' for Afrika. One of his/her tasks should be to promote the UIP in other African countries and to create more member organizations. However if now only two African societies exists, this function should temporarily been filled in by another region, Southern-Europe?
- **Austrian Society:** should be introduced

NO:

- **Balkan Venous Reform:** Retain the current representation by Europe.
- **UIP Treasurer:** No. One of the European Board members should undertake this role
- **German Society:** If we start introducing new Vice Presidents this will be a conflict of where this ends... Perhaps we should think about "Board Member" for underrepresented regions with the aim to encourage these regions to grow into UIP.

1.6. Vice Presidents- Should VPs be elected by the entire GC or by their respective regions?

BACKGROUND

Currently, each society has the ability to nominate a candidate for Vice President and vote for them in the elections held by the General Council.

Once Vice-presidents are elected, it is the UIP and not the member societies who appoint each Vice-President to represent a region. Each region currently has little to no input into who represents their region in the UIP.

It is currently possible that all 5 Vice-Presidents may be elected from one area of the world. In this case the UIP would have to appoint a Vice-President to represent a region that they do not currently reside in or have very little professional exposure to.

In this proposed change to the constitution, we are seeking feedback as to whether UIP Vice-Presidents should be elected by the entire General Council, or elected by the region they will represent. If this is formalised in the constitution, the regions will need to be defined in the constitution

ISSUES

- Should Vice-Presidents be elected by the entire GC or by their respective regions?
- Do these regions need to be defined by the constitution?
- How will these regions be defined? Will this be based on continents / number of societies / regions with similar interests and cultures / or based on other factors?
- How do we ensure that societies are happy with the region they are assigned to?
- Can a society choose to switch to a different region if they feel their region no longer serves their needs or will the definition of a region be such that they must remain?
- What other factors are needed to be considered in defining regions. For example:
 - the number of societies in the region
 - the number of individuals represented by societies in that region
 - input from societies in each proposed region

1.6. Vice Presidents- Should VPs be elected by the entire GC or by their respective regions?

On the one hand, members of a specific region (5) choose their own Vice-President to represent their interests rather than being assigned a representative from the top 5 candidates. It also avoids representation by candidates nominated by societies outside of their region. It facilitates dialog between regional Vice-Presidents and their member societies, and avoids unequal regional representation (e.g Multiple Vice-Presidents from a single region)

However, it may limit the election of well qualified candidates from the same region. Voting power from members in regions with few societies (e.g North America) to elect their representative is greater than for members in regions with multiple societies (e.g. Europe).

Vice–Presidents could place interests of a region above those of the UIP as a whole.

Some society members, such as the International Compression Club are global organisations and have interests in more than one continent.

Societies may feel that their region does not represent their interests and this may create animosity towards the UIP and create new tension in their region. The potential for increased political maneuvering within the UIP that hinders progress.

1.6. Vice Presidents- Should VPs be elected by the entire GC or by their respective regions?

MEMBER FEEDBACK

ENTIRE GC:

- **Iranian College:** If the vice presidents are elected by the entire GC they will have a much higher influence on the societies

RESPECTIVE REGION:

- **Austrian Society:** by the respective region
- **UIP Treasurer:** Respective regions should elect their representative.
- **Ecuadorian Society:** They should be elected by the regions they represent.
- **American Venous Forum:** Elected by the Regions

Topic 2 Executive Committee Terms



BACKGROUND

The second topic discussed in this paper is the Executive Committee Terms. This includes questions regarding the current length of terms that members of the Executive Committee hold, as well as a proposal regarding the Executive Committee's powers.

The main articles from the current UIP Constitution that govern this issue include:

Articles 16 and 20 explain the term of the President.

Article 22 explains the terms of the Vice Presidents.

Article 23 explains the terms of the General Secretary and Assistant Secretary.

Article 24 explains the term of the Treasurer.

Article 25 explains the terms of the Chairs of Scientific and Educational Committees.

This particular issue requires an analysis of the current term lengths held by the Executive Committee of the UIP, and whether or not these term lengths are adequate, and up to date with the current needs and values of the UIP. There will also need to be an analysis into the powers of the Executive Committee, and whether or not they should also be able to remove an elected member due to their conduct.

Overall, these issues address the outdated regulations of the current constitution, and allow for a deeper look into how we can effectively reflect the UIP's needs when referring to the length of the Executive Committee's terms as well as their executive powers.

Article 16

The General Council discusses and votes on the items on the agenda drawn up by the General Secretary with the President.

PRESIDENT

Article 20

10. The President is elected by the General Council Meeting during a World Congress.
11. The President's term of office is 4 years and is not renewable.
12. The General Council, at its General Council Meeting, elects its next President — the President Elect – who will take up office 2 years later, but who will immediately become a member of the General Council and of the Executive Committee as President Elect.
13. The President who has ended his/her 4 year term of office is designated Past President and remains on the General Council and on the Executive Committee for 2 years as Past President.
14. During the first two years of his/her term of office, the President will have the assistance of the Past President and, during the last two years, the assistance of the President Elect.
15. Past Presidents or Presidents Elect will be consultative members of the Executive Committee, with no voting rights, during their term of office as Past President or President Elect.
16. In the event of impediment or death of the President, he/she will be replaced immediately by the President Elect who will complete the President's term of office before beginning his/her own. An election of President Elect will take place at the General council meeting during the next World Congress.
17. In the event of impediment or death of one of the members of the Executive Committee, he/she can be replaced by an election at the General Council meeting during the next World Congress

The President will only vote when a deciding vote is required.

VICE – PRESIDENTS

Article 22

The 5 Vice-Presidents are elected for one, non-renewable 4-year term by secret ballot at the General Council Meeting.

They assist the President and replace him/her at his/her request.

The Vice-Presidents have the right to vote on the General Council and on the Executive Committee.

GENERAL SECRETARY and ASSISTANT SECRETARY

Article 23

The General Secretary and the Assistant Secretary are elected for a 4 year renewable term at a Council Meeting by secret ballot.

With the President and by approval of the Executive Committee, the General Secretary draws up the Agenda of the General Council meetings and records the minutes of these meetings.

They invite applications for the different Executive Committee positions and convene the members of the General Council and of the Executive Committee to the meetings, within the deadlines set out in the Internal Regulations.

The General Secretary and the Assistant Secretary have the right to vote on the General Council and on the Executive Committee.

TREASURER

Article 24

The Treasurer is elected for a 4 year renewable term by secret ballot at a General Council Meeting.

The Treasurer will first present a financial report to the Executive Committee and after approval by the Executive Committee, he/she will send the report to all members of the General Council prior to its next meeting.

He/She authorizes the expenses.

The Treasurer is responsible for the proper management of the finances of the UIP as well as for collecting membership fees.

The Treasurer has the right to vote on the General Council and on the Executive Committee.

CHAIRS OF SCIENTIFIC AND EDUCATIONAL COMMITTEES

Article 25

The chairs of Scientific and Education Committees are elected for a 4 year renewable term by secret ballot at a General Council Meeting

The chairs have right to vote and take part of Executive Committee and General Council.

Topic 2- Executive Committee Terms

2.1. Term of the current Executive Committee- to be terminated in 2021 or continue till 2022?

BACKGROUND

The current UIP Executive Committee was elected at the World Congress in Melbourne in February, 2018. The term of the committee was to conclude during the World Congress in Istanbul, which at the time was scheduled for October 2021. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, this meeting was rescheduled to September 2022. This would extend the term of the current executive for an extra 349 days.

Rather than assume that the Executive term is automatically extended, we are seeking feedback on whether elections for a new Executive should be held early.

It should be noted however, that the term of the current executive (2018 -) is expected to be only 72 days longer than that of the previous UIP executive (2013-2018).

ISSUES

- Should the term of the current Executive Committee be terminated in 2021 or continue till 2022?
- If the term is terminated, when and where will the next election occur?

On the one hand, the UIP Executive Committee members that are eligible for re-election are usually able to present an account of their activities for their term at a general council meeting. By extending their term EC members are able to demonstrate their contribution to the UIP before standing for re-election.

However, If the EC term is terminated, how and where will the election occur and how can this be performed to allow a fair and free election?

The UIP welcomes any suggestions or alternatives that the General Council feels can address this issue.

Previous UIP Executive Committee Terms

2nd September, 2009 – 12th September, 2013 = **1,451** days

12th September, 2013 - 7th February 2018 = **1,609** days

Current EC term (Prior to COVID-19 rescheduling of Istanbul meeting)

7th February 2018 – 1st October 2021 = **1,332** days

Current EC term (if extended until 2022 Istanbul meeting)

7th February 2018- 15th September 2022 = **1,681** days

2.1. Term of the current Executive Committee- to be terminated in 2021 or continue till 2022?

MEMBER FEEDBACK

YES:

- **Ecuadorian Society:** Shorten the length of the next Executive committee from 2022-2023 to end with the current President's term.
- **UIP Treasurer:** I think this would be a good idea as it should result in improved workability of each President's aims and efforts.
- **Iranian College:** Agreed

NO:

- **Balkan Venous Forum:** No change to any term and the current system remains
- **German Society:** Even though it means adapting to different teams, the “continuity” of contents is better achieved if President and EC do not start and end simultaneously.

2.2. Should the term of the UIP President be synchronised with the UIP EC?

BACKGROUND

The UIP Presidential term is currently out of alignment with the remainder of the Executive Committee. This allows for a President to serve with 2 Executive Committees and for each Executive Committee to serve with 2 presidents.

This does however cause disruption to the Executive and to the President, as it limits the time that they have to work together. An executive committee may prefer to work with just one President and a President may prefer to work with just one Executive committee.

The current President's term is 2019-2023 and the current Executive Committee term is 2018-2021/2 (see Topic 2.1 above). In order to synchronise the terms, there are several methods by which this could be achieved:

- *Shorten* the length of the next Executive committee from 2022-2023 to end with the current President's term.
- *Increase* the term of the current executive committee so that it ends in 2023 with the President's term
- *Shorten* the term of the current president to end in 2022 with the current Executive Committee
- No change to any term and the current system remains

ISSUES

- Should the term of the UIP President be synchronised with the UIP EC?
- How will this be achieved?

On the one hand, the President and Executive Committee have a synchronised term and once terms are aligned, they have 4 continuous years to work together for the UIP.

However, there may be situations where a President may wish to work with two Executive Committees, or the Executive Committees may wish to work with two different Presidents. This would also mean potential shortened terms for the current President for future Executive Committees, as well as potential prolonging of the current Executive Committee, after already having been extended from 2021 to 2022 (if approved in Topic 2.1)

The UIP welcomes any suggestions or alternatives that the General Council feels can address this issue.

2.2. Should the term of the UIP President be synchronised with the UIP EC?

MEMBER FEEDBACK

SHORTEN NEXT EC TERM 2022-23

- **Ecuadorian Society:** Shorten the length of the next Executive committee from 2022-2023 to end with the current President's term.

INCREASE CURRENT EC TO 2023

- No responses

SHORT TERM OF CURRENT PRESIDENT TO 2022

- No responses

2.3. Should the term of the Executive Committee be reduced to two years?

BACKGROUND

The current term for executive committee members is four years. For many, this is a long commitment, and may stop good candidates from applying to the UIP Executive. The UIP is seeking feedback as to whether the length of the term of the Executive should be reviewed and possibly shortened to two years. This would increase the number of positions available on the Executive Committee over the long-term, allowing for more representation of its members.

Now that the UIP conducts more frequent congresses, elections could be held at each World Congress of the UIP.

In considering this point, societies can also make recommendations in association with Topic 3 below, which discusses whether each executive position can be re-elected. This change could be enacted where a Vice-President is able to be reelected once, thereby creating two 2 year terms. This would ensure that Vice-Presidents are productive and actively represent the interests of their region.

ISSUES

- Should the term of the Executive Committee be reduced to two years?
- If the Executive Committee terms are reduced, can positions become re-electable, based (see also Topic 3 below)

On the one hand, more well qualified candidates may be encouraged to apply, due to the decreased length of the commitment on the committee. Societies who are dissatisfied with the performance of their representative do not have to wait as long for the election of a new representative. Shortened terms would lead to more individuals joining the committee in the long-term, ensuring diversity in representation on the committee.

However, a shortened term on the executive committee may limit the ability for members to commit to long term projects on the board. Increasing the number of individuals who can serve the UIP may mean less qualified candidates eventually join the committee if there are only limited numbers of individuals willing to apply. Furthermore, it must also be noted that 2 years may not be long enough to become sufficiently conversant with a position in the Executive Committee.

2.3. Should the term of the Executive Committee be reduced to two years?

MEMBER FEEDBACK

YES:

- **Austrian Society:** reduce to two years

NO:

- **Benelux:** the term stays for four years. But a member of the executive committee can ask to be replaced after two years. Then elections can be organized, if applicable, to fill-in those open mandates.
- **German Society:** Two years is too short in my eyes to get introduced to the topics. 4 years with all the inconveniences are ok in my eyes.
- **AUS and NZ:** no 4 years
- **American Venous Forum:** no

2.4. Should the EC be able to remove an elected member, if that member fails to contribute to the organisation, due to gross misconduct, or failing fiduciary duties?

BACKGROUND

The UIP currently has no clear and transparent mechanism within the constitution to deal with a member of the executive who is failing to fulfill their duties, even if there is proven gross misconduct. Reasons that have been suggested to the UIP by our legal advisors for the removal of a member are:

- Professional disciplinary sanction
- Bankruptcy or arrangements with creditors (this is a legal requirement in Australia)
- Expelled as a member from the society member they represent
- If the member society they represent is wound up
- They are absent from 3 consecutive executive meetings without leave
- They resign from office
- Unsound mind evidenced by medical report or failure to provide medical report as to soundness of mind on reasonable request of the executive
- Any other legal requirement of the country/jurisdiction in which the UIP is registered
- Failure to comply with conflict of interest disclosure obligations. Conflict of Interest to be defined in Code of Conduct.
- Failure to comply with Code of Conduct
- Felony conviction

This may not be a complete list and the UIP welcomes any feedback about any other reasons for removal.

ISSUES

- Does the UIP constitution need to address how an executive member can be removed?
- What criteria can be used to remove a sitting member?
- Can an executive member be removed for failing to fulfil their obligations?
- Can an executive member be removed for gross misconduct
- Can an executive member be removed for failing fiduciary duties?
- What rights does the member have to appeal the decision?
- What is the role of the General Council in the decision to remove a member or the appeal process?

On the one hand, the UIP would have the ability to ensure it is protected both legally and professionally, should an executive member fail in their duties. Executive members are accountable for their actions and the UIP has a clear course of action in the event of a dispute.

On the other hand, any system would need to have appropriate appeal processes so that a member cannot be removed for other reasons (for example political maneuvering). Too much Executive and General Council time is used to review appeals of removed members.

The UIP welcomes any suggestions or alternatives that the General Council feels can address this issue.

2.5 Should the term of the President Elect and Past President roles also be reduced to 1 year?

BACKGROUND

Topic 2.3 has proposed shortening the term of the UIP Executive to 2 years. In order to retain the executive comprising either a President Elect or the Immediate Past President (but not both at the same time), this would require the term for each to be only 1 year and the total time spent on the UIP executive to be 4 years.

Duration of the Presidential term following election.	
ELECTION	
President Elect	1 year
President	2 years
Immediate Past President	1 year
Emeritus President	Perpetual

ISSUES

- Should the term of the President Elect and Past-President roles also be reduced to 1 year?
- Can the President Elect and Immediate Past President be serving on the UIP Executive simultaneously

On one hand, this would mean that President Elect would not serve at the same time as the Immediate Past President, where their future agenda may be influenced by the agenda of a past president.

However, this shortens the time that the President Elect has to prepare and set the agenda for their presidency from 2 years to 1. This would also mean that the President Elect would effectively spend one year following Election before they become a member of the Executive.

An alternative would be that the President Elect and Immediate Past-President could serve at the same time. This would however increase the size of the Executive.

2.5 Should the term of the President Elect and Past President roles also be reduced to 1 year?

MEMBER FEEDBACK

YES:

- **German Society:** If the President time is shortened to 2 years, the President Elect could be a non voting member of the executive for 1 year and voting member then for 1 year – and the same as the past president – voting member for 1 year and then be guest for 1 further year (if this is necessary).
- **Austrian Society:** Yes
- **Benelux:** Agree to reduce the term to one year.

NO:

- **Iranian College:** Two years would be more effective
- **AUS and NZ:** No I suggest keeping them at 2 years

Topic 3 Executive Committee Re-election



BACKGROUND

The third topic discussed in this paper is the Executive Committee Re-election. This includes questions regarding the specifics of what the current constitution allows for re-electing members of the Executive Committee.

The main articles from the current UIP Constitution that govern this topic include:

Article 20 describes the election of the President.

Article 22 describes the election of the Vice Presidents.

Article 23 describes the election of the General Secretary and Assistant Secretary.

Article 24 describes the election of the Treasurer.

Article 25 describes the election of the Chair of Scientific and Educational Committees.

These particular issues require an analysis of the current members of the Executive Committee and their roles in the UIP, to determine whether or not the current restrictions and allowances in the constitution are up to date with how the present-day members of the UIP would like matters to run in the organization.

Overall, reviewing these sections of the constitution will make sure that the Executive Committee's roles continue to uphold the desires of the members of the UIP.

PRESIDENT

Article 20

18. The President is elected by the General Council Meeting during a World Congress.
19. The President's term of office is 4 years and is not renewable.
20. The General Council, at its General Council Meeting, elects its next President — the President Elect – who will take up office 2 years later, but who will immediately become a member of the General Council and of the Executive Committee as President Elect.
21. The President who has ended his/her 4 year term of office is designated Past President and remains on the General Council and on the Executive Committee for 2 years as Past President.
22. During the first two years of his/her term of office, the President will have the assistance of the Past President and, during the last two years, the assistance of the President Elect.
23. Past Presidents or Presidents Elect will be consultative members of the Executive Committee, with no voting rights, during their term of office as Past President or President Elect.
24. In the event of impediment or death of the President, he/she will be replaced immediately by the President Elect who will complete the President's term of office before beginning his/her own. An election of President Elect will take place at the General council meeting during the next World Congress.
25. In the event of impediment or death of one of the members of the Executive Committee, he/she can be replaced by an election at the General Council meeting during the next World Congress
26. The President will only vote when a deciding vote is required.

VICE – PRESIDENTS

Article 22

The 5 Vice-Presidents are elected for one, non-renewable 4-year term by secret ballot at the General Council Meeting.

They assist the President and replace him/her at his/her request.

The Vice-Presidents have the right to vote on the General Council and on the Executive Committee.

GENERAL SECRETARY and ASSISTANT SECRETARY

Article 23

The General Secretary and the Assistant Secretary are elected for a 4 year renewable term at a Council Meeting by secret ballot.

With the President and by approval of the Executive Committee, the General Secretary draws up the Agenda of the General Council meetings and records the minutes of these meetings.

They invite applications for the different Executive Committee positions and convene the members of the General Council and of the Executive Committee to the meetings, within the deadlines set out in the Internal Regulations.

The General Secretary and the Assistant Secretary have the right to vote on the General Council and on the Executive Committee.

TREASURER

Article 24

The Treasurer is elected for a 4 year renewable term by secret ballot at a General Council Meeting.

The Treasurer will first present a financial report to the Executive Committee and after approval by the Executive Committee, he/she will send the report to all members of the General Council prior to its next meeting.

He/She authorizes the expenses.

The Treasurer is responsible for the proper management of the finances of the UIP as well as for collecting membership fees.

The Treasurer has the right to vote on the General Council and on the Executive Committee.

CHAIRS OF SCIENTIFIC AND EDUCATIONAL COMMITTEES

Article 25

The chairs of Scientific and Education Committees are elected for a 4 year renewable term by secret ballot at a General Council Meeting

The chairs have the right to vote and take part in the Executive Committee and General Council.

3.1. The President currently cannot be re-elected. Should this change?

BACKGROUND

There are several positions with the UIP Executive that can be re-elected and some positions that cannot be re-elected.

In the interest of continual review of UIP policies, the UIP is interested in feedback from its members in reviewing the renewal policies of all the EC positions.

UIP Executive positions that are currently renewable are

- General Secretary
- Assistant Secretary
- Treasurer
- Education Committee Chair
- Scientific Committee Chair

UIP Executive positions that are currently **NOT** renewable are

- President
- Vice-Presidents
- President-Elect and Immediate Past-President*

*By definition, the President-Elect and Immediate Past President by definition are non-renewable. The Immediate Past-President becomes an Emeritus President of the UIP for life.

This section refers to the position of the UIP President.

ISSUES

- The President currently cannot be re-elected. Should this change?
- Could restricting EC office bearers from holding office again too dramatically limit the pool of persons willing and able to take on such roles?
- Is stipulating non-consecutive appointments another option for some roles?
- Can they be appointed to a different role?
- If this is changed, would there be any limits on the number of times that a President could be re-elected? Could this be a non-consecutive appointment?
- Can a Past-President be appointed to a different role in the EC?

This could be a positive change as a highly productive President could be retained by the UIP.

However, restricting EC office bearers from holding office again would too dramatically limit the pool of persons willing and able to take on such roles. An alternative could be that the position of President should be optionally be electable for a 2nd term of 4 years.

The UIP welcomes any suggestions or alternatives that the General Council feels can address this issue.

3.1. The President currently cannot be re-elected. Should this change?

MEMBER FEEDBACK

YES:

- **German Society:** Re-Election of Presidents could be possible for 1 Term in my eyes.
- **Benelux:** It should be possible for the president to be re-elected with a maximum of two terms.

NO:

- **AUS and NZ:** No Only one term for the president
- **Balkan Venous Forum:** Non, The President cannot be re-elected.

3. Topic 3- Executive Committee Re-election

3.2. The General Secretary currently can be re-elected. Should this change?

BACKGROUND

There are several positions with the UIP Executive that can be re-elected and some positions that cannot be re-elected.

In the interest of continual review of UIP policies, the UIP is interested in feedback from its members in reviewing the renewal policies of all the EC positions.

UIP Executive positions that are currently renewable are

- General Secretary
- Assistant Secretary
- Treasurer
- Education Committee Chair
- Scientific Committee Chair

UIP Executive positions that are currently **NOT** renewable are

- President
- Vice-Presidents
- President-Elect and Immediate Past-President*

*By definition, the President-Elect and Immediate Past President by definition are non-renewable. The Immediate Past-President becomes an Emeritus President of the UIP for life.

This section refers to the position of the UIP General Secretary.

ISSUES

- The General Secretary currently can be re-elected. Should this change?
- If this is not changed, would there be any limits on the number of times that a General Secretary could be re-elected?

Could restricting EC office bearers from holding office again too dramatically limit the pool of persons willing and able to take on such roles?

The UIP welcomes any suggestions or alternatives that the General Council feels can address this issue.

3. Topic 3- Executive Committee Re-election

3.2. The General Secretary currently can be re-elected. Should this change?

MEMBER FEEDBACK

RENEWABLE:

- **Balkan Venous Forum:** can be re-elected
- **German Society:** Re-Election of General Secretary could be possible for **1 Term**
- **AUS and NZ:** No The secretary is a re-electable position and should stay that way
- **Benelux:** The General Secretary currently can be re-elected. Should this change? No

NON-RENEWABLE:

- **Ecuadorian Society:** No to reelection.

3. Topic 3- Executive Committee Re-election

3.3. The Treasurer currently can be re-elected. Should this change?

BACKGROUND

There are several positions with the UIP Executive that can be re-elected and some positions that cannot be re-elected.

In the interest of continual review of UIP policies, the UIP is interested in feedback from its members in reviewing the renewal policies of all the EC positions.

UIP Executive positions that are currently renewable are

- General Secretary
- Assistant Secretary
- Treasurer
- Education Committee Chair
- Scientific Committee Chair

UIP Executive positions that are currently **NOT** renewable are

- President
- Vice-Presidents
- President-Elect and Immediate Past-President*

*By definition, the President-Elect and Immediate Past President by definition are non-renewable. The Immediate Past-President becomes an Emeritus President of the UIP for life.

This section refers to the position of the UIP Treasurer.

ISSUES

- The Treasurer currently can be re-elected. Should this change?
- If this is not changed, would there be any limits on the number of times that a Treasurer could be re-elected?

Could restricting EC office bearers from holding office again too dramatically limit the pool of persons willing and able to take on such roles?

The UIP welcomes any suggestions or alternatives that the General Council feels can address this issue.

3. Topic 3- Executive Committee Re-election

3.3. The Treasurer currently can be re-elected. Should this change?

MEMBER FEEDBACK

RENEWABLE:

- **Balkan Venous Forum:** can be re-elected
- **Benelux:** The General Secretary currently can be re-elected. Should this change?
No
- **German Society:** Ok with the treasurer being re-elected, but I propose to organize a dynamic, that the terms of being 4 years are overlapping. This means: 2000 – 2004 President, 2002 – 2006 General Secretary, to ensure any kind of continuity.
- **AUS and NZ:** No The secretary is a re-electable position and should stay that way

NON-RENEWABLE:

- **Ecuadorian Society:** No to reelection.

3. Topic 3- Executive Committee Re-election

3.4. The Assistant Secretary currently can be re-elected. Should this change?

BACKGROUND

There are several positions with the UIP Executive that can be re-elected and some positions that cannot be re-elected.

In the interest of continual review of UIP policies, the UIP is interested in feedback from its members in reviewing the renewal policies of all the EC positions.

UIP Executive positions that are currently renewable are

- General Secretary
- Assistant Secretary
- Treasurer
- Education Committee Chair
- Scientific Committee Chair

UIP Executive positions that are currently **NOT** renewable are

- President
- Vice-Presidents
- President-Elect and Immediate Past-President*

*By definition, the President-Elect and Immediate Past President by definition are non-renewable. The Immediate Past-President becomes an Emeritus President of the UIP for life.

This section refers to the position of UIP Assistant Secretary

ISSUES

- The Assistant Secretary currently can be re-elected. Should this change?
- If this is not changed, would there be any limits on the number of times that an Assistant Secretary could be re-elected?

Could restricting EC office bearers from holding office again too dramatically limit the pool of persons willing and able to take on such roles?

The UIP welcomes any suggestions or alternatives that the General Council feels can address this issue.

3. Topic 3- Executive Committee Re-election

3.5. The Vice Presidents currently cannot be re-elected. Should this change?

BACKGROUND

There are several positions with the UIP Executive that can be re-elected and some positions that cannot be re-elected.

In the interest of continual review of UIP policies, the UIP is interested in feedback from its members in reviewing the renewal policies of all the EC positions.

UIP Executive positions that are currently renewable are

- General Secretary
- Assistant Secretary
- Treasurer
- Education Committee Chair
- Scientific Committee Chair

UIP Executive positions that are currently **NOT** renewable are

- President
- Vice-Presidents
- President-Elect and Immediate Past-President*

*By definition, the President-Elect and Immediate Past President by definition are non-renewable. The Immediate Past-President becomes an Emeritus President of the UIP for life.

This section to the positions of the UIP Vice-Presidents

ISSUES

- The Vice-Presidents currently cannot be re-elected. Should this change?
- If this is changed, would there be any limits on the number of times that a Vice-President could be re-elected?

On the one hand, the current situation is very restrictive and not necessarily in the best interests of the UIP. They should be able to be re-elected.

However, it is important to note that restricting EC office bearers from holding office again could too dramatically limit the pool of persons willing and able to take on such roles.

The UIP welcomes any suggestions or alternatives that the General Council feels can address this issue.

3. Topic 3- Executive Committee Re-election

3.5. The Vice Presidents currently cannot be re-elected. Should this change?

MEMBER FEEDBACK

RENEWABLE:

- **German Society:** Regional Delegates / Board Members (Vicepresidents) should be reelected, but, again, **possibly changing turns to enable continuity**
- **Benelux:** No, again max 2 terms of 4 years each **Idem for the vice-presidents. It should also be possible to appoint them for a different function in the UIP executive committee.**
- **Iranian College:** re-election should only be allowed **once.**
- **Austrian Society:** this should be uniformly adapted to the role of the President. **if re elected the number of times for reelection should be limited**
- **American Venous Forum:** Yes

NON-RENEWABLE:

- **Balkan Venous Forum:** The Vice Presidents currently cannot be re-elected. Should this change? Ans: NO
- **UIP Treasurer:** No. This rule allows a turn-over of "talent" and a VP can always seek re-election to another position on the Board.
- **Ecuadorian Society:** no
- **AUS and NZ:** No Don't change. Their role is social and collegiate and spreading information. No need to re-elect them

3. Topic 3- Executive Committee Re-election

3.6. The Chair of the Science Committee currently can be re-elected. Should this change?

BACKGROUND

There are several positions with the UIP Executive that can be re-elected and some positions that cannot be re-elected.

In the interest of continual review of UIP policies, the UIP is interested in feedback from its members in reviewing the renewal policies of all the EC positions.

UIP Executive positions that are currently renewable are

- General Secretary
- Assistant Secretary
- Treasurer
- Education Committee Chair
- Scientific Committee Chair

UIP Executive positions that are currently **NOT** renewable are

- President
- Vice-Presidents
- President-Elect and Immediate Past-President*

*By definition, the President-Elect and Immediate Past President by definition are non-renewable. The Immediate Past-President becomes an Emeritus President of the UIP for life.

This section refers to the Chair of the Science Committee.

ISSUES

- The Chair of the Science Committee currently can be re-elected. Should this change?

Could restricting EC office bearers from holding office again too dramatically limit the pool of persons willing and able to take on such roles?

The UIP welcomes any suggestions or alternatives that the General Council feels can address this issue.

3. Topic 3- Executive Committee Re-election

3.7. The Chair of the Education Committee currently can be re-elected. Should this change?

BACKGROUND

There are several positions with the UIP Executive that can be re-elected and some positions that cannot be re-elected.

In the interest of continual review of UIP policies, the UIP is interested in feedback from its members in reviewing the renewal policies of all the EC positions.

UIP Executive positions that are currently renewable are

- General Secretary
- Assistant Secretary
- Treasurer
- Education Committee Chair
- Scientific Committee Chair

UIP Executive positions that are currently **NOT** renewable are

- President
- Vice-Presidents
- President-Elect and Immediate Past-President*

*By definition, the President-Elect and Immediate Past President by definition are non-renewable. The Immediate Past-President becomes an Emeritus President of the UIP for life.

This section refers to the Chair of the Education Committee.

ISSUES

- The Chair of the Education Committee currently can be re-elected. Should this change?

Could restricting EC office bearers from holding office again too dramatically limit the pool of persons willing and able to take on such roles?

The UIP welcomes any suggestions or alternatives that the General Council feels can address this issue.

3. Topic 3- Executive Committee Re-election

3.7. The Chair of the Education Committee currently can be re-elected. Should this change?

MEMBER FEEDBACK (3.6 and 3.7)

RENEWABLE:

- **Balkan Venous Forum:** no change - can be re-elected
- **Benelux:** no, again max. 2 terms of 4 years each

NON-RENEWABLE:

- **Ecuadorian Society:** no to re-election
- **German Society:** Assistant Secretary (if it is still a job that we keep) should be also non-renewable
- **American Venous Forum:** yes

NOT SURE:

- **Iranian College:** no idea
- **Austrian Society:** the position of Assistant Secretary should be skipped
- **AUS and NZ:** there will be no Assistant Secretary but the Congress and Events Position should be re-electable
- **UIP Treasurer:** agree with the above

Topic 4 General Council Membership



BACKGROUND

The fourth topic discussed in this paper is the General Council Membership. This includes questions regarding the composition of the General Council, as well as the different ways the General Council would be able to vote and meet.

The main articles from the current UIP Constitution that govern this issue include:

Article 10 which explains the role of the General Council.

Article 12 which details the composition of the General Council.

Article 16 sets out in more detail the role of the General Council.

Article 17 as it explains voting procedures of the General Council.

These particular issues require an analysis of the General Council's current structure, as well as a hypothetical view into how the General Council could potentially be organized. A look into the different possible ways that the General Council could meet as well as vote will allow for a more updated and current perspective that can help meet the demands of the General Council of the UIP, as well adapt more modern ways to arrange General Council matters.

Overall, to amend these sections of the constitution, it is necessary to understand the needs of the General Council, as well as the UIP as a whole, to see whether the addition of different groups of members into the General Council, as well as the adaptation of voting and meeting methods, would benefit the UIP or not.

Article 10

The UIP is administered by a General Council which, outside its meetings, delegates its authority to the Executive Committee which reports to the General Council.

Article 12

The General Council comprises:

8. The President of the International Union of Phlebology
9. The Past President or the President Elect
10. The Executive Committee
11. The President of each Member Society together with one member from each of them
12. The Associate Members, as defined in Article 6, numbering one per society
13. The Honorary Members
14. The Emeritus Presidents

Article 16

The General Council discusses and votes on the items on the agenda drawn up by the General Secretary with the President.

Every 4 years the General Council elects the next President (the President Elect) and the members of the Executive Committee by secret ballot.

The General Council discusses and votes on the candidatures of Society Members, Associate Members and other members.

The General Council elects Honorary Members.

The General Council votes on the locations and dates of the official Congresses of the UIP.

The General Council votes on the amount of membership fees based on the recommendation of the Treasurer and Executive Committee.

Article 17

Debating and voting procedures:

1. All the members of the General Council can take part in the debates, but only the following are entitled to vote on the Council:

The President or his/her duly authorized representative of each of the Member Societies, which are up-to-date with their membership fees, on the following bases:

- Countries with one member society: 2 votes per society
- Maximum of two votes per country: countries with more than one society: one vote belongs to the first Society accepted in the UIP; the second vote belongs to the other new Society/Societies.

- Societies representing a group of countries in which no other member society of the UIP exists: 2 votes
- Societies representing a group of countries in which other member society(ies) of the UIP exists: 1 vote
- International societies representing a continent or subcontinent: 1 vote
- Multinational or regional societies: 1 vote

- The members of the Executive Committee except the President (present, past or elect): 1 vote each.

Voting by proxy is accepted within the limit of one proxy per person. .

2. The only circumstance under which the President of the UIP votes is when a deciding vote is required.
3. The Past President and the President Elect do not vote under any circumstance.
4. At least half the members of the General Council with the right to vote, or their duly authorized representatives, must be present in order for the proceedings to be valid [exceptions- see Article 17.6 and also Article 33].
5. The General Council's decisions will be taken on an absolute majority, defined as more than half of the votes cast; failing a decision, further voting will take place and the decision taken on a relative majority, defined as the largest number of votes cast [exceptions – see Article 17.6 and also Article 33].
6. The status of Society Member, Associate Member, or Honorary Member is acquired by a vote on a relative majority of the General Council Members present or represented.

Appropriate decorum and adherence to rules of order will be maintained by the President during General Council meetings

4.1. Can GC meetings occur online?

BACKGROUND

UIP General Council meetings are held at every UIP World Congress or at the request of members. This means that the General Council meets on average every 2 years. As the UIP evolves into a more modern society, holding a general council meeting more regularly would allow the UIP to respond more rapidly to challenges in Phlebology, and allows decision making processes to be more streamlined.

The COVID-19 pandemic has highlighted that travelling to a general council meeting is not always possible, but has also demonstrated how technology can be used to ensure that societies can continue to function. The issue of whether General Council meetings could be held online needs to be discussed.

There are currently no specifications in the constitution that currently either prohibits or permits online GC meetings, however refers on multiple occasions to “members present”. This was written at a time before online communication was possible and needs to be specific about whether this should be restricted to “physically present” or increased to “physically present or present online”.

ISSUES

- Can GC meetings occur online?
- What forms of technology can be used to join meetings? Could any form of appropriate technology be used, for example, could GC members join by telephone if they are unable to join by audio-visual means?
- Considering member societies are spread across different time zones, when should GC meetings be scheduled so as not to disadvantage

societies for which GC meetings are scheduled during non-business hours?

On the one hand, the UIP can continue to function at full capacity in between congresses and physical GC meetings or during times where travel is limited (e.g. pandemics or political turmoil).

- Fast decision making: Decisions can be made faster, without having to wait until the next physical GC meeting.
- Urgent problem solving: A GC meeting can be called quickly to address any urgent needs of the UIP.
- Furthermore, there is no constitutional impediment to online GC meetings and voting.

On the other hand, this could lead to loss of in person brainstorming:

- The UIP could lose the potential benefit of being able to discuss and address issues in person, where the environment may be more conducive to finalising discussions and decision making.
- The appeal of attending in person UIP GC meetings and its congresses is reduced, resulting in very few members attending in person.
- A bias develops against those members who have limited access to technology or stable internet. Members who are not comfortable communicating online may be disadvantaged

4.1. Can GC meetings occur online?

MEMBER FEEDBACK

YES:

- **Benelux:** Yes, but online if an urgent decision has to be made or in times traveling can be difficult. Maybe, hybrid sessions can be organized if some member organizations can't attend the meeting and have a good explanation for this.
- **German Society:** GC should be able online – totally and partially. Of course, a personal meeting is always the best option. But less rich countries / societies would not be able to send delegates on a yearly or two year basis... Thus, enabling online participation also allows poorer regions to participate on every GC. GC should be held at every UIP meeting. We have an executive committee for important issues. Extraordinary GCs should only be held, if the president has to be removed from his job (see 2.4)
- **Balkan Venous Forum:** Yes. In cases during times where travel is limited
- **Iranian College:** Yes it can
- **Austrian Society:** Yes, absolutely
- **AUS and NZ:** Yes. In the modern era GC meetings should be a hybrid meeting of in-house and online, just like our scientific meetings
- **American Venous Forum:** Yes

NO:

- **UIP Treasurer:** No. Too difficult.

4.2. Should a secure online voting be conducted during the GC meetings?

BACKGROUND

As discussed in 4.1, with the potential for GC meetings to be conducted online, the UIP is seeking feedback as to whether online voting can be performed during these discussions, or whether these meetings would just be held to discuss issues without voting?

There are a number of different online voting systems that allow for secure elections to occur.

It should be noted that in previous in person GC meetings, electronic voting has already been used. In practice, this could be considered to be equal to an online, if not less secure, system.

ISSUES

- Should a secure online voting be conducted during the GC meetings?
- How does the UIP ensure that discussion and online voting is conducted securely and without bias against those societies who have limited access to technology?
- What quorum will be required for votes to be held on business matters?

On the one hand, the following are the positive things that come from online voting; Faster decision making, urgent problem solving, online brainstorming, faster GC executive empowerment, faster society entrance less need of proxy, new EC election in state of emergency (pandemic-like), urgent EC member substitution in case of one member loss, assuring GC representation & voting powers.

However, the following are possible disadvantages of the online voting systems: loss of in person brainstorming and exchange of ideas, reduced direct human interaction, loss of appeal to attend the UIP Meetings; an underpopulated GC meeting puts the UIP at risk of political maneuvering (25% of members call a GC, 50% of the GC can then be present, 50% of them agreeing = 25% voters holds executive power)

4.3. Should proxy voting be allowed?

BACKGROUND

The UIP currently allows for proxy voting to occur within GCI meetings. This ensures that societies that are unable to attend GC meetings for whatever reason are still able to contribute to the decisions of the GC.

It is however possible that by continuing to allow for proxy votes to occur that a society would never attend a GC meeting and perpetually pass their vote to another society or individual that does not truly represent that society.

The UIP is seeking the feedback of the general council as to whether proxy voting should be allowed to continue; whether further rules should be placed on who can represent a society as their proxy; or whether proxy voting should no longer be allowed.

For example, proxy voting could be allowed to continue, but with restrictions, such as:

- the representative must be a member of the society they are representing,
- that the society can only assign a proxy for one meeting only, before they are required to attend the following meeting.

ISSUES

- Should proxy voting be allowed?
- If proxy voting is allowed, should any restrictions be placed on who can represent a society as their proxy?
- If proxy voting is not allowed, what is the responsibility of the UIP to ensure that societies with limited access to financial support to attend meetings are still able to attend. Could the UIP provide any financial assistance to Tier 3 countries who are unable to attend?
- If the UIP adopts online voting, is proxy voting therefore redundant as societies can now attend online?

On the one hand, the possible advantages of ALLOWING proxy voting include; proxy voting allows societies to be represented at GC meetings if they are unable to attend for whatever reason, societies who cannot attend due to financial, political or travel constraints are still able to have their voice heard. However, the possible advantages of NOT ALLOWING proxy voting include; this would encourage attendance and active involvement of all societies at GC meetings, and encouraging attendance at GC meetings means member societies are able to participate in discussion and make an informed decision before casting their society's vote

On the other hand, the negatives of ALLOWING proxy voting include; a society

4.3. Should proxy voting be allowed?

may never attend a GC meeting and therefore not be truly represented, votes may be cast that are not in the interest of the society, but in the interest of the person holding the proxy vote, although allowances made to fund attendance by economically depressed countries, some future conditions (e.g world-wide pandemics, travel restrictions) could require adoption of electronic voting.

The UIP welcomes any suggestions or alternatives that the General Council feels can address this issue. One alternative could be that proxy voting should be allowed, but under the standard rules of a public company.

4.3. Should proxy voting be allowed?

MEMBER FEEDBACK

YES:

- **German Society:** Proxy Voting is an alternative, if online voting is not possible. If a society gives the Proxy-Voting to another society, this means that they trust them and I think, this has not to be regulated by UIP. Thus, Proxy Voting should be allowed and, in my eyes, unlimited.
- **Ecuadorian Society:** Proxy voting should be allowed, with some restriction for future events if you are not a member of your society
- **Balkan Venous Forum:** Yes
- **Iranian College:** Yes
- **Austrian Society:** Yes

NO:

- **AUS and NZ:** **When on line attendance and voting are available** , Proxy voting will not be needed and can be discontinued.
- **UIP Treasurer:** No. Need to encourage societies to have their representatives physically present. It doesn't need to be the President of the society. It could also be a member of the Board.(Except those with non-voting positions)
- **Benelux:** Preferentially not. This can be replaced by a hybrid meeting with online voting
- **American Venous Forum:** No

4.4. Should the General Council composition include members of the past ECs?

BACKGROUND

Members of the UIP Executive Committee serve the UIP in an unpaid position often sacrificing their spare time and other professional responsibilities. At the end of their term, their official responsibilities cease and unless they are invited to a general council meeting as the representative of a society, have no further input into the future of the UIP.

It has been proposed that past EC members could be invited to join the General Council meetings to continue to contribute to how the UIP functions in the future.

ISSUES

- Should the General Council composition include members of the past ECs?
- If yes, would this be for life or just for the immediate term following their term?
- Would they have any voting rights or only be invited as an observer?

On the one hand, EC members can continue to contribute to the future of the UIP, and EC members are rewarded for their service to the UIP by recognition in the General Council. Past EC members retain “Institutional Memory” that allows future General Councils to understand why decisions were made in the past.

However, the inclusion of past EC members may mean that the UIP remains stuck addressing issues from past Executive Committees and fails to move

forward with new ideas. Discussion time becomes limited for societies following the inclusion of more members to the general council as the General Council could potentially have more than 200 attendees. The ability to prevent disruptive members from attending future GC meetings is limited if their contribution is “for life”.

The UIP welcomes any suggestions or alternatives that the General Council feels can address this issue.

4.4. Should the General Council composition include members of the past ECs?

MEMBER FEEDBACK

YES:

- **Ecuadorian Society:** They may be invited as observers and for a period close to the term of office they left Ecs
- **Balkan Venous Forum:** Ans: Yes, just for the immediate term following their term with voting rights
- **Iranian College:** Yes

NO:

- **AUS and NZ:** No Bigger than the UN Don't do it. Members must know when to get off the stage.
- **UIP Treasurer:** No. I think this could increase the size of the general council too much. The UIP may need to rent a football stadium.
- **Benelux:** No
- **German Society:** Past EC Members are represented in the person of the "Past President" – which then is a member of GC as emeritus president. Anyway, any past president or past EC member can be sent by his country as a representative of his country.
- **American Venous Forum:** No

4.5. Should the General Council composition include “Members of Honour”?

BACKGROUND

In the interest in reviewing the structure of all those attending the General Council, the UIP would appreciate the feedback of its societies about whether the Members of Honour should continue to attend General Council Meetings.

The UIP constitution currently recognises Members of Honour which recognises individuals who have contributed greatly to the field of Phlebology and the UIP. They are invited to attend the UIP General Council meetings, with no voting rights.

The list of Members of Honour are found in Article 7 of the Internal Regulations of the UIP. This also means that the General Council does not approve the list of Members of Honour and can be changed at any time by the UIP Executive, without the approval of the General Council.

ISSUES

- Should the General Council composition include “Members of Honour”?
- If Members of Honour continue to be recognised, what role should the General Council have in the appointment of members?
- Would they have any voting rights or only be invited as an observer?

On the one hand, Members of Honour can continue to contribute to the future of the UIP. Members of Honour are rewarded for their service to the UIP or to Phlebology by recognition in the General Council. Eminent Phlebologists can contribute to the functioning of the UIP even after their service to the UIP and to the field have ended.

However, a failure to invite experienced and notable Phlebologists and to take into account their unique insights and perspectives may have negative impacts for the General Council.

The UIP welcomes any suggestions or alternatives that the General Council feels can address this issue.

4.5. Should the General Council composition include “Members of Honour”?

MEMBER FEEDBACK

YES:

- **Benelux:** Yes, especially ex-presidents of the GC. That function should be supportive, consultative without voting rights.
- **German Society:** Members of Honour can be invited to the GC as observers. No vote.
- **Ecuadorian Society:** Only as observers.
- **Balkan Venous Forum:** Yes. But no voting rights
- **Iranian College:** Yes
- **Austrian Society:** Yes, only observer
- **UIP Treasurer:** Yes

NO:

- **AUS and NZ:** No They are honored for past service , but not relevant for future decisions. Do not include
- **American Venous Forum:** No

4.6. Should the General Council composition include past Presidents?

BACKGROUND

In the interest in reviewing the structure of all those attending the General Council, the UIP would appreciate the feedback of its societies about whether the Past Presidents should continue to attend General Council Meetings.

The UIP Past Presidents are invited to General Council meetings as a recognition of their dedication and hard work for the UIP. Past Presidents have served the UIP as the President-Elect, President and Immediate Past President over which time they have served the UIP for 8 years. Many may also have previously been on the UIP Executive Committee before this. These positions are unpaid and often require sacrificing their spare time and other professional responsibilities.

Furthermore, UIP Past Presidents retain “Institutional Memory” that allows future General Councils to understand the history of the UIP and why certain decisions and directions were undertaken by the UIP in the past. They also have an understanding about the inner workings of the UIP, its strengths and weaknesses and are in a unique position to advise and guide the General Council about the feasibility of its plans and future directions.

They currently attend the General Council meeting with no voting rights.

ISSUES

- Should the General Council composition include past Presidents?
- Should Past Presidents have voting rights?

On the one hand, continuing to invite Past Presidents to the General Council allows the UIP to benefit from the experience of Past Presidents by retaining institutional memory. Past Presidents can continue to contribute to the future of the UIP. Past Presidents are rewarded for their service to the UIP by recognition in the General Council.

However, the inclusion of Past Presidents may mean that the UIP remains stuck addressing issues from the past and fails to move forward with new ideas. The ability to prevent disruptive members from attending future GC meetings is limited if their contribution is “for life”

The UIP welcomes any suggestions or alternatives that the General Council feels can address this issue.

4.6. Should the General Council composition include past Presidents?

MEMBER FEEDBACK

YES:

- **Benelux:** Yes, with voting rights; But only if the past-presidents themselves are asking for it. An ex-president may also choose not to do so
- **German Society:** The “past President” (the one who just left to be) is a member of the GC, as he is a member of the EC? Past-Past presidents are invited as observers (4.5.) – or perhaps I got this wrong.
- **Iranian College:** Yes
- **UIP Treasurer:** Yes, but I don't think they should have voting rights
- **Ecuadorian Society:** They must be invited as consultants for **a maximum of two consecutive terms.**
- **Balkan Venous Forum:** Yes, **just for the immediate term following their term** with voting rights
- **Austrian Society:** Yes. No voting rights
- **AUS and NZ Society:** Only the immediate past president **for the 2 years following his presidency.**

NO:

- **American Venous Forum:** No

Topic 5 General Council Voting Procedures



BACKGROUND

The fifth topic discussed in this paper is the General Council Voting Procedures. This includes questions regarding the fairness of current voting allocations and the secrecy of votes.

The main articles from the current UIP Constitution that govern this issue include: **Articles 16 and 17** which explain in detail the current debating and voting procedures.

These particular issues require an analysis of the current voting measures and allocations. This will allow for a more just approach to voting, as well as consider what different societies believe is the most fair way to vote. An examination of whether voting should be by secret or open ballot will allow for everyone to consider whether this represents the current values of the UIP and therefore lead to a more inclusive approach to voting.

Overall, to amend these sections of the constitution, it is necessary to understand that the needs and values of the UIP may have changed, and the current General Council voting procedures may not represent the principles by which the UIP currently operates.

Article 16

The General Council discusses and votes on the items on the agenda drawn up by the General Secretary with the President.

Every 4 years the General Council elects the next President (the President Elect) and the members of the Executive Committee by secret ballot.

The General Council discusses and votes on the candidatures of Society Members, Associate Members and other members.

The General Council elects Honorary Members.

The General Council votes on the locations and dates of the official Congresses of the UIP.

The General Council votes on the amount of membership fees based on the recommendation of the Treasurer and Executive Committee.

Article 17

Debating and voting procedures:

7. All the members of the General Council can take part in the debates, but only the following are entitled to vote on the Council:

The President or his/her duly authorized representative of each of the Member Societies, which are up-to-date with their membership fees, on the following bases:

- Countries with one member society: 2 votes per society
- Maximum of two votes per country: countries with more than one society: one vote belongs to the first Society accepted in the UIP; the second vote belongs to the other new Society/Societies.
- Societies representing a group of countries in which no other member society of the UIP exists: 2 votes
- Societies representing a group of countries in which other member society(ies) of the UIP exists: 1 vote
- International societies representing a continent or sub-continent: 1 vote
- Multinational or regional societies: 1 vote
- The members of the Executive Committee except the President (present, past or elect): 1 vote each.

Voting by proxy is accepted within the limit of one proxy per person. .

8. The only circumstance under which the President of the UIP votes is when a deciding vote is required.
9. The Past President and the President Elect do not vote under any circumstance.

10. At least half the members of the General Council with the right to vote, or their duly authorized representatives, must be present in order for the proceedings to be valid [exceptions- see Article 17.6 and also Article 33].
11. The General Council's decisions will be taken on an absolute majority, defined as more than half of the votes cast; failing a decision, further voting will take place and the decision taken on a relative majority, defined as the largest number of votes cast [exceptions – see Article 17.6 and also Article 33].
12. The status of Society Member, Associate Member, or Honorary Member is acquired by a vote on a relative majority of the General Council Members present or represented.

Appropriate decorum and adherence to rules of order will be maintained by the President during General Council meetings.

5.1. Should voting in the GC meetings be by secret ballot or open?

BACKGROUND

The UIP Constitution specifies that the Election of President and Executive Committee members is by secret ballot (Article 16) and does not specify how other votes should be conducted. All recent General Council votes have therefore been conducted by secret ballot.

As part of the review of voting procedures, the UIP is seeking feedback about whether voting should be open (not anonymous) or remain secret (anonymous).

As the majority of votes in the General Council are cast on behalf of a society, it has been suggested that voting is open (not anonymous) so that societies can be assured that the person representing their society has voted along with the wishes of their society. Open voting is a feature of most governments and parliaments around the world, where those who are elected into government are accountable for the decisions they make on behalf of their constituents.

Secret ballots are also important for many democracies. The secret nature of voting allows individuals to cast a vote free from interference and bias from others and without repercussion.

ISSUES

- Should voting in the GC meetings be by secret ballot or open?
- If voting is to remain secret, how does the UIP ensure that anonymity is retained, whilst still remaining auditable to ensure that voting has been conducted correctly?

On the one hand, the positive aspects of conducting a Secret Ballot include; The secret nature of voting allows individuals to cast a vote free from interference and bias from others and without repercussion. A smaller society may fear the outcome of voting against the wishes of a larger or more powerful society or person.

However, the positive aspects of an Open Ballot include;

- increased transparency of members with their own society by demonstrating they have voted according to the wishes of the society.
- Decisions are made solely based on the wishes of the society and not by the personal motivations of the individual in the meeting.
- Personal relationship issues can be avoided, as the representative can state that they are simply representing the wishes of their society, without personal motivation.
- Greater accountability for decisions made by societies.

5.1. Should voting in the GC meetings be by secret ballot or open?

- Less complex voting software required as the system does not have to guarantee anonymity and may come at a lower cost to the UIP.
- Members can ensure that their vote has been counted as per their wishes.

On the other hand, the negative aspects of conducting a Secret Ballot include;

- possible personal corruption/favoritism: An attendee may vote against the direction of their own society.
- Decreased accountability for societies that block decisions or hide their true motives.
- The potential for political maneuvering by hidden voting blocks. More elaborate online voting software is required to guarantee anonymity with potential higher costs to the UIP.
- More complicated procedures and more elaborate rights verification required for the UIP to guarantee anonymity.
- More complex auditing and the need to trust the software and the administrators.

However, the negative aspect of an open ballot is that a smaller society may fear the outcome of voting against the wishes of a larger or more powerful society or person and may be forced to vote against their own interests.

Furthermore, there is no mention of a need for anonymous voting, apart from the EC election, in the current constitution.

5.1. Should voting in the GC meetings be by secret ballot or open?

MEMBER FEEDBACK

SECRET:

- **Balkan Venous Forum:** yes, by secret ballot
- **Benelux:** secret ballot
- **Iranian College:** secret ballot
- **UIP Treasurer:** should remain secret
- **Ecuadorian Society:** voting must be anonymous and secret
- **AUS and NZ:** it has always been secret ballot and I think it should remain thus
- **German Society:** Regularly, votes are open, as Delegates have to represent the interests of their country. But, as a basic democratic instrument, some votes have to be given secretly. On request, secret vote has to be possible. At least for the present delegates, where the correctness of voting is given by the number of present delegates and the number of votes given. If enabling secret voting for online votings is technically very difficult, it could be enabled to vote as secretly as possible online and making rules for whom will be able to have a look at the electronic polls and this person (or these two persons) are only allowed to check if everything was ok (number of votes equals number of voting persons), but is not allowed to comment on the origin and the record of the voting is then immediately erased, like the papers of the secret voting are deleted after voting was accepted.

OPEN:

- **Austrian Society:** open
- **American Venous Forum:** open

5. Topic 5- General Council Voting Procedures

5.2. Voting allocation: Is the current system of 2 votes per country fair?

BACKGROUND

According to the constitution, voting in the general council is assigned as follows

- Countries with one member society: 2 votes per society
- Maximum of two votes per country: countries with more than one society: one vote belongs to the first Society accepted in the UIP; the second vote belongs to the other new Society/Societies.
- Societies representing a group of countries in which no other member society of the UIP exists: 2 votes
- Societies representing a group of countries in which other member society(ies) of the UIP exists: 1 vote
- International societies representing a continent or subcontinent: 1 vote
- Multinational or regional societies: 1 vote
- The members of the Executive Committee except the President (present, past or elect): 1 vote each.

The UIP is interested in feedback from member societies about whether the voting system should be changed.

ISSUES

- Is the current system of 2 votes per country fair?
- What other system(s) are acceptable to all societies?
 - Retaining the current system
 - Votes allocated per society
 - Votes allocated per country
 - Votes allocated based on the size of the society (membership numbers)
- In determining voting rights, UIP should consider whether it is appropriate to have different classes of membership. Each class may have different rights (including voting rights), obligations (including fees) and restrictions. For example, honorary members may not have to pay fees, but will not have voting rights. International society members may have more voting rights but pay a higher membership fee.
- The UIP may wish to consider allocating vote numbers per country and then tying that to the membership. For example the UIP may allow state / city based society members, but there might be a limit of half a dozen such memberships per Country. State / city based members may have fewer votes than a national society member, which may have fewer votes again than an international society member. In determining which society is the “national member” for any country, the UIP may take into account membership numbers of each society

5.2. Voting allocation: Is the current system of 2 votes per country fair?

and any other factors which may be considered relevant.

On the one hand, the advantage of keeping the current system is that all countries are given the same recognition by the UIP regardless of their size.

However, the negative aspects of keeping the current system include complexity and perception of unfairness by the larger member societies. Member societies pay equal membership fees, despite having different numbers of votes. Larger societies with many members are given the same voting power as smaller societies with very few members.

In addition, the current voting allocation is an extremely complex system and is difficult for the UIP to manage. This also adds complexity for any future move towards online voting, with voting systems required to allow for split/shared votes.

5.3. Voting allocation: Is the current system of 1 vote for the first member society from the member country and sharing of the vote with any other member societies from that country fair?

BACKGROUND

According to the constitution, voting in the general council is assigned as follows

- Countries with one member society: 2 votes per society
- Maximum of two votes per country: countries with more than one society: one vote belongs to the first Society accepted in the UIP; the second vote belongs to the other new Society/Societies.
- Societies representing a group of countries in which no other member society of the UIP exists: 2 votes
- Societies representing a group of countries in which other member society(ies) of the UIP exists: 1 vote
- International societies representing a continent or subcontinent: 1 vote
- Multinational or regional societies: 1 vote
- The members of the Executive Committee except the President (present, past or elect): 1 vote each.

The UIP is interested in feedback from member societies about whether the voting system should be changed.

ISSUES

- Is the current system of 1 vote for the first member society from the member country and sharing of the vote with any other member societies from that country fair?
- What other system(s) are acceptable to all societies?
- Retaining the current system
- Votes allocated per society
- Votes allocated per country
- Votes allocated based on the size of the society
- Other systems?

On the one hand, the positive aspects of keeping the current system include;

- Societies who have been in the UIP for decades are recognised by retaining at least one vote when one or more other societies from their country enter the UIP.
- Competing societies in one country are required to come to a consensus on voting issues.
- This however, may also be a “con” as this may lead to tension between societies.
- This system discourages the formation of “empty box” societies that may attempt to join the UIP solely to obtain more votes in the general council.

On the other hand, the negative aspects of keeping the current system include;

5.3. Voting allocation: Is the current system of 1 vote for the first member society from the member country and sharing of the vote with any other member societies from that country fair?

- Complexity. This is an extremely complex system and can be difficult for the UIP to manage. This also adds complexity for any future move towards online voting, with voting systems required to allow for split/shared votes.
- Member societies pay equal membership fees, despite having different numbers of votes.
- Competing societies from one country are required to share votes, causing conflict should they both wish to vote differently

The UIP welcomes any suggestions or alternatives that the General Council feels can address this issue. An alternative could be 1 vote can be allocated to the society with the largest number of members (validation necessary), and the 2nd vote to the remaining societies

5. Topic 5- General Council Voting Procedures

5.4. Should there be 1 vote per member society but raise the membership bar and limit the maximum number of members from a country?

BACKGROUND

Given the complexity of the current system for the allocation of votes in the UIP General Council, a potential new system could be that 1 vote is allocated per society and limit the number of members from a country with full membership, by raising the membership bar so that only societies that represent their country/region as whole have voting rights.

This may be a simpler system when it comes to allocation of voting, but would require stricter requirements for full membership of the UIP.

ISSUES

- Should there be 1 vote per member society but raise the membership bar and limit the maximum number of members from a country?
- What happens to those societies already with full membership of the UIP?

On the one hand, this may be a simpler voting system.

However, societies that have contributed to the UIP for many years would lose some of their current voting power. This may require UIP societies to justify their role and create conflict between societies.

The UIP welcomes any suggestions or alternatives that the General Council feels can address this issue.

Topic 6 Membership of the UIP



BACKGROUND

The sixth topic discussed in this paper is the Membership of the UIP. This includes questions regarding the benchmark components for membership, the registration of societies, requirements for societies, and proposed limits to memberships.

The main articles from the current UIP Constitution that govern this issue include:

Article 3 describes who the UIP is made up of.

Article 4 describes Society Members.

Article 5 describes other members.

Article 6 describes who the Honorary Members are made up of.

Article 8 explains how a Society or Association must apply to join the UIP.

These particular issues require an analysis into the current requirements for membership of the UIP, as well as a hypothetical perspective into what could possibly become the requirements for membership into the UIP. Analyzing the registration requirements for memberships as well as possibly the sort of proof that will be necessary for the maintenance of a full membership is required to gain a stronger collective notion into who we view as worthy of membership of the UIP.

Overall, an updated look into the requirements for membership of the UIP will be beneficial to acquiring a fresher understanding of what we, as an international union, merit the most. This means that future societies wanting to join the UIP will have to meet requirements more in line with the standards of the current UIP.

Article 3

The UIP is composed of Society Members, Associate Members, Individual Members, Industry Members, Honorary Members and Emeritus Presidents.

Article 4

Society Members are:

- a) National Phlebology Societies or Associations
- b) Or failing this, the national Society or Association where phlebology is not the main activity, but which has a dedicated phlebology interest group or section concerned with venous disorders
- c) International, multinational and regional societies or associations with activity as described in b) above.

Article 5

Other Members

a. Associate Members

Societies that have not met the membership pre-requisites. This is a transitional status until the Society achieves the minimum pre-requisites (See Appendix). These Societies pay annual fees as determined by the Executive Committee and reviewed from time to time, and may attend the Council Meeting, but will not have voting rights.

b. Individual Members

These are individual members who will pay an annual fee as determined by the Executive Committee and reviewed from time to time. Such members will have no voting rights and cannot attend the Council Meeting.

c. Industry members

While member societies of the UIP are not-for-profit organizations, any other entity that operates for profit can apply for membership of the UIP as an "Industry Member."

Such "Industry Members" will have no voting rights and cannot attend the Council Meetings. The membership fee will be decided by the Executive Committee from time to time.

Article 6

Honorary Members composed of:

1. Presidents of international societies affiliated with the UIP for the duration of their term;

2. Individuals included in the former categories “Honorary Members” and “Committee of Honor”.
3. Individuals proposed and approved by a vote during a General Council meeting.

Honorary Members can attend the Council Meeting as an observer but will have no voting rights.

Article 8

A Society or Association wishing to join the UIP must make a formal application which will be considered at the following Meeting of the General Council (Article 17). (For Guidelines on Membership Application see Appendix). Any request for Associate Membership must be drawn up by the applicant and must be sponsored by at least two members of the Executive Committee.

6.1. What should be the benchmark phlebology component of the member society activities? Should it be predominantly phlebology or a percentage (currently 50% venous)?

BACKGROUND

In order to be accepted into the UIP as a member society, applicants need to demonstrate that their society is predominantly interested in Phlebology.

This is currently measured by their activities being dedicated to greater than or equal to 50% venous topics, commonly assessed by their scientific programs of their recent meetings and congresses. This is an arbitrary measure of the activities of a society, as a society's activities are not limited to their congresses and meetings, but on other activities such as education and training, research output and advocacy.

In addition, can a society's activities be calculated as a percentage? For example, a society may conduct regular meetings with a venous component/stream, but also have an arterial stream and a lymphatic stream. This may mean their scientific output is only 33% venous, rendering them ineligible to join the UIP as a full member.

Finally, could the UIP be allowed to grow by relaxing the entry criteria, or should ineligible societies be encouraged to join the UIP as associate members.

ISSUES

- What should be the benchmark phlebology component of the member society activities? Should it be predominantly phlebology or a percentage (currently 50% venous)?
- How will the percentage of "venous" benchmark be measured?
- For example, based upon the objectives of the member society?
- Given the multidisciplinary nature of Phlebology and the expansion of Phlebology to include areas such as Lymphology, should the UIP change the requirements of its member societies.
- What other activities for societies warrant inclusion in the UIP as a full member
- Should entry criteria be relaxed or tightened, allowing the UIP to grow by accepting more societies, or should ineligible societies be encouraged to join the UIP as an associate member?

On the one hand, the UIP ensures that the societies meet a bench mark requirement for activity.

However, there may be no truly accurate ways of measuring the phlebology component of a society. A society may also organise arterial meetings, and this may mean their Phlebology component becomes less than 50%, despite being an active Phlebology society in their region.

6.1. What should be the benchmark phlebology component of the member society activities? Should it be predominantly phlebology or a percentage (currently 50% venous)?

MEMBER FEEDBACK

PREDOMINANTLY PHLEBOLOGY

- **Austrian Society:** What should be the benchmark phlebology component of the member society activities? Should it be predominantly phlebology or a percentage (currently 50% venous)? **AGREED**. How will the percentage of “venous” benchmark be measured? **DIFFICULT QUESTION**. What other activities for societies warrant inclusion in the UIP as a full member? **LYMPHOLOGY**. Should entry criteria be relaxed or tightened, allowing the UIP to grow by accepting more societies, or should ineligible societies be encouraged to join the UIP as an associate member? **BE RELAXED**
- **AUS and NZ:** Very commonly the vascular surgical society of the country represents that country’s venous interests. No I do not think there should be a minimum limit

A PERCENTAGE

- **Balkan Venous Forum:** 50% venous
- **Ecuadorian Society:** you should perform at least 50% of venous activities
- **American Venous Forum:** continue with 50%
- **Benelux:** agree with minimal 50%
- **Iranian College:** percentage (50%)

DOES NOT HAVE TO BE PREDOMINANTLY PHLEBOLOGY

- **German Society:** What would be the disadvantage of having societies as members that only have 10% of Phlebology engagement? They have interest in participating, they pay a fee... Apart from the problem with the votes per country, which we should indeed solve, this brings enrichment to UIP – because they have other “border to phlebology” interests that could enrich us...?
- **UIP Treasurer:** I would prefer not to use a number as this is always going to be an estimate anyway. I would just recommend the term "A significant interest in phlebology, and/or lymphology."

6.2. Should formal registration of societies in their respective countries be mandatory for full membership of the UIP?

BACKGROUND

The UIP is a formally registered society and accepts membership from around the world. The UIP has never previously requested confirmation from member societies about their status and it is possible that some member societies do not have legal registration in their country.

ISSUES

- Should formal registration of societies in their respective countries be mandatory for full membership of the UIP?
- What happens to societies that are not formally registered in their country? Will they be required to become fully registered and what timeframe will they be given to achieve this?

The UIP welcomes any suggestions or alternatives that the General Council feels can address this issue.

6.3. Should proof of ongoing organisational activity be mandatory for maintaining full membership of the UIP?

BACKGROUND

The UIP has defined criteria for admitting societies to join the UIP based on their activity, however the constitution does not allow for the UIP to ensure that its member societies remain active.

It is therefore possible that a society could have little to no activity, no longer represents their members and therefore takes voting rights away from other active societies in their region.

ISSUES

- Should proof of ongoing organisational activity be mandatory for maintaining full membership of the UIP?
 - Example of ongoing activity could be non attendance at GC meeting without consent of EC
 - Evidence of society registration within the societies' country
 - Obligation to notify the UIP of any change in the societies' objectives
- How frequently should the UIP request this information?
- What should happen to the membership status of societies that are inactive?

On the one hand, less strict membership rules advantages include:

- Support for societies in economic difficulty. Nevertheless, UIP is already offering discounted rates for tier 2 and 3 countries.
- More inclusive UIP.
- More detailed reporting advantages: proper stats.

However, less strict membership rules disadvantages include:

- voting rights despite lack of proper duty accomplishment
- risk of UIP brand inappropriate use,
- more detailed reporting disadvantages: not a disadvantage, rather a difficulty in identifying a proper way to assess the objective measures of quality.

6.4. Should the UIP accept individual members? If yes, what should be the minimum qualification for an applicant?

BACKGROUND

The UIP constitution currently allows for individuals to join the UIP as an Individual member.

These members pay an annual fee, but do have voting rights in the general council. They can receive membership benefits such as access to the UIP website and the UIP official journal Phlebology.

This scheme however may hinder the activities of local societies, with individuals being able to join the UIP without having first joined the society in their country. This scheme does however help those individuals who do not have a dedicated Phlebology society in their country.

Finally, the UIP cannot always easily verify the qualifications of applicants or that the applicant has a good reputation in their country. This may have implications for the UIP, should an individual promote their UIP membership status to their patients, whilst having little to no recognition by their country's society.

ISSUES

- Should the UIP continue to allow Individual Members to join the UIP?
- What level of qualification should the UIP accept for its Individual Members?
- How does the UIP verify the qualifications of individuals?
- Should the UIP accept individual members even if they are not already members of a UIP society of their nation or continent, in case of a non-national organization?

On the one hand, the positive aspects of retaining Individual Members include;

- The UIP remains an inclusive body, allowing membership from all those interested in joining.
- Individuals in countries that do not currently have a dedicated Phlebology society have access to the resources of the UIP.
- The UIP is in a stronger financial position due to increased revenue from membership fees.

However, the negative aspects of retaining individual members include;

- The UIP risks competing with its member societies for members.
- The UIP places itself in a situation where it accepts membership from an individual who is not in good standing in their country and that this membership status is used to advertise to patients.

6.4. Should the UIP accept individual members? If yes, what should be the minimum qualification for an applicant?

MEMBER FEEDBACK

YES

- **Ecuadorian Society:** Must be individual members, those who demonstrate with a certificate through a local medical association that is a proven professional, or who are active for more than 3 years in vascular diseases, present certificates of refresher courses for 3 years and that is active as a physician
- **Balkan Venous Forum:** Yes The UIP should allow for individuals to join the UIP as an Individual member.
- **Iranian College:** Yes, the minimum qualification for an applicant would be his academic or professional reputation in the region
- **American Venous Forum:** Yes

NO

- **AUS and NZ:** No. The UIP remains a society of venous organizations
- **Benelux:** No
- **German Society:** I feel like no individual membership. If a person is involved in phlebology and his country has no society, very often neighbor countries have and the person might join in. How many individual members do we have and where are they from? From countries not organized in UIP? Or are they from countries with membership societies? Perhaps we should admit only individual application from persons coming from countries or regions (South-Africa) without any representation in the UIP? And make the admission only for 5 years inviting the person to found a society in his country in the meantime?

6.5. Should the UIP limit its membership to “national” societies? If yes, should it not accept applications from non-national, city-based societies?

BACKGROUND

The UIP has member societies that represent cities, countries, multiple countries, continents, multiple continents and the entire world.

The UIP is asking for feedback from its members about whether the UIP should continue to accept applications from societies that represent cities and not their whole country or multiple countries.

ISSUES

- Should the UIP limit its membership to “national” societies?
- If yes, should it not accept applications from non-national, city-based societies?

On the one hand, the positive aspect of limiting membership to national societies is that there is less risk of the proliferation of societies in UIP with very few members that do not represent the interests of their country.

On the other hand, the UIP reduces its reach to societies, and ends up limiting its educational and networking opportunities to whatever society is interested. Can the UIP be assured that it can decide whether a society represents a nation, or just a city? Would a society be required to provide membership lists and would one member outside of a city be enough to prove the society represents more than one city. All societies can no longer access benefits of UIP membership, independently by local disagreement among the different groups. Risk of not fulfilling the one of the aims of the UIP being the “strengthening the link between the societies”.

The UIP welcomes any suggestions or alternatives that the General Council feels can address this issue.

6.5. Should the UIP limit its membership to “national” societies? If yes, should it not accept applications from non-national, city-based societies?

MEMBER FEEDBACK

YES

- **Ecuadorian Society:** they should be national societies
- **Benelux:** yes, see above 5.2 and 5.3
- **American Venous Forum:** yes

NO

- **AUS and NZ:** As long as the 2 votes per country rule is in place regional societies are catered for and accepting them helps encourage participation.
- **German Society:** This is an historical problem and a future issue. City societies sometimes are very strong – and cannot be expelled from UIP without great damage to our image. But also here, I would close the candidature for city societies starting 2022. Perhaps in countries with great e.g. political or historical disbalance between north / south or east and west, two societies or regional societies might be accepted, but not on a general basis. The acceptance of a “regional” society should be presented and discussed when applying.

Topic 7 Congresses and Events



BACKGROUND

The seventh topic discussed in this paper is the Congresses and Events. This includes questions regarding current and possible UIP meetings and workshops.

The main articles from the current UIP Constitution that govern this issue include:

Articles 14, 15 and 16 govern the current Council Meetings.

These particular issues require an analysis of the benefits and challenges that the current UIP meetings frequency poses on the UIP, and whether changing this will be favourable to the UIP. The proposal of hands on workshops can also help to determine what is the best way to encourage the UIP

Overall, to amend these sections of the constitution, it is necessary to scrutinize the present-day proceedings by which the UIP meets, and to analyze how best to utilize the congresses and events to meet the aims, values and needs of a contemporary UIP.

Article 14

The President presents his/her report to the Congress at the General Council Meeting of the UIP and invites comments. In his/her report, the President must give an account of his/her activities and those of the Executive Committee. He/She must announce the names of any new members and inform the General Council of any proposed changes in the Constitution or of the dissolution of the Union.

Article 15

A meeting of the General Council is held at each Chapter meeting and World Congress of the UIP. A meeting of the General Council can also be called by the President or at the request of one quarter of its members.

Article 16

The General Council discusses and votes on the items on the agenda drawn up by the General Secretary with the President.

Every 4 years the General Council elects the next President (the President Elect) and the members of the Executive Committee by secret ballot.

The General Council discusses and votes on the candidatures of Society Members, Associate Members and other members.

The General Council elects Honorary Members.

The General Council votes on the locations and dates of the official Congresses of the UIP.

The General Council votes on the amount of membership fees based on the recommendation of the Treasurer and Executive Committee.

7.1. Should the frequency of the UIP World Congress remain at every 2 years or should it be held on an annual basis?

BACKGROUND

The UIP conducts its World Congress every 2 years, having previously conducted its World Congress every 4 years and a chapter meeting in the 2 year period in between. Since 2013, UIP meetings have been held in the following years.

2013 Boston, USA (World Congress)
2015 Seoul, Korea (Chapter Meeting)
2016 Rome, Italy (Chapter Meeting)
2018 Melbourne, Australia (World Congress)
2019 Karkow, Poland (Chapter Meeting)
2021 Istanbul, Turkey (World Congress), rescheduled to 2022.
2023 Miami, USA (World Congress)
2025 Venue TBA (World Congress)

The UIP is interested in feedback from its members about whether it should conduct its congresses on an Annual Basis. This would allow the UIP to establish a regular meeting, with delegates expecting to attend an UIP sponsored event every year. The scientific programs would be more relevant for delegates, allowing for the most recent information to be presented, rather than information from the previous 2 years.

Other, similar societies, such as the International Society of Thrombosis and Haemostasis (ISTH), who previously held congresses every 2 years, now conduct their congress annually, typically in July. Delegates expect that each July, they will travel to the next event. By not hosting an annual meeting, the UIP loses potential delegates who elect to attend other meetings that are held more frequently. It further loses the ability to drive other projects, such as

consensus meetings, through infrequent meetings.

This would make attracting sponsorship easier, as a number of major exhibitors prepare their budgets annually. When a meeting is not conducted in one year, sponsorship is typically distributed to other meetings and may be lost for future meetings.

ISSUES

- Should the frequency of the UIP World Congress remain at every 2 years or should it be held on an annual basis?

On one hand, the UIP establishes regular meetings that provide only the most recent and up to date scientific information, rather than updates from the previous 2 years. Increased delegate numbers and sponsorship as attendees become used to attending a UIP event annually. More member societies are able to be the local hosts of UIP meetings. Increased frequency of consensus project meetings, UIP Committee meetings (Education, Science etc.), face-to-face General Council Meetings; increased income for the UIP.

On the other hand, this could cause Increased competition with member societies and their congresses.

Possible alternatives (discussed below in 7.2 and 7.3) are conducting Regional (Chapter) meetings or Hand-on workshops.

7.1. Should the frequency of the UIP World Congress remain at every 2 years or should it be held on an annual basis?

MEMBER FEEDBACK

EVERY 2 YEARS

- **Ecuadorian Society:** Must be individual members, those who demonstrate with a certificate through a local medical association that is a proven professional, or who are active for more than 3 years in vascular diseases, present certificates of refresher courses for 3 years and that are active as a physician.
- **Balkan Venous Forum:** every 2 years
- **Benelux:** every 2 years is okay
- **Austrian Society:** 2 years
- **AUS and NZ:** every 2 years is fine. We are over conferenced as it is
- **American Venous Forum:** remain 2 years
- **Iranian College:** This 2-yearly schedule should be maintained and the member societies should be allowed to hold their own congresses, so as not to saturate the number of meetings with national or regional congresses.
- **German Society:** We had world congresses every 4 years and chapter meetings in between. Reducing to 2 years and chapter meetings in between would be enough – there are too many meetings and in my eyes, we do not invent phlebology yearly, there is not so much new information to share. Guidelines can be conducted online, even though personal meetings are much preferable for these issues.

ANNUALLY

- No responses

7.2. Should a regional (previously 'Chapter') meeting be held in the odd years?

BACKGROUND

In addition to conducting a World Congress, the UIP welcomes feedback about whether it should conduct regional meetings (previously known as Chapter Meetings). These would be held in the alternate years to its congresses and would rotate around the world.

The UIP previously held Chapter meetings every 4 years and alternated with World Congresses. These meetings slowly evolved into small World Congresses and were no longer considered regional meetings.

These meetings are a chance for all UIP societies in a region to come together at a regular UIP organised event.

ISSUES

- Should a regional (previously 'Chapter') meeting be held in the odd years?

On the one hand, regional meetings would allow societies from the same continent to come together regularly in a UIP conducted event. Smaller societies that would typically not want to host a World Congress could be the local hosts for a regional meeting. Increased exposure for the UIP in regional areas, with the UIP supporting the local activities of its societies. Increased income for the UIP from conducting more frequent meetings.

On the other hand, increased numbers of conferences may compete with the activities of member societies and their regular meetings.

The UIP welcomes any suggestions or alternatives that the General Council feels can address this issue.

7.2. Should a regional (previously 'Chapter') meeting be held in the odd years?

MEMBER FEEDBACK

YES

- **Ecuadorian Society:** The UIP would be competing with industry sponsorship, when we have to hold national and regional congresses, since it would not contribute economically to carry out such events.
- **German Society:** I am very much in favor of chapter meetings – and, why not – there could be simultaneous chapter meetings at different places of the world to avoid the trend to Little “UIP Meetings”
- **Iranian College:** Yes, it should be
- **AUS and NZ:** Chapter meetings in the 2 years between World Meetings
- **American Venous Forum:** Yes

NO

- **Benelux:** I propose to abandon this chapter meeting. However the organization of the UIP conferences should be well spread geographically so that every region is covered. A rotation can be made per region.
- **Austrian Society:** No
- **Balkan Venous Forum:** No

7.3. Should the UIP organise a hands-on workshop in different parts of the world in the odd years?

BACKGROUND

In addition to conducting a World Congress, the UIP welcomes feedback about whether it should conduct “Hands-on” workshops. These could be held in the alternate years to its congresses and would rotate around the world. These workshops could be held in conjunction with a regional Chapter meeting, or could operate independently of any regional Chapter meetings

These workshops would be conducted by international and local experts using a standardized curriculum to allow the training provided by each workshop to be consistent around the world.

The UIP would endeavour to ensure that its workshops supplement existing training programs, so it does not compete with the educational initiatives and events of its member societies.

The UIP could seek support to help fund this initiative through industry to minimise registration costs for attendees.

ISSUES

- Should the UIP organise a hands-on workshop in different parts of the world in the odd years?
- What should the process be for deciding on the location of these workshops?

On the one hand, the workshops would allow for hands-on training in regions that would not typically have access to international experts in the field. A standardised curriculum would allow for the same level of training to be given around the world, independent of its location.

However, the UIP would need to ensure that its workshops do not compete with established workshops and training programs.

The UIP welcomes any suggestions or alternatives that the General Council feels can address this issue.

7.3. Should the UIP organise a hands-on workshop in different parts of the world in the odd years?

MEMBER FEEDBACK

YES

- **Ecuadorian Society:** If resources are obtained from the UIP, it could be beneficial to have within a regional congress a practical and academic workshop according to international standards.
- **German Society:** Hands on workshops with experts from “rich” regions transported to poorer regions on behalf of UIP would be a wonderful alternative to chapter meetings
- **Iranian College:** Yes
- **Austrian Society:** Good idea
- **American Venous Forum:** Yes
- **AUS and NZ:** This type of hands on workshop will have to be decided and run by the Education committee and needs funds and manpower. It could make money for the UIP but there has to be enthusiasm from inside the UIP.

NO

- **Benelux:** No. This can be done by the member organizations themselves

Appendix A- Submissions and Feedback



Balkan Venous Forum | Dr Elena Goranova
Sofia, Bulgaria.
President of BVF.

Topic 1- Executive Committee Composition

1.1. Should the position of Assistant Secretary be maintained? **Ans: This position should be removed and replaced by another committee Chair, such as the Chair of Congresses.**

1.2. Should UIP introduce- in place of Assistant Secretary- the position of “Chair Congresses and Events”? **Ans: Yes**

1.3. Vice Presidents- should the name “Vice President” be changed to “Regional Representative”? **Ans: Regional Representative**

1.4. Vice Presidents- Should UIP introduce a new dedicated Vice President position for Africa? **Ans: Retain the current representation by Europe.**

1.5. Vice Presidents- Should UIP introduce a new dedicated Vice President position for Central America? **Ans: combine the representation of Central American member societies with that of North America**

1.6. Vice Presidents- Should VPs be elected by the entire GC or by their respective regions? **Ans: The Vice-Presidents Should be elected by their respective regions.**

- Do these regions need to be defined by the constitution? Ans, **Yes**

- How will these regions be defined? **Ans. based on continents and on the number of societies in the region**

Topic 2- Executive Committee Terms

2.1. Term of the current Executive Committee- to be terminated in 2021 or continue till 2022? **Ans: Current EC term extended until 2022 Istanbul meeting - 15th September 2022 .**

2.2. Should the term of the UIP President be synchronized with the UIP EC? **Ans: No change to any term and the current system remains**

2.3. Should the term of the Executive Committee be reduced to two years? **Ans: No change for the executive committee members and remains at four years.**

2.4. Should the EC be able to remove an elected member, if that member fails to contribute to the organisation, due to gross misconduct, or failing fiduciary duties? Ans: Does the UIP constitution need to address how an executive member can be removed? **YES**

- Can an executive member be removed for failing to fulfil their obligations? **YES**
- Can an executive member be removed for gross misconduct? **Yes**

2.5 Should the term of the President Elect and Past President roles also be reduced to 1 year? **Ans : YES** Duration of the Presidential term following election. ELECTION - President Elect 1 year; President 4 years; Immediate Past President 1 year. Emeritus President Perpetual;

Topic 3- Executive Committee Re-election

3.1. The President currently cannot be re-elected. Should this change? **Ans: Non, The President cannot be re-elected.**

3.2. The General Secretary currently can be re-elected. **Ans: can be re-elected**

3.3. The Treasurer currently can be re-elected. **Ans: can be re-elected.**

3.4. The Assistant Secretary currently can be re-elected. Should this change? **Ans: NO-Change - can be re-elected**

3.5. The Vice Presidents currently cannot be re-elected. Should this change? **Ans: NO**

3.6. The Chair of the Science Committee currently can be re-elected. Should this change? **Ans: NO-Change - can be re-elected**

3.7. The Chair of the Education Committee currently can be re-elected. Should this change? **Ans: NON-Change, can be re-elected**

Topic 4- General Council Membership

4.1. Can GC meetings occur online? **Ans: Yes. In cases during times where travel is limited**

4.2. Should a secure online voting be conducted during the GC meetings? **Ans: Yes, online voting.**

4.3. Should proxy voting be allowed? **Ans: Yes**

4.4. Should the General Council composition include members of the past ECs? **Ans: Yes, just for the immediate term following their term with voting rights**

4.5. Should the General Council composition include “Members of Honour”? **Ans: Yes. But no voting rights**

4.6. Should the General Council composition include past Presidents? **Ans: Yes, just for the immediate term following their term with voting rights**

Topic 5- General Council Voting Procedures

5.1. Should voting in the GC meetings be by secret ballot or open? **Ans: Yes. by secret ballot**

5.2. Voting allocation: Is the current system of 2 votes per country fair? **Ans: Yes. by secret ballot**

5.3. Voting allocation: Is the current system of 1 vote for the first member society from the member country and sharing of the vote with any other member societies from that country fair?

5.4. Should there be 1 vote per member society but raise the membership bar and limit the maximum number of members from a country? **ANS: 1 vote is allocated per society**

Topic 6- Membership of the UIP

6.1. What should be the benchmark phlebology component of the member society activities?
Ans: 50% venous,

6.2. Should formal registration of societies in their respective countries be mandatory for full membership of the UIP?

6.3. Should proof of ongoing organizational activity be mandatory for maintaining full membership of the UIP?

6.4. Should the UIP continue to allow Individual Members to join the UIP? **ANS : Yes The UIP should allow for individuals to join the UIP as an Individual member.**

6.5. Should the UIP limit its membership to “national” societies? If yes, should it not accept applications from non-national, city-based societies?

7.1. Should the frequency of the UIP World Congress remain at every 2years or should it be held on an annual basis? **Ans : every 2years**

7.2. Should a regional (previously ‘Chapter’) meeting be held in the odd years? **Ans: No**

German Society of Phlebology | Erika Mendoza

Comments on UIP Constitution Changes

1.1. I am not as involved as to comprehend, if the assistant secretary is necessary or not, but if you feel like it, I am ok with the change to a new “Chair of Congresses and Events”

1.2. See 1.1.

1.3. I understand perfectly the point with the regional representatives and feel like this is a better denomination than the Vice President. Board member is perfect, too, thus I think, you could denominate them Board member.

1.4. If we start introducing new Vice Presidents this will be a conflict of where this ends... Perhaps we should think about “Board Member” for underrepresented regions with the aim to encourage these regions to grow into UIP.

1.5. I am prone to option 4 – if the region is ok with that

1.6. This is a difficult topic. Regions should be well defined to avoid further problems.

1.6.1. North America

1.6.2. Central and South America

1.6.3. Europe

1.6.4. Australia / Asia

1.6.5. “White spots” like Africa and Middle East / Oceania (as however to be organized). The number of representatives should be following the number of societies / represented members...

2.1. The Term should end in Istanbul, given the COVID Situation there is no choice

2.2. Even though it means adapting to different teams, the “continuity” of contents is better achieved if President and EC do not start and end simultaneously.

2.3. Two years is too short in my eyes to get introduced to the topics. 4 years with all the inconveniences are ok in my eyes.

2.4. Hoping this will not happen, it is necessary to have regulations for failing members. We had this problem in Germany with a Congress President that was incriminated for raping test persons during anaesthesia... We had to decide in a special meeting, because there were no rules...

2.5. If the President time is shortened to 2 years, the President Elect could be a non voting member of the executive for 1 year and a voting member then for 1 year – and the same as the past president – voting member for 1 year and then be a guest for 1 further year (if this is necessary).

3.1. Re-Election of Presidents could be possible for 1 Term in my eyes.

3.2. Re-Election of General Secretary could be possible for 1 Term

3.3. Ok with the treasurer being re-elected, but I propose to organize a dynamic, that the terms of being 4 years are overlapping. This means: 2000 – 2004 President, 2002 – 2006 General Secretary, to ensure any kind of continuity.

3.4. Assistant Secretary (if still a job we will keep) should be also only 1 time possible

3.5. Regional Delegates / Board Members (Vicepresidents) should be reelected, but, again, possibly changing turns to enable continuity

3.6. Yes, re-elected

3.7. Yes, re-elected

4.1. GC should be able online – totally and partially. Of course, a personal meeting is always the best option. But less rich countries / societies would not be able to send delegates on a yearly or two years basis... Thus, enabling online participation also allows poorer regions to participate in every GC. GC should be held at every UIP meeting. We have an executive committee for important issues. Extraordinary GCs should only be held, if the president has to be removed from his job (see 2.4)

4.2. Online voting – if a society really is not able to access the internet (do we have any??) who will they attend the meeting? Thus, if online attendance is possible, in my eyes online voting is possible (if not, there is still the possibility to vote per post / mail, of course, losing privacy... - but is this really a possible scenario?)

4.3. Proxy Voting is an alternative, if online voting is not possible. If a society gives the Proxy-Voting to another society, this means that they trust them and I think, this has not to be regulated by UIP. Thus, Proxy Voting should be allowed and, in my eyes, unlimited.

4.4. Past EC Members are represented in the person of the “Past President” – which then is a member of GC as emeritus president. Anyway, any past president or past EC member can be sent by his country as a representative of his country.

4.5. Members of Honour can be invited to the GC as observers. No vote.

4.6. The “past President” (the one who just left to be) is a member of the GC, as he is a member of the EC? Past-Past presidents are invited as observers (4.5.) – or perhaps I got this wrong.

5.1. Regularly, votes are open, as Delegates have to represent the interests of their country. But, as a basic democratic instrument, some votes have to be given secretly. On request, secret vote has to be possible. At least for the present delegates, where the correctness of voting is given by the number of present delegates and the number of votes given. If enabling secret voting for online votings is technically very difficult, it could be enabled to vote as secretly as possible online and making rules for whom will be able to have a look at the electronic polls and this person (or these two persons) are only allowed to check if everything was ok (number of votes equals number of voting persons), but is not allowed to comment on the origin and the record of the voting is then immediately erased, like the papers of the secret voting are deleted after voting was accepted.

5.2. This is a very difficult question, knowing that some countries have, indeed, 6 or more societies... I would enable 1 vote per society, that fulfills the membership requirements. More than 1 vote per society depending on members (but never more than 2, and I know that I am cutting USA and Germany specially) and over all 2 votes per country in any case (this means, if a country has only one little society, this will have 2 votes).

5.3. To avoid “empty box” societies, perhaps in these cases it is not the number of societies, but the comparison of the persons composing the societies – if they are the same in two societies or are nearly the same, the vote has to be shared. Membership fees should adapt to members in the original society (which then, would be negative for Germany, too, but I think is fair).

5.4. Difficult again. 2 Votes per Country, one vote per society (or two, if only one member) might be a way – and saying, all member societies till 2021 will maintain one vote. But: If we open to Lymphatic societies, each country will possibly have more societies being members... We should think of this, also. (By the way, in Cracow the first proposition was to rename the society to include lymphatic issues – is this idea abandoned?)

6.1. What would be the disadvantage of having societies as members that only have 10% of Phlebology engagement? They have interest in participating, they pay a fee... Apart from the problem with the votes per country, which we should indeed solve, this brings enrichment to UIP – because they have other “border to phlebology” interests that could enrich us...?

6.2. We have to rely on a minimum of seriousness for the member societies – so they should be registered in their country.

6.3. UIP should not turn into a police department... But, societies without activities should not be holding votes. They could be offered to get an “associate Members” until they get organized again. I would rely on knowledge of activities, on Answers to requests, on information of regional board members... I would not actively request activity information – or on the other hand, if we send yearly requests on information about number of members, name of president, GS etc., and nobody answers throughout a number of years, this could be the reason to start the request via the regional board member...?

6.4. I feel like there is no individual membership. If a person is involved in phlebology and his country has no society, very often neighboring countries have and the person might join in. How many individual members do we have and where are they from? From countries not organized in UIP? Or are they from countries with membership societies? Perhaps we should admit only individual applications from persons coming from countries or regions (South-Africa) without any representation in the UIP? And make the admission only for 5 years inviting the person to found a society in his country in the meantime?

6.5. This is an historical problem and a future issue. City societies sometimes are very strong – and cannot be expelled from UIP without great damage to our image. But also here, I would close the candidature for city societies starting 2022. Perhaps in countries with great e.g. political or historical disbalance between north / south or east and west, two societies or regional societies might be accepted, but not on a general basis. The acceptance of a “regional” society should be presented and discussed when applying.

7.1. We had world congresses every 4 years and chapter meetings in between. Reducing to 2 years and chapter meetings in between would be enough – there are too many meetings and in my eyes, we do not invent phlebology yearly, there is not so much new information to share. Guidelines can be conducted online, even though personal meetings are much preferable for these issues.

7.2. I am very much in favor of chapter meetings – and, why not – there could be simultaneous chapter meetings at different places of the world to avoid the trend to Little “UIP Meetings”

7.3. Hands-on workshops with experts from “rich” regions transported to poorer regions on behalf of UIP would be a wonderful alternative to chapter meetings.

Ecuador | Ernesto Intriago

Submissions on Constitutional Reforms

Topic 1- Executive Committee Composition

1.1. Should the position of Assistant Secretary be maintained? It can be eliminated since the main role is played by the general secretary.

1.2. Should UIP introduce- in place of Assistant Secretary- the position of “Chair Congresses and Events”? It may be a valid option, if the position of assistant secretary is eliminated and this position should be renewable.

1.3. Vice Presidents- should the name “Vice President” be changed to “Regional Representative”? Accordingly, it may be called a regional representative.

1.4. Vice Presidents- Should UIP introduce a new dedicated Vice President position for Africa? An alternative could be that the UIP recognises a Vice-President representing Asia, Africa and Oceania

1.5. Vice Presidents- Should UIP introduce a new dedicated Vice President position for Central America? Option 4- Create a Latin American region represented by two Vice Presidents. - Having Central American societies be grouped with South American societies will provide for cultural and linguistic links. This can also be beneficial as these societies grouped together add up to a number close to that of Europe’s, which means that these societies can also be represented by 2 Vice Presidents (as Europe does too).

1.6. Vice Presidents- Should VPs be elected by the entire GC or by their respective regions? They should be elected by the regions they represent.

Topic 2 Executive Committee Terms

The term of office of the executive committee, president, vice-president, secretaries and treasurer and president of the scientific and educational committee, shall last 4 years, equal to the term of office of the president, and shall not be renewable and shall be voted by secret ballot.

2.1. Term of the current Executive Committee- to be terminated in 2021 or continue till 2022? They should be extended until the Istanbul congress in September 2022.

2.2. Should the term of the UIP President be synchronised with the UIP EC? Shorten the length of the next Executive committee from 2022-2023 to end with the current President's term.

2.3. Should the term of the Executive Committee be reduced to two years? If it can be reduced to a short period of two years and with the option to reelected candidates who have demonstrated their commitment to work with the executive committee.

2.4. Should the EC be able to remove an elected member, if that member fails to contribute to the organisation, due to gross misconduct, or failing fiduciary duties? A serious offense must be sanctioned, and there should be an ethics and sanctions committee to qualify the offense and apply the sanctions, subject to appeal.

2.5 Should the term of the President Elect and Past President roles also be reduced to 1 year? The president-elect should have a shorter period of one year before fully assuming his functions, the past president should only be an advisor to accompany the president-elect on specific issues.

Topic 3- Executive Committee Re-election

3.1. The President currently cannot be re-elected. Should this change? It should be for a period of 4 years, no position should be up for re-election, so that there will be greater participation of the other members to contribute to the UIP. 3.

3.2. The General Secretary currently can be re-elected. Should this change? No to reelection.

3.3. The Treasurer currently can be re-elected. Should this change? No to reelection.

3.4. The Assistant Secretary currently can be re-elected. Should this change? No to reelection.

3.5. The Vice Presidents currently cannot be re-elected. Should this change? No to reelection.

3.6. The Chair of the Science Committee currently can be re-elected. Should this change? No to reelection.

3.7. The Chair of the Education Committee currently can be re-elected. Should this change? No to reelection.

Topic 4- General Council Membership

4.1. Can GC meetings occur online?

4.2. Should a secure online voting be conducted during the GC meetings? Who guarantees that the online vote will not have internet signal or connectivity drops, that the results will be secret and that the vote will be the correct one. 4.

4.3. Should proxy voting be allowed? Proxy voting should be allowed, with some restriction for future events if you are not a member of your society.

4.4. Should the General Council composition include members of the past ECs? They may be invited as observers and for a period close to the term of office they left Ecs.

4.5. Should the General Council composition include “Members of Honour”? Only as observers.

4.6. Should the General Council composition include past Presidents? They must be invited as consultants for a maximum of two consecutive terms.

Topic 5- General Council Voting Procedures

5.1. Should voting in the GC meetings be by secret ballot or open? Voting must be anonymous and secret. 5.

5.2. Voting allocation: Is the current system of 2 votes per country fair? Maintain the system of 2 votes per country.

5.3. Voting allocation: Is the current system of 1 vote for the first member society from the member country and sharing of the vote with any other member societies from that country fair? Votes assigned per society. If there are more than 3 societies, they must take turns to vote.

5.3. Voting allocation: Is the current system of 1 vote for the first member society from the member country and sharing of the vote with any other member societies from that country fair?

5.4. Should there be 1 vote per member society but raise the membership bar and limit the maximum number of members from a country?

Topic 6- Membership of the UIP

6.1. What should be the benchmark phlebology component of the member society activities? Should it be predominantly phlebology or a percentage (currently 50% venous)? You should perform at least 50% of venous activities.

6.2. Should formal registration of societies in their respective countries be mandatory for full membership of the UIP? They must be previously registered in their country and in case they are not they must regulate their situation within a period of 2 years and present the documentation in the UIP.

6.3. Should proof of ongoing organisational activity be mandatory for maintaining full membership of the UIP? They must demonstrate that they are in academic activity of their specialty in their country.

6.4. Should the UIP accept individual members? If yes, what should be the minimum qualification for an applicant? Must be individual members, those who demonstrate with a certificate through a local medical association that is a proven professional, or who are active for more than 3 years in vascular diseases, present certificates of refresher courses for 3 years and that are active as a physician.

6.5. Should the UIP limit its membership to “national” societies? If yes, should it not accept applications from non-national, city-based societies?. They should be national societies.

Topic 7- Congresses and Events

7.1. Should the frequency of the UIP World Congress remain at every 2 years or should it be held on an annual basis? This 2-yearly schedule should be maintained and the member societies should be allowed to hold their own congresses, so as not to saturate the number of meetings with national or regional congresses

7.2. Should a regional (previously ‘Chapter’) meeting be held in the odd years? The UIP would be competing with industry sponsorship, when we have to hold national and regional congresses, since it would not contribute economically to carry out such events.

7.3. Should the UIP organise a hands-on workshop in different parts of the world in the odd years? If resources are obtained from the UIP, it could be beneficial to have within a regional congress a practical and academic workshop according to international standards

American Venous Forum | Fedor Lurie

UIP Constitutional Reform Feedback

David,

I misunderstood the process, sorry.

Below are the American Venous Forum positions on the issues that are discussed:

1.1 No

1.2 No

1.3 Yes

1.4 Combine Africa, Asia and Oceania

1.5 Yes

1.6 Elected by the region

2.1 continue to 2022

2.2 Yes

2.3 No

2.4 Yes

2.5 Yes

3.1 No

3.2 Yes

3.3 No

3.4 Yes

3.5Yes

3.6 No

3.7 No

4.1 Yes

4.2 Yes

4.3 No

4.4 No

4.5 No

4.6 No

5.1 Open

5.2 Yes

5.3 Yes

5.4 No position

6.1 Continue with 50%

6.2 Yes

6.3 Yes

6.4 Yes

6.5 Yes

7.1 Remain 2 years

7.2 Yes

7.3 No.

Thanks,

Fedor

Chilean Society of Phlebology and Lymphology | Dr Juan Bombin Franco
SUBMITTED IN SPANISH AND AUTOMATICALLY TRANSLATED INTO ENGLISH
UIP Constitution Reform

Dr Kurosh Parsi
President
Union Internationale de Phlebologie (UIP)

Dear Dr Parsi

I have reviewed the interesting discussion on the different points on which the Amendments to the Constitution of the Union Internationale de Phlebologie (UIP) are focused.

I would like to add two points that seem very important to me, but are not included in the list of issues to be resolved.

The first is about the official language(s) of the organization. In the writing (background) it is reported that the original statute was written in French and later translated into English. That is why the name of the IPU derives from its name in French. In my opinion there has been an imperceptible change of official language from French to English. However, over the years a significant number of Spanish-speaking phlebological societies have been created and joined the IPU, which has made it necessary to include translation into that language in almost all meetings, congresses and conferences of the IPU. the IPU.

I propose that the official languages of the IPU be English and Spanish, which should be registered in the Statutes.

Secondly, the official seat of the IPU has been itinerant, that is, it has changed depending on the country of the President, who is now in Australia. In a planetary organization, there is a problem with the schedules of the different countries. In this case, while America and Europe are awake, Asia and Australia are asleep. One solution to this difficulty is to establish a headquarters in an intermediate time zone between both places, that is, the GMT -3 or GMT -4 time zone, equidistant between Europe and Asia-Oceania. In addition, the ideal that the Statutes were legally established in relation to a particular country or state, as shown by the example of the International Society of Thrombosis and Haemostasis (ISTH), which availed itself of the laws of the state of North Carolina (North Carolina, USA), despite being a worldwide organization. Similarly, the IPU could establish its headquarters and adopt the legislation of an Eastern US state like Florida (USA), or better still in a small stable Central American country like Costa Rica.

I propose to fix the domicile of the IPU headquarters in San José, Costa Rica, under its legislation.

My best regards

Dr. Juan Bombin Franco

President

Chilean Society of Phlebology and Lymphology

IPU Member

DISCUSSION TOPICS

1. Executive Committee Composition

1.1. Should the position of Assistant Secretary be maintained? In our opinion, the position of assistant secretary should be replaced by chair of congresses and events.

1.2. Should UIP introduce- in place of Assistant Secretary- the position of “Chair Congresses and Events”? Agreed.

1.3. Vice Presidents- should the name “Vice President” be changed to “Regional Representative”? Regional ambassador would be a more suitable name .

1.4. Vice Presidents- Should UIP introduce a new dedicated Vice President position for Africa? Africa can be merged with Asia

1.5. Vice Presidents- Should UIP introduce a new dedicated Vice President position for Central America? Depends on the regional societies opinion (North, central and south america)

1.6. Vice Presidents- Should VPs be elected by the entire GC or by their respective regions? If the vice presidents are elected by the entire GC they will have a much higher influence on the societies.

2. Executive Committee Terms

2.1. Term of the current Executive Committee- to be terminated in 2021 or continue till 2022? Should continue till 2022.

2.2. Should the term of the UIP President be synchronised with the UIP EC? Agreed.

2.3. Should the term of the Executive Committee be reduced to two years? Four years will be better because they would have more time to make changes.

2.4. Should the EC be able to remove an elected member, if that member fails to contribute to the organisation, due to gross misconduct, or failing fiduciary duties? Agreed.

2.5. Should the term of the President Elect and Past President roles also be reduced to 1 year? Two years would be more effective.

3. Executive Committee Re-election

3.1. The President currently cannot be re-elected. Should this change? In our opinion re-election should only be allowed once.

3.2. The General Secretary currently can be re-elected. Should this change? No.

3.3. The Treasurer currently can be re-elected. Should this change? No.

3.4. The Assistant Secretary currently can be re-elected. Should this change? No idea.

3.5. The Vice Presidents currently cannot be re-elected. Should this change? re-election should only be allowed once.

3.6. The Chair of the Science Committee currently can be re-elected.

Should this change? No.

3.7. The Chair of the Education Committee currently can be re-elected.

Should this change? No.

4. General Council Membership

4.1. Can GC meetings occur online? Yes it can.

4.2. Should a secure online voting be conducted during the GC meetings? Yes it should be.

4.3. Should proxy voting be allowed? Yes.

4.4. Should the General Council composition include members of the past ECs? Yes.

4.5. Should the General Council composition include “Members of Honour”? Yes.

4.6. Should the General Council composition include past Presidents? Yes.

5. General Council Voting Procedures

5.1. Should voting in the GC meetings be by secret ballot or open? Secret ballot

5.2. Voting allocation: Is the current system of 2 votes per country fair? Yes.

5.3. Voting allocation: Is the current system of 1 vote for the first member society from the member country and sharing of the vote with any other member societies from that country fair? Yes.

5.4. Should there be 1 vote per member society but raise the membership bar and limit the maximum number of members from a country? No.

6. Membership of the UIP

6.1. What should be the benchmark phlebology component of the member society activities? Should it be predominantly phlebology or a percentage (currently 50% venous) ? Percentage (50%)

6.2. Should formal registration of societies in their respective countries be mandatory for full membership of the UIP? Yes.

6.3. Should proof of ongoing organisational activity be mandatory for maintaining full membership of the UIP? Yes.

6.4. Should the UIP accept individual members? If yes, what should be the minimum qualification for an applicant? Yes, the minimum qualification for an applicant would be his academic or professional reputation in the region.

6.5. Should the UIP limit its membership to “national” societies? If yes, should it not accept applications from non-national, city-based societies? No idea.

7. Congresses and Events

7.1. Should the frequency of the UIP World Congress remain at every 2 years or should it be held on an annual basis? Every two years.

7.2. Should a regional (previously ‘Chapter’) meeting be held in the odd years? Yes it should be.

7.3. Should the UIP organise a hands-on workshop in different parts of the world in the odd years? Yes.

ANZ Society of Phlebology | Dr G Mark Malouf

Discussion Paper Submission - Feedback

Hi Kurosh. Hi David.

I have found it a bit tricky to find the mechanism to comment on Kurosh's questions/options to reform the UIP constitution.

I have been through the discussion points and as best I can here are my comments:

1.1 Abolish the position of assistant secretary

1.2 Yes introduce the position of Congresses and Events coordinator and it should be renewable

1.3 Vice president term to be retained but they still act in a regional capacity

1.4 Africa has 54 countries and 1.37 billion population and not many societies in the UIP . Yes, one of the vice president positions is to include responsibility for Africa

1.5 Central America has 8 countries and 185 million population and a few UIP member societies . They seem to not want to be included in the Nth America or South America responsible vice president . But I do not think numbers dictate a separate board representation. They have to choose.

1.6 The regions put forward the candidates for vice president but the GC should vote on them

2.1 Fait accompli. 2022 already Office bearers to stay till Istanbul meeting

2.2 No. We need them to be 2 years apart like now for continuity and oversight. It is a bit like the upper chamber in a bicameral parliament.

2.3 No 4 years

2.4 No 4 years 2.5 No I suggest keeping them at 2 years

3.1 No Only one term for the president

3.2 No The secretary is a re-electable position and should stay that way

3.3 No Stay the same as re-electable

3.4 There will be no assistant secretary but the Congress and events position should be re-electable.

3.5 No Don't change. Their role is social and collegiate and spreading information. No need to re-elect them

3.6 No change. Allow re-election for this position

3.7 No change. Allow re-election

4.1 Yes. In the modern era GC meetings should be a hybrid meeting of in-house and online, just like our scientific meetings

4.2 Yes , in the modern era, definitely 2

4.3 When online attendance and voting are available , Proxy voting will not be needed and can be discontinued.

4.4 No Bigger than the UN Don't do it. Members must know when to get off the stage.

4.5 No They are honored for past service , but not relevant for future decisions. Do not include

4.6 Only the immediate past president for the 2 years following his presidency.

5.1 It has always been a secret ballot and I think it should remain so.

5.2 Yes it is fair and stops more societies in a country claiming more voting power for that country

5.3 Yes

5.4 This is a very cumbersome proposition. Leaving it as is may be better

6.1 Very commonly the vascular surgical society of the country represents that country's venous interests. No I do not think there should be a minimum limit

6.2 Formal registration of venous societies will mean different things in different countries. Often they are not Medical Council registered or government registered and may not pay tax etc so difficult to control

6.3 Hard to police. Ongoing activities vary widely

6.4 No. The UIP remains a society of venous organizations

6.5 As long as the 2 votes per country rule is in place regional societies are catered for and accepting them helps encourage participation.

7.1 Every 2 years is fine. We are over conferenced as it is.

7.2 Chapter meetings in the 2 years between World meetings

7.3 This type of hands-on workshop will have to be decided and run by the Education committee and needs funds and manpower. It could make money for the UIP but there has to be enthusiasm from inside the UIP.

Cheers. Mark

UIP Treasurer | Paul Thibault

Feedback on Suggested Changes to the Constitution

Dear David

Here is a summary of my thoughts:

1. Should the position of Assistant Secretary be maintained?: No. it is superfluous. Agree with the proposition to replace it with Chair of Congresses and Events. This would remain a re-electable position.
2. Vice Presidents- should the name "Vice President" be changed to "Regional Representative"?: Agree with the suggestion to call the position: Board Member - with regional representation of
3. Vice Presidents- Should UIP introduce a new dedicated Vice President position for Africa?: No. One of the European Board members should undertake this role
4. Vice Presidents- Should UIP introduce a new dedicated Vice President position for Central America?: Agree with the 4th suggestion: Create a Latin American region represented by two Vice Presidents
5. Should VPs be elected by the entire GC or by their respective regions? : Respective regions should elect their representative.
6. Term of the current Executive Committee- to be terminated in 2021 or continue till 2022?: Should continue till 2022.
7. Should the term of the UIP President be synchronised with the UIP EC?: I think this would be a good idea as it should result in improved workability of each President's aims and efforts. To do this I suggest shortening the length of the next Executive committee from 2022-2023 to end with the current President's term, but allow those Vice Presidents (Board members) to be re-elected to another term in 2023.
8. Should the term of the Executive Committee be reduced to two years? : No - too short. May be OK to do this if VPs are re-electable.
9. Should the EC be able to remove an elected member, if that member fails to contribute to the organisation, due to gross misconduct, or failing fiduciary duties? : No. This would create more problems than it solves.
10. Should the term of the President Elect and Past President roles also be reduced to 1 year?: No. I recommend that the President-elect is elected 2 years prior to the election of the next Board, so that he/she has 2 years on the Board before the President's term and 2 years after as Immediate Past President, then there still is only either a Past President OR a

President Elect at the same time and the Board is not increased in size. The President therefore serves a total of 8 years on the Board - 2 yrs as President Elect, 4 years as President and 2 years as Immediate Past President.

11. The President currently cannot be re-elected. Should this change?: No
12. The General Secretary currently can be re-elected. Should this change?: No 2
13. The Treasurer currently can be re-elected. Should this change?: No
14. The Assistant Secretary currently can be re-elected. Should this change?: See 1. above
15. The Vice Presidents currently cannot be re-elected. Should this change? : No. This rule allows a turn-over of "talent" and a VP can always seek re-election to another position on the Board.
16. The Chair of the Science Committee currently can be re-elected. Should this change?: No
17. The Chair of the Education Committee currently can be re-elected. Should this change?: No
18. Can GC meetings occur online?: No. Too difficult
19. Should a secure online voting be conducted during the GC meetings?: No. Too difficult
20. Should proxy voting be allowed?: No. Need to encourage societies to have their representatives physically present. It doesn't need to be the President of the society. It could also be a member of the Board. (Except those with nonvoting positions)
21. Should the General Council composition include members of the past ECs?: No. I think this could increase the size of the general council too much. The UIP may need to rent a football stadium.
22. Should the General Council composition include "Members of Honour"? : Yes
23. Should the General Council composition include past Presidents?: Yes, but I don't think they should have voting rights.
24. Should voting in the GC meetings be by secret ballot or open?: Should remain secret.
25. Voting allocation: Is the current system of 2 votes per country fair?: Yes
26. Voting allocation: Is the current system of 1 vote for the first member society from the member country and sharing of the vote with any other member societies from that country fair?: I can't think of a better system and it discourages too many societies representing a country. There should possibly be a limit to the number of societies from a country. In my

term as Treasurer, I feel that it is more difficult obtaining annual subscriptions from countries with multiple societies and they tend to be fighting each other rather than attempting to resolve their differences.

27. What should be the benchmark phlebology component of the member society activities? Should it be predominantly phlebology or a percentage (currently 50% venous)? I would prefer not to use a number as this is always going to be an estimate anyway. I would just recommend the term "A significant interest in phlebology, and/or lymphology."

28. Should formal registration of societies in their respective countries be mandatory for full membership of the UIP?: Yes, I think every member society should be a legal entity in their jurisdiction.

The remaining questions are pretty straight forward I hope.

Regards

Paul

Benelux Society | Marc Vuylsteke

Feedback Response

Topic 1: Executive committee composition:

1.1 Agree to remove the position of assistant secretary.

1.2 Agree to have a permanent congresses and events committee. The chair should be a renewable position, elected.

1.3 agree to change the name of vice-president into 'regional councilor'

1.4 Agree to introduce in the future a 'regional councillor' for Afrika. One of his/her tasks should be to promote the UIP in other African countries and to create more member organizations. However if now only two African societies exist, this function should temporarily be filled in by another region, Southern-Europe?

1.5 Option 4 is my preference

1.6 The 'vice-presidents' or 'regional councilors' should be preferentially elected by their respective regions. These regions should be based on continents. However some continents have more societies/members/activities than others. Therefore a weighted distribution of the number of vice-presidents is the most logical choice. Eg Europe and Central/South America having two vice-presidents.

Topic 2: Executive Committee Terms:

2.1 The current executive committee should continue till the next meeting in Istanbul.

2.2 Agree to increase the term of the current executive committee so that it ends in 2023 with the President's term.

2.3 Proposal : the term stays for four years. But a member of the executive committee can ask to be replaced after two years. Then elections can be organized, if applicable, to fill-in those open mandates.

2.4 Yes, this can be combined with topic 2.3. After two years an elected member can be removed/replaced by another one. This is at the request of the member himself, or forced upon him by others. For the latter, there must be a two-thirds majority in the committee supporting this decision. Members of the committee can also be dismissed immediately in the event of serious misconduct, such as theft, legal proceedings, etc. This also requires at least a two-thirds majority of the committee to support the decision.

2.5 Agree to reduce the term to one year.

Topic 3 Executive committee re-election

3.1 It should be possible for the president to be re-elected with a maximum of two terms. Idem for the vice-presidents. It should also be possible to appoint them for a different function in the UIP executive committee.

3.2 No

3.3 No

3.4 No

3.5 No, again max 2 terms of 4 years each

3.6 Idem

3.7 idem

Topic 4 General Council membership

4.1 Yes, but online if an urgent decision has to be made or in times traveling can be difficult. Maybe, hybrid sessions can be organized if some member organizations can't attend the meeting and have a good explanation for this.

4.2 Yes, see above. Only if there is need to

4.3 Preferentially not. This can be replaced by a hybrid meeting with online voting

4.4 No

4.5 Yes, especially ex-presidents of the GC. That function should be supportive, consultative without voting rights.

4.6 Yes, with voting rights; But only if the past-presidents themselves are asking for it. An ex-president may also choose not to do so.

Topic 5 General council voting procedures

5.1 Secret ballot

5.2 Difficult problem. There are small countries and large countries. As far as voting is concerned, we can use the principle of 'degressive proportionality', which is how representation in the European Parliament is organised. Such a system ensures that large

regions have more votes, but prevents them from dominating the whole. This makes the influence of the smaller societies somewhat greater than the size of the country they represent. See also: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Degressive_proportionality

I am also in favour of limiting the number of societies entitled to vote per country/region. Situations like those in Argentina and Italy are not conducive to smooth decision-making. My proposal to these countries would be that they first have to reorganise themselves internally in order to be able to come to the General Assembly with unambiguous representation. There, of course, they would be given voting rights in proportion to their weight as determined by degressive proportionality.

5.3 see above: max one representative for each country, with a different number of votes depending on the size/interest of the country. But perhaps we should also decide that the UIP is an umbrella body for countries and not for societies. These are two different things.

5.4 See above

Topic 6 Membership of the UIP

6.1 Agree with minimal 50%

6.2 Yes, especially if we choose one (or maybe two board members for each country) representative for each country

6.3 No, only if the society is inactive, which means no activities, no board, no representatives. They can temporarily be excluded from the GC until activity restarts.

6.4 No

6.5 Yes, see above 5.2 and 5.3

Topic 7

7.1 Every two years is OK

7.2 I propose to abandon this chapter meeting. However the organization of the UIP conferences should be well spread geographically so that every region is covered. A rotation can be made per region.

7.3 No. This can be done by the member organizations themselves.

Appendix B - Existing Constitution of the UIP



INTERNATIONAL UNION OF PHLEBOLOGY (UIP)

CONSTITUTION

UNION INTERNATIONALE DE PHLEBOLOGIE PTY LTD

ACN: 167 177 219

ABN: 67 167 177 219

LAST UPDATE, 24th AUGUST 2019.

I – OBJECTIVES

Article 1

The aims of the International Union of Phlebology (UIP) are to:

- a) Strengthen the links between the societies or associations, either existing or to be created, which have a special interest in the study and the therapy of venous and lymphatic disorders;
- b) Promote phlebology teaching and education as well as training and continuing medical education of phlebologists; promote consensus on all aspects of venous disorders; encourage studies and research on disorders of venous origin;
- c) Promote joint meetings or international congresses;
- d) Encourage the formation and activities of phlebology societies or associations and encourage these societies to join the UIP.

Article 2

The registered Office of the UIP is at: Level 5, 7 Help st. Chatswood, NSW 2067 Australia

II – COMPOSITION

Article 3

The UIP is composed of Society Members, Associate Members, Individual Members, Industry Members, Honorary Members and Emeritus Presidents.

Article 4

Society Members are:

- a) National Phlebology Societies or Associations
- b) Or failing this, the national Society or Association where phlebology is not the main activity, but which has a dedicated phlebology interest group or section concerned with venous disorders
- c) International, multinational and regional societies or associations with activity as described in b) above.

Article 5

Other Members

a. Associate Members

Societies that have not met the membership pre-requisites. This is a transitional status until the Society achieves the minimum pre-requisites (See Appendix). These Societies pay annual fees as determined by the Executive Committee and reviewed from time to time, and may attend the Council Meeting, but will not have voting rights.

b. Individual Members

These are individual members who will pay an annual fee as determined by the Executive Committee and reviewed from time to time. Such members will have no voting rights and cannot attend the Council Meeting.

c. Industry members

While member societies of the UIP are not-for-profit organizations, any other entity that operates for profit can apply for membership of the UIP as an “Industry Member.”

Such “Industry Members” will have no voting rights and cannot attend the Council Meetings. The membership fee will be decided by the Executive Committee from time to time.

Article 6

Honorary Members composed of:

1. Presidents of international societies affiliated with the UIP for the duration of their term;
2. Individuals included in the former categories “Honorary Members” and “Committee of Honor”.
3. Individuals proposed and approved by a vote during a General Council meeting.

Honorary Members can attend the Council Meeting as an observer but will have no voting rights.

Article 7

Emeritus Presidents: This role is exclusively for past Presidents of the UIP, is a lifetime role, and confers to the individual waiving of registration for official UIP Congresses and attendance at the General Council meetings, but without voting rights.

Article 8

A Society or Association wishing to join the UIP must make a formal application which will be considered at the following Meeting of the General Council (Article 17). (For Guidelines on Membership Application see Appendix). Any request for Associate Membership must be drawn up by the applicant and must be sponsored by at least two members of the Executive Committee.

Article 9

1. The status of Society Member or Associate Member is lost by:
 1. Resignation
 2. Termination by the General Council for non-payment of the membership fees for 4 years or for a serious reason. The member must be notified each of the 4 years of the lack of payment.
2. Suspension by the Executive Committee for non-payment of the membership fees for 4 years. The member must be notified each of the 4 years of the lack of payment

III – ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURES

Article 10

The UIP is administered by a General Council which, outside its meetings, delegates its authority to the Executive Committee which reports to the General Council.

Article 11

A General Council Meeting of the UIP is held at every Chapter meeting and World Congress of the Union.

Article 12

The General Council comprises:

1. The President of the International Union of Phlebology
2. The Past President or the President Elect
3. The Executive Committee
4. The President of each Member Society together with one member from each of them
5. The Associate Members, as defined in Article 6, numbering one per society
6. The Honorary Members
7. The Emeritus Presidents

Article 13

The Executive Committee comprises the President, the Past President and the President Elect, the 5 Vice-Presidents, the General Secretary, the Assistant Secretary, the Treasurer, the Chair of Scientific Committee and the Chair of Education Committee.

The chair of Scientific Committee and the chair of Education Committee take part of meetings of Executive Committee and of General Council with voting rights.

IV – FUNCTIONING COUNCIL MEETING

Article 14

The President presents his/her report to the Congress at the General Council Meeting of the UIP and invites comments. In his/her report, the President must give an account of his/her activities and those of the Executive Committee. He/She must announce the names of any new members and inform the General Council of any proposed changes in the Constitution or of the dissolution of the Union.

Article 15

A meeting of the General Council is held at each Chapter meeting and World Congress of the UIP. A meeting of the General Council can also be called by the President or at the request of one quarter of its members.

Article 16

The General Council discusses and votes on the items on the agenda drawn up by the General Secretary with the President.

Every 4 years the General Council elects the next President (the President Elect) and the members of the Executive Committee by secret ballot.

The General Council discusses and votes on the candidatures of Society Members, Associate Members and other members.

The General Council elects Honorary Members.

The General Council votes on the locations and dates of the official Congresses of the UIP.

The General Council votes on the amount of membership fees based on the recommendation of the Treasurer and Executive Committee.

Article 17

Debating and voting procedures:

1. All the members of the General Council can take part in the debates, but only the following are entitled to vote on the Council:

The President or his/her duly authorized representative of each of the Member Societies, which are up-to-date with their membership fees, on the following bases:

- Countries with one member society: 2 votes per society
- Maximum of two votes per country: countries with more than one society: one vote belongs to the first Society accepted in the UIP; the second vote belongs to the other new Society/Societies.

- Societies representing a group of countries in which no other member society of the UIP exists: 2 votes
- Societies representing a group of countries in which other member society(ies) of the UIP exists: 1 vote
- International societies representing a continent or sub-continent: 1 vote
- Multinational or regional societies: 1 vote

- The members of the Executive Committee except the President (present, past or elect): 1 vote each.

Voting by proxy is accepted within the limit of one proxy per person. .

2. The only circumstance under which the President of the UIP votes is when a deciding vote is required.
3. The Past President and the President Elect do not vote under any circumstance.
4. At least half the members of the General Council with the right to vote, or their duly authorized representatives, must be present in order for the proceedings to be valid [exceptions- see Article 17.6 and also Article 33].
5. The General Council's decisions will be taken on an absolute majority, defined as more than half of the votes cast; failing a decision, further voting will take place and the decision taken on a relative majority, defined as the largest number of votes cast [exceptions – see Article 17.6 and also Article 33].
6. The status of Society Member, of Associate Member, of Honorary Member is acquired by a vote on a relative majority of the General Council Members present or represented.
7. Appropriate decorum and adherence to rules of order will be maintained by the President during General Council meetings.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Article 18

The members of the General Council with the right to vote elect the members of the Executive Committee by secret ballot, including the President Elect, the 5 Vice-Presidents, the General Secretary, the Assistant Secretary and the Treasurer.

Article 19

1. The Executive Committee meets whenever it is convened by the President or called by two thirds of its members.
2. The Agenda is drawn up by the President assisted by the General Secretary. Any member of the Executive Committee has the right to place an item on the Agenda.
3. All the members of the Executive Committee have the right to vote except for the Past President and the President Elect.
4. The decisions are taken on a relative majority of the members present, the President having only a deciding vote.
5. Discussion and decision making is also possible by written communication (e.g. letters, e-mails) on a relative majority of the members with a right to vote, the President having only a deciding vote.

The Executive Committee conveys its decisions to the General Council.

PRESIDENT

Article 20

1. The President is elected by the General Council Meeting during a World Congress.
2. The President's term of office is 4 years and is not renewable.
3. The General Council, at its General Council Meeting, elects its next President — the President Elect – who will take up office 2 years later, but who will immediately become a member of the General Council and of the Executive Committee as President Elect.
4. The President who has ended his/her 4 year term of office is designated Past President and remains on the General Council and on the Executive Committee for 2 years as Past President.
5. During the first two years of his/her term of office, the President will have the assistance of the Past President and, during the last two years, the assistance of the President Elect.
6. Past Presidents or Presidents Elect will be consultative members of the Executive Committee, with no voting rights, during their term of office as Past President or President Elect.
7. In the event of impediment or death of the President, he/she will be replaced immediately by the President Elect who will complete the President's term of office before beginning his/her own. An election of President Elect will take place at the General council meeting during the next World Congress.
8. In the event of impediment or death of one of the members of the Executive Committee, he/she can be replaced by an election at the General Council meeting during the next World Congress
9. The President will only vote when a deciding vote is required.

Article 21

1. The President represents the UIP and chairs all its meetings.
2. The President can mandate a representative if he/she is not available.

VICE – PRESIDENTS

Article 22

The 5 Vice-Presidents are elected for one, non-renewable 4-year term by secret ballot at the General Council Meeting.

They assist the President and replace him/her at his/her request.

The Vice-Presidents have the right to vote on the General Council and on the Executive Committee.

GENERAL SECRETARY and ASSISTANT SECRETARY

Article 23

The General Secretary and the Assistant Secretary are elected for a 4 year renewable term at a Council Meeting by secret ballot.

With the President and by approval of the Executive Committee, the General Secretary draws up the Agenda of the General Council meetings and records the minutes of these meetings.

They invite applications for the different Executive Committee positions and convene the members of the General Council and of the Executive Committee to the meetings, within the deadlines set out in the Internal Regulations.

The General Secretary and the Assistant Secretary have the right to vote on the General Council and on the Executive Committee.

TREASURER

Article 24

The Treasurer is elected for a 4 year renewable term by secret ballot at a General Council Meeting.

The Treasurer will first present a financial report to the Executive Committee and after approval by the Executive Committee, he/she will send the report to all members of the General Council prior to its next meeting.

He/She authorizes the expenses.

The Treasurer is responsible for the proper management of the finances of the UIP as well as for collecting membership fees.

The Treasurer has the right to vote on the General Council and on the Executive Committee.

CHAIRS OF SCIENTIFIC AND EDUCATIONAL COMMITTEES

Article 25

The chairs of Scientific and Education Committees are elected for a 4 year renewable term by secret ballot at a General Council Meeting

The chairs have right to vote and take part of Executive Committee and General Council.

SOCIETY MEMBERS

Article 26

The Society Members as defined in Article 4, are elected at a General Council Meeting. Only the President of each Society Member or Association, or his duly authorized representative, has the right to vote.

ASSOCIATE MEMBERS

Article 27

Associate Members are defined in Article 6, and they are elected at a General Council meeting. They do not have the right to vote.

HONORARY MEMBERS

Article 28

Honorary Members as defined in Article 7, are proposed and elected at a General Council Meeting. They do not have the right to vote.

Article 29

Languages:

The official language of the UIP and its Constitution is English.

The minutes of World Congresses are drafted in English, Spanish, and French languages, as by request from a member society. The minutes are signed by the President.

Article 30

The members of the Executive Committee cannot receive any payment for the duties which are entrusted to them. Nevertheless, their travelling expenses can be refunded, subject to the President's and the Treasurer's prior approval.

Article 31

The UIP is represented in legal proceedings, and in all actions of civil life, by its President or any other person delegated to this end by the General Council.

Article 32

Annual fees:

Every member society will pay only one annual fee according to the categories below. Member Societies will be divided in 3 (three) categories: A, B and C

Category A – standard membership fee. Annual fees will be determined by the Executive Committee and approved by the General Council from time to time. The annual fee will be included in the Appendix.

Category B – Societies from the developing world. Annual fees will be reviewed by the Executive Committee from time to time but must remain no more than 50% of the standard fee.

Category C– Societies from countries in major crises (e.g. war) or in difficult socio-economic circumstances. Annual fees for such member societies will be waived while their circumstances remain the same.

The decision on the inclusion of the country in each category (A, B or C) must be taken considering information such as its GDP (Gross Domestic Product), per capita GDP, Human Development index and others. Such information must be obtained from formal reliable sources.

The request for classification under categories B and C must be made by the society and must be accompanied by adequate supporting material to justify such request.

Requests, sent to the President with a copy to the General Secretary, will be examined first by the Vice President of the corresponding geographic region and then by the President. Provided the application is considered complete, the request will be presented to the Executive Committee for approval.

The Executive Committee maintains the right to review the membership classification from time to time and change classification based on the available evidence.

Expenditures are approved by the President and dispersed by the Treasurer when appropriate. In the case of a dispute, resolution will be by the Executive Committee.

Article 33

The assets of the UIP will alone meet the commitments contracted on its behalf. None of its members can personally be held liable for its undertakings, subject to the possible application of the provisions applicable regarding the Court's administration on insolvency or liquidation of assets.

V – MODIFICATION OF CONSTITUTION AND DISSOLUTION

Article 34

The Constitution can be modified by a decision of the General Council with at least half of its members with voting rights being present or by proxy and by a three-quarter majority vote. The decision to dissolve the UIP can only be taken by a three-quarter vote at a meeting of the General Council with a quorum of two-thirds of its members.

Article 35

In the event of a voluntary or a statutory dissolution, or a dissolution ordered by a Court or by decree, the General Council will appoint one or more auditors responsible for evaluating the assets of the UIP. The General Council will determine, after all contributions have been collected, how the net assets will be applied.

Article 36

The General Secretary of the UIP will fulfill the declaration and publication formalities laid down by the law, both for registering this Constitution and for informing the Executive Committee of any modifications to the management, the Constitution or the registered office of the Union.

Article 37

The Internal Regulations and Appendix will not be a part of the Constitution and may be amended by the Executive Committee, as necessary, at any of its meetings.

Article 38

Any modification to this Constitution which is approved at a General Council Meeting, will be immediately applied, subject to prior commitments.

Constitution revised and approved: Sydney, September 1998; Rome, September 2001; Rio de Janeiro, October 2005; Boston, September 2013; Seoul, August 2015; Rome, April 2016; Melbourne, February 2018; Krakow. September 2019.

