May First/People Link Leadership Committee Meeting
09 February 2013

= Introductions =

 dkg::
 looking forward to talking about where the organization is going to go this year
 con esperanzas de platicar sobre adonde la organización sigue en este año
 Hilary::
 excited to brainstorm, think practically, big
 animada para pensar con todos, práctimente, en terminos grande
 Jack::
 prefer she, psyched to work with all
 prefiere ella, emocionada trabajar con todos
 Dana::
  fly on the wall, listening and learning, member of MF/PL staff, does support for members
  mosca en la apred, escuchando y aprendiendo, miembra del personal de PM/EP, apoya a los miembros
 Juan Gerardo::
  part of the Mexico chapter of MF/PL, honor of being elected for co-chair of LC, happy to be here for the first time
  parte del capítulo mijicano de PM/EP, honor de ser elejido co-presidente del CD, feliz estar aquí por la primera vez
 Josue Guillen::
  excited about what this year will bring
  animado sobre lo que este año traerá
 Enrique::
  con mucho agrado que estar aqui con ustedes en este reunion
  happy to be here will you all in this meeting
 Joseph::
  I don't like the snow.
  no me gusta la nieve
 Jamie::
  codirector with Enrique, had the pleasure of an afternoon with Juan Gerardo and Alfredo, excited esp. about integrating Mexican membership and becoming an international organization
  co-director con enrique, tuve el placer de pasar una tarde con juan gerardo y alfredo, animado especialmente sobre la integración de la membrecía mejicana y
 Mike Lee::
  via email: had trouble traveling, had legal situation (work) that he as to deal with, will come in at 1
  por email: problemas viajando, tuvo una situación legal (trabajo) que tiene que bregar con, llega a la una
 Mallory::
  flight delayed, will be here during lunch
  vuelo detrasado, llega para almuerzo
 Lourdes::
  unable to attend this weekend
  no puede atender este fin de semana
 Nadir::
  Member of Rude Mechanical Orchestra, attended last May's MF/PL fundraising event; has

been wondering about the org since then, got invited to participate, excited to be here (as volunteer interpreter)
  miembro del orquesta rude emchanical, atendió un event de recaudación de findos; ha estado pensado de la organización desde ese tiempo, lo invitaron a participar, animado estar aquí (como interprete voluntario)
 Rasha::
  Joining from Atlanta GA, glad to be here, appreciate the remote participation setup; a little sick so trying not to lose her voice today!
  atendiendo de atlanta, GA, feliz de estar aquí, aprecio el sistema de participación remoto; un poco enferma, va a tratar de no perder su voz hoy
 Roberto::
  (hard to hear Roberto:) out and about as always, excited to be here, excited about working on the democratic process, sad he can't be here in person
  (difícil oir a roberto) estoy en camino, animado de estar aquí, animado de trabajar en el proceso democrático, triste no poder estar en persona
 Aaron::
  estoy muy feliz por estar con ustedes, gracias al traductor, ahora que integrado en este equipo... I've got some ideas about how we can work today, happy to be working between Mexico & US
  very happy to be here with you all, thanks to the interpreter, now that i am integrated with this system...tengo algunas ideas de como podemos trabajar hoy, feliz de estar trabajando entre mejico y EEUU
 Alfredo::
  one of the founders and co-chairs of the LC. This is a departure meeting, given the maturity of the organization and the state of the world. It's an honor and a privilege to be here.
  uno de los fundadores y co-presidente del CD. Es una reunión de salida, dada la madurez de la organización y la situación del mundo. es un honor y una privilegia estar aquí

= Agenda Changes =
Cambios de la agenda

Moving things back an hour:
Retrasando
 * 11-12: discussion of report
 * 12-1pm: start discussion of subcommittees
 * 1pm - lunch
 * 2-5pm: continue discussion of subcommittees as needed, followed by meetings of subcommittees themselves (depending on how earlier day goes)

* Alfredo: At the end of day, anticipate needing to make a decision about whether some subcommittees need to continue meeting before making their presentations to the group tomorrow. There are 4 subcommittees as currently constituted, another being proposed; if we continue with that structure there's not a whole lot of time, even given tomorrow's meeting time.
* Alfredo: We should reflect on the question of how we've changed as a leadership committee. We're now an international organization (at least 2 countries w members). LC has people not just from 2 different countries and cultures, but 2 different movement experiences and histories. A huge challenge for any organization; a lot of room for misunderstanding; taking for granted that we understand things in the same way. Different political experience & understanding btwn US and Mexico. What may appear to be very dramatic differences or loaded questions could be a function of different experiences; let's ask for clarifications, offer them when we can.

* Alfredo: reports on membership meeting; there are URLs to more detailed online reports.
* Juan Gerardo: in the general sense of the meeting, would like to ask all of us if we agree on the objectives we're to accomplish today and tomorrow, sent previously by the co-chairs.
* Rasha: seems like important things are covered in this; not sure if htere are additional things that folks think are not covered here. Support covering these topics; appreciate inclusion of item D.
* Juan Gerardo: many of these objectives are not stated clearly in the agenda; if we agree that we should accomplish these objectives, they should be taken up throughout the agenda.
* Alfredo: no one says anything. are we asleep?
* Jack - broadly agree with agenda and goals. only concerns are the ones that reflect on the different structures, i.e. B. Would like us to step back, not make assumptions about current structures, not act as if anything in set in stone.
* Joseph: items D and E are not included in current agenda; is a subcommittee taking up those items? How will they be handled?
* Alfredo: E especially is so loaded with work that we might not get specific; we should keep these items in mind as we proceed. We have nothing on legal in this agenda.
* Roberto: (connection isn't very clear; for people discussing in english, can't tell what letters people are saying when speaking; be more clear about what letters (B, C, D) are being said. please say "B as in boy" or "C as in cat"
* Roberto: in relation to B, want to analyze the subcommittees, is this referring to the existing subcommittees, or can we have a larger disucssion regarding the structure
* Joseph: that's included in the agenda; what's unclear of what's on the agenda is D or E, unless they're being taken up by subcommittee.
* Alfredo: E might be taken up by outreach; no one can take up legal issues, we might want a specific point on the agenda. We had major issues last year; we're going to have significant ones this year.
* jack - doesn't see space to take a step back. a meta conversation about the structure of the organization. can we expand the section B - discuss the overall structure of the organization, not just limit it to the subcommittees
* Jack - no veo espacio para tomar un paso para tras. una conversación meta sobre la estructurs de la organización. podemos ampliar la sección B - platicar sobre la estructura de la organización, no limitarlo a solo los subcomités
* Roberto: agrees with Jack
* Hilary: that's a good idea
* dkg: would propose we discuss the ongoing tension between our organizational goals of transparency and how to deal with some specific situations that we can't deal with transparently; would like to discuss that with the LC. Right now everything is very transparent, notes are being broadcasted publicly; what about those situations where we feel we can't meet a goal of 100% transparency?
* Juan Gerardo: would suggest we bring that up in the democracy subcommittee
* Alfredo: Jack has proposed a change in agenda to open the subcommittee discussion to a discussion of the entire organizational structure; that's an agenda change that requires the approval of... some section of the LC. Are there any comments or discussion of that proposed idea?
* dkg, Hilary, Joseph: good idea
* Juan Gerardo: it is a good idea in the sense of analyzing and review the whole organization and structure. my only worry is that we do not give it so much weight that it sucks up all our time. this is important but it shouldn't overwhelm our external obligations.
* Rasha: my understanding was that we agreed to include a review of the structure in this meeting, so I support the recommendation.
* Jamie: there's some overlap between this discussion and the democracy subcommittee; if there's any quesiton of the overall structure of the organization, that has to be sorted out

before subcommittees can operate.
* Enrique: can we ask aaron to contribute? he hasn't spoken up
* Aaron: i'm in favor of the change!

= Discussion of Report on Membership Meeting =

'''Links'''
* https://support.mayfirst.org/wiki/projects/membership-meeting/2012/notes/priorities
* https://support.mayfirst.org/wiki/projects/membership-meeting/2012/notes/priorities-feedback

* Jamie--very good summary, a lot of info to condense, appreciate the work that went into it. Important document for us to have. If people have differences over interpretation, it's important that we come to agreement together.
* Jamie: this reinforces some of the discussions at the meeting; there's not enough time during the meeting to really work on these points, as demonstrated by lack of substantitve changes. How can we organize the next membership meeting in a way that gets more substantive feedback?
* Joseph: clarification: where did the pre-seeded ideas come from?
* Jamie: the LC discussed and came up with the proposed ideas; it was a mini-subcommittee of the LC who brainstormed the initial topics, LC approved them, we then made a survey out of them, collected feedback from survey of members, handed that out at membership meetings to review. The numbers in the report are a quantification of responses from the online survey.
* Hilary: in the survey we prioritized the items; at the meeting after enhancing them we prioritized again. Was that prioritzed list from the meeting included in this report?
* Alfredo: i don't think so. i don't know what you're referring to.
* Hilary: during the meeting, we worked in groups and then e-mailed a ranked list of the prioirites per group
* Alfredo: having drafted this report for the subcommittee--this was an extremely chaotic membership meeting for tracking decisions. It was successful in terms of spirit; in terms of clarity of decisions, it didn't function well. You can see by the documents & the different points of view; in the collaborative democracy workshop people made very few changes to each point, but during the discussions (the second document linked to from the report) there's an enormous amount of material with people making different points. Impossible to weight those things. The process is crippled because of the chaos -- it can't produce a clear directive.
* Jamie: It does appear that's missing from the report; I'd like the agenda committee to take a second review of the notes and determine whether priorities are extractable from the notes and report back.
* Juan Gerardo: main problem is that during the meeting every comment was taken as though it were a conclusive comment. I don't think that in Mexico or here in the US that the meeting was asked if everyone agreed to every comment or not. This is a problem we have to solve; it's one thing to listen to everyone; another is to say that this group agrees on those points. If that is the reality it wouldn't do much good for the agenda committee to review all comments; on what criteria are we to decide what's been truly approved and what has not? I would suggest we bring to the next membership meeting this report and see what reactions there are; those reactions can be put to a final voting or agreement or conclusion. Otherwise we'll be working in vain or applying our own criteria to determine what's valid and what is not.
* Hilary: only concern is that it leads us with no mandate until the next meeting. If we're trying to clarify different ideas on these points, how are we going to organize and move projects forward?
* dkg: question about the emails sent by each group after the workshop--I don't know where

those are.
* Jamie: that's what I was referring to; there were at least 5-6 groups sending their groups prioritized items; all of those emails are buried in these wiki links.
* Jamie: my proposal for the membership & agenda meeting--I don't think you should spend more than 10 minutes doing this, as the person who compiled the notes. I think you'll be able to eyeball the rankings, do a qualitatve analysis, see what corresponds and what's different.
* Jamie: the process was flawed; it didn't go very well and I think we need to do better next year. Given the flawed process, I think the best way to move forward is to say we have this data, let's interpret it and approve it. going back to the membership would take too long to get a mandate to move forward.
* Jack: concept of mandate is problematic, it will be hard to find and that's ok for this year. If we want to find a mandate out of membership meetings, we have tofind another structure than what has been tried the last few years. We're still as LC interpreting alot and creating the mandate. Stick with this year and work to change it next year.
* alfredo: that's the mandate to the Agenda and membership committee: to figure out how to get clearer direction from the membership in general. and it's clear we have to change how we do things
* Joseph: The quantitative numbers in some ways reflect the membership already; in a certain sense the ideas were already pre-seeded and discussed by a subset of membership, we have what we have, membership has been included in the process to a certain degree.
* Joseph: there's always going to be an interpretive process for the LC coming out of the membership meeting; we'll always have to do a certain amount of interpretation.
* Jamie: seems like there's consensus; I withdraw my proposal to have the membership and agenda committee review. We can move forward with this report.
* (reading points from membership meeting priorities as sent out to LC in membership meeting report email, also represented at https://support.mayfirst.org/wiki/projects/membership-meeting/2012/notes/priorities
* dkg: a concern about point 6 in the report; the report says there was very little comment made about this point. I remember that in my group that was explicitly marked as lowest priority; our comments that we sent back (https://support.mayfirst.org/wiki/projects/membership-meeting/2012/notes/priorities-feedback#crescentmoongroup) said that the proposed priority because of concerns about prioritization; "there is a strong and deep skepticism about promoting the internet itself."
* dkg: the important part of this point is about strengthening international alliances and struggles; we were not convinced by the idea of promoting the internet itself, because in many contexts the internet may in fact be harmful to international alliances and struggles.
* Juan Gerardo: point 6 is very related to points 3 and 4; in some manner, if you prioritize 3 and 4, you're pulling point 6 up too.
* dkg: I think 3 and 4 are well structured; if 6 can be structured similarly...
* Jamie: I think waht we want to do now is approve whether this is an accurate description of the membership meeting. We should make an addition to this report that includes dkg's note: "skepticism was expressed about promoting the internet itself."
* Hilary: additionally we could add that this point was better articulated in previous points 3 and 4.
* Jamie: I appreciate the use of parentheses as editorial comments; it's good to make a difference between what we're editorializing as the LC and what is being reported from the membership meeting itself.
* Alfredo: point 1 included concerns about staffing
* Joseph: staffing has changed, e.g. with Dana's hire.
* Jamie: when the LC approves this report, staff is going to be sending this out to membership saying that this is what LC interprets from the membership meeting
* Hilary: #1 might need to include some of our thinking from the membership meeting about

the organization, whether it's a service organization or an activism organization and what that means, how paid staff relates to volunteer staff
* Josue: how does #1 impact people's perceptions of our organizations? Prioritizing ensuring that hosting services... it being a focus of our work lends some weight to people seeing us as a service organization. How do we do #1 while keeping on the forefront that we are a political and membership organization and that these services are being prioritized for political
* Jack: i think it is key. the order of these priorities is what i have perceived with groups that i work with that use MF/PL. Other groups that do this, like Sylvia Rivera Law Project, has been working to bring in a movement perspective to their service work.
* Juan Gerardo: we should differentiate the part of keeping the services going well from the part of free software, new software, developing tools for our members for the future. If we're going to keep the system going efficiently, we need people almost permanently working on the systems, which is the first part; what should give us an image before our members is the second part, not the first part.
* Alfredo: at this point, if there's nothing else, we should approve these two documents: the membership meeting report and the LC agenda, with the amendments made
*
* Enrique: i have some comments on the agenda and the report from the membership meeeting in mx. it's important to reflect the debate that happened there in this document so that we can count on the document reflecting our discusison in mexico. re: #2 there is a portion of our membership who doesn't have a radical connection or position in the movement who is not thinking about having a strategy for the membership. there was criticsm about the use of these terms. It could be cultural differences that are reflected. This complicates our multinational collaboration, i think it's important to record that: #2 is a result of capitalism and racism and colonization. shall i propose an amendement or read the concerns?
* Alfredo: read them; we can add them
* Enrique: point #3: provide tech support to movement struggles: recognize that there are two kinds of struggles: some of resistance(defensive) and others that are making alternatives (participatory visionary projects). we need to consider both of them and we need to differentiate between them.

* Alfredo: i'm sure the group supports these adjustments
* jack: i have one more clarification about #2. i like the addition that these are the results of things. when we start listing things, i worry that there will be things left off: sexism and ableism for example. We list everything or be general. Neither is ideal.
* Jamie: based on Jack's comment and keeping with the idea of reporting what happened, we can note under that that the LC noted it was a complete list, chose not to go down the path of making a complete list.
* Alfredo: this addition was generally supported by all of the membership; that's why we pulled it in. I don't like it because I don't like lists.
* (agreement that we should note that while membership generally agreed with the list of capitalism, racism, and colonialization, that there was also some concern in the membership that this list left certain oppressions or power relations out.)
* Alfredo: we're moving on to the next portion of the agenda; we'll include Enrique's additions in the report.

= intermission =

= Subcommittees/Overall Organization and Structure =

* Juan Gerardo: i want to share some of our experiuence in mexico, with our cooperative we ask: what do we organize for, and for whom? We also try to get a clear idea on whether the organization and the structure is a means, a strategy, or a goal for the group. If we don't answer these quesitons precisely, then we can go into very long and difficult debates. I'd like to propose that we try to focus our analysis starting from these two questions: a) we organize for what and for whom? b) how do we see organization? as a means to meet our mission, vision, and goals, or as something very internal for us to feel good, to work happily?
* Jack: it would be interesting to go around -- i can start. we organize for international social justice organizations and movements. For what? to enable those people to use the internet as a beneficial tool in their struggles
* Hilary: I was thinking more about the "for whom": we can frame this as "for our members" or "for larger movements;" those different perspectives changes what we're organizing for, if we're thinking about broader social change vs serving member needs so they can do what they need to do.
* dkg: In general, saying that you're organizing against something isn't a positive perspective, but in addition to what has been raised, say we're organizing in opposition to centralized control of communications infrastructure. Looking at ways we can build in opposition to centralized controlling networks. There aren't that many groups actively thinking of the negative consequences; we need to be doing that, presenting an analysis for people to be aware of the risks out there.
* Jamie: you didn't ask "what am I participating for" but it's related; my participation in MF/PL is for a completely different world. I wonder to what degree the organization is working beyond just a different internet or for technology support, but for a completely transformed world.
* dkg: do you want to say something about the goals for that transformation?
* Jamie: a society that values people and life over profit; a society that values human relations, that isn't destroying the planet; one based on real justice and participation of everyone in a productive life.
* Josue: prefigurative politics: trying to live in the world that we want to see as a way of guiding how we work; dual power: creating institutions that are, while in this society, also side by side with it--how do we get more independence, create our systems so they can be maintained in spite of opposition, etc.
* Alfredo: the answer to this question 3 or 4 years ago would have been very different than it is today. part of the brilliance of what we did was to build in the flexibility to grow into what we are today. the progressive movement has changed dramatically in the last year, and the conscience of the USA is in the middle of a huge change. the average US'ian has very provfound doubts about whether the country can take care of them. The consciousness of people of color -- that the society doesn't want to take care of us, or that at any point you might be about to die. working with white folks surprised me to find that they didn't have that feeling. but i think a lot of people of all races have that feeling now.
This country can't solve its own problems. it hasn't been independent for ages, it's economy is interlinked with the rest of the world. how do we address this? the internet is one answer. it's an international mechanism we can use to address these concerns.
I don't believe we can make a revolution independently, but with the internet, that's a connection to the rest of the world that we might be able to use to create the revolution we need.
* Enrique: i'm old enough to have experienced the decline of socialism in europe. even when it existed in my infancy and after its downfall i've seen in my cmmunity multiple efforts to reach better living conditions under many struggles, most of which have had large setbacks,

and some that continue. some struggles have survived 2 or 3 generations of activists. One of my conclusions is that some of these struggles didn't have the conditions to let them bear fruit. From my perspective, for the last several years befcore knowing this organization, i was certain was that one of the conditions these struggles require is better communications tools, and with a possibility of collaboration that can now exist. With my experience in tech support, being responsible for operations in my organizations, i understand that we have responsibility to work on these challenges. not just tech transfer, but there is an intercultural dialogue necessary to take advantage of the growing capacity. There's also a challenge to bring information tools to the left movement in Mexico, to encourage them to see these challenges as part of the larger struggle. These are the conclusions that my own struggle has brought me to, and that's what brought me to MF/PL , and i think that our recent work has created a good relationship that allows me to feel happy and strengthens the bonds with our comrades here. This is tied with the emancipation struggle in mexico which is tied to the struggle in the USA.

* Aaron: we're shooting for a free, secure internet -- decentralized. This means we need it for political organizations, and for cooperative projects that have dignity for human life. We need this for groups that keep these objectivges in mind and real democratic process. in MX, we also need support in infrastructure to maintain secure communication. it's clear in mexico that there is a fragmentation , but i think this transformation requires a basic platform derived from infrastructure we don't reall yhave here in MX yet, because the service providers are all commercial and there is service available for social organizations. And this is a platform that we need, and the work on MF/PL is something we can take advantage of in mexico.

there are a lot of doubts. in mexico, we do have a government moving toward dictatorship; and each time we lose more liberties. the communications we're having in mexico are based on commercialized social networks, since there is no other method of getting to these technologies of free software, for example. There is a pool of ignorance, but many people in mexico are getting into free software, and starting to use and contribute to it. with the help of MF/PL , there are points where we can have distributed communication and support these goals.

* Rasha: I appreciate the folks who are taking notes on the etherpad. thanks! it's important and helpful to me remotely to be able to review the conversation. Helpful for me to read while listening.

* Rasha: I have an impulse to return to Juan Gerardo's questions: what do we organize for and for whom? Also, the question of the purpose of the organizing, a question for the goals of this conversation in terms of how we're thinking of who we organize for, what kinds of structures we need in place within the LC and MF/PL to accomplish that what and for whom. Also appreciate the richness of everything that people are discussing and sharing; provides context, we're all coming from different geographies and political realities. Part of my reality right now about these processes is that there's some degree of team building so that we can accomplish things on behalf of the membership; to that end I'm really appreciative. Some content is situational analysis that gives us a view of realities on the ground, as organizers in different political and geographical context, and also for the folks we work with. Where can we come back to some more content about situational analysis, politics, goals?

* Rasha: from my perspective, for what and for whom: as someone relatively new to MF/PL but coming from an organization that has long collaborated with MF/PL (Project South), there may be a few different ways to talk about it: what's happened and accumulated to this point, what's desired to focus on in the future. Membership seems like an important "for whom;" there are some "for whats" that come out of focusing on needs of membership. MF/PL has been flexible and responsive, which has been important for Project South and other wider regional efforts being supported by MF/PL folks. Flexibility to being open to taking on projects of tech support for folks on the front line of struggle within our membership.

* Rasha: observation= a tension that doesn't have to be there but can arise between

organizing for technology in support of fronts of struggle, and organizing for technology as a front of struggle itself--two different "for whats"--which speaks a great deal to dkg's points about centralized control, limits on access and infrastructure, privacy etc. Coming back to points from membership meeting and network gathering at Allied Media Conference (AMC.)

* Juan Gerardo: I conclude (if you allow me) that the majority of comments reflect that we're in the same frequency; we've spoken both of our mission and our vision. They are very well stated in everyone's comments. I do think that now, this mission and vision, if we contrast it with the priorities that have been discussed previously, I find there is a good link between what we have just said and whta we have as priorities for the LC for the present year. I do observe, nevertheless, that nobody has pointed out a significant weakness that we have if we're thinking of this mission with this vision: we're focusing the software part but we don't have a vision on the hardware. We can really work the software technologically speaking ,but what happens if we don't have access, if we are blocked from the hardware? What happens to our contribution of this possible different world which we've clearly stated in comments. We all believe in an alternative world possible, and that tech and communications can play a very important role. But what happens if we don't have access to the hardware, controlled today through patents, private ownership of technology. We should keep this in mind in this mission and vision that we've expressed. We must find an alliance with the organizations who produce the hardware we need: servers and so forth.

* Juan Gerardo: let's now speak about the structure; how can we get our priorities landed in programs or projects? That's where I believe the discussion of structure can begin.

* Hilary: are we thinking about structure on the committee or organizationally? (Both.)

* Juan Gerardo: structure begins with the role of the membership; then it goes to the LC and the subcommittees. Is it a goal, or a means, to carry out the priorities of our mission with our vision? that will make a big difference.

* Hilary: would it be helfpul to lay out where the structure seems to be, or start from scratch?

* Juan Gerardo: I suggest we don't go far too back, because there's been work and effort put into the structure.

 * Hilary: when i think of the role of the membership -- right now members pay dues that support the economic infrastructure and they get to elect leadership. i don't see many other roles.

* dkg: there are other roles that member can play; members can pop up, work on infrastructure work, propose new changes to how the organization supports its members; there are technical ways for members to plug in, happens but not frequently.

* Hilary: maybe we need to publcize that more?

* Jamie: members also participate in internationalization and support team

* Jack: i think i hear what you're saying about not going too far back -- it's a large can of worms to open and energy to be re-expended. It's hard for me because i think that the vision and mission we've expressed feels different from the structure we've set up thus far. I'd like to see a much less hierarchical, differently-structured organization. can we not have an LC, and just have an LC that people can self-select into, that members can get involved in without elections. our elections have been fairly flawed. as part of the democracy subcommittee, this has been on my mind. for example, i brought up term limits as a mechanism, and dkg disagreed. i realized i only wanted term limits because of the way that the LC is set up as it is, with the directors, co-chairs, sub-committeees, etc. in other projects that were less hierarchical, there are other (maybe better mechanisms) to prevent power from concerntrating. I know that making those changes is a lot of work, and i don't know if the organization is up for making those changes. but i'd like to see us move to a more flatcollective structure for the organization.

* Aaron: i have a question. would this signify horizontality, of having a concrete structure that would eliminate voting or consensus? how would we structure a commission that would organize and rotate membership?

* Jack: so many of those we would have to asnwer as a group. I would prefer a consensus-based decision-=making process. i would probably not involve elections. we'd need to have mechanisms for dealing with lack of consensus. I also think that i'm not advocating a structure-less organization, just that flatter or totally flat organization would be better (i've seen it work!). it takes a lot of structure to have a flat organization.
* Alfredo: where have you seen it work?
* Jack: the SRLP is the example i'm always coming back to. they are a movement-based organization who offers legal services.
* Alfredo: how big are they? 800, 500 members?
* Jack: they have a community that they work within. they have a staff and a collective (the difference is that staff are paid). it doesn't map exactly to MF/PL, but it's a good example of a functional group that does something similar.
* Alfredo: can you envision a very horizontal organization with 2000 members in it?
* Jack: yes, we can. SRLP doesn't have an official membership, but they do have a large body of people who are part of the community, but who are not part of the collective. I want to see the core committees as a subset, not as a hierarchy. I think of it as concentric circles.
* JAmie: based on jack's description, i'd describe the practice of MF/PL as a collective. we have staff (some are paid, some aren't) that meets weekly to do the work. we have co-directors, but we operate functionally based on consensus from conversations with in that staff. we've been working hard to change that over the last several years, in particular to try to make sure that our members have more control. That's the most important part. It's important that we do that. The way we've done that up to now is to have the membership vote on who is in the leadership committee to make decisions about how the organization is structured. voting isn't the only way, but it's one way to get the membership some sort of control over the organization.
* Jack: i'm not opposed to votes, i'm opposed to members voting on electing leaders, specifically opposed to the idea of an elected leadership committee.
* Juan Gerardo: I ask myself whether we as LC feel that being here is an issue of status or is an issue of responsibility to getting things done? If we feel that it is power or status, then I agree with Jack. It is not good to have a structure with a leadership committee, chairs, co-chairs, co-directors, etc. But if we perceive this as responsibilities, because none of us really get any advantage of being here; what are the factors that bring a group into some sort of conflict? First, the need to be here. Second, the real interest which each one of us has; if it is a personal interest and not a group interest (as reflected in the first quesiton) then you're going to have problems.Third, the ideology; if in the first question we reflected different idealogies, a structure would mean conflict, power, etc. I'd like for us to review that: if our structure is there for need of somebody, for personal interest, or for an ideological pursuit, then be aware of that structure. But if it's more a responsibility, one way of doing things that the members have pointed things out; is it a way of working together and dividing work.
* Roberto: I missed a lot of the conversation, frustrating because I've wanted to have this convo for a while. My recap: Jack suggested as flat a decision making process as possible; I heard Jamie replying that the practices right now may not reflect that perfectly but that's kind of the way of the organization, something we're working towards for several years.
* Joseph: I think there's a question of how you have a horizontal structure with such a large and diverse membership base.
* Juan Gerardo: there's a question of how we perceive as part of the structure; if we perceive it as a means to have power is one thing; if we perceive it as a means to serving and carrying out a responsibility tied with the priorities, that's another thing.
* Alfredo: i want to point to the base of my thinkning about this. i think that the reality of an organizastion is based entirely on its relationship with the larger movement of which it is a part. i think the momvement dictates what the organization is. I think the structure of the organization dictates its future its size and its role in that movement. I don't think this is

about making decisions in the organization alone. Because a horizontal organization makes much better decisions, because it's always smaller. I know this is a difference that i have with my niece Jack. I think there is a limit to what horizontal organizations can do. I think that MF/PL is going to be called upon to become a much larger organization in the next two or three years. i think our discussions about structure has to do with that. I think if you rip down the clothing of these discussions you come to the conclusion that the real question is "do we have to aggressively grow as an organization or not?" I think we do have to aggressively grow. Not everyone does. that's the difference that may "clothe itself" as this discussion. I'm not saying that Jack is trying to pull a fast one on us. I know she believes this issue. I think the base of the issue is "do we grow or not?" I think we need to discuss that.

* Joseph: I think you clearly want the organization to grow (Alfredo); why? What's the importance of the growth?

* Alfredo: it has to do with the other point that was raised: i believe that this society and this country is at the point of structural collapse. i don't know if it's 2 or 3 years. but that's teh next historical moment. our movement has those challenges i spoke about: having to converge as a movement (communicate with each other) and to merge with the other movements of this world, including of this hemisphere. I'm not alone on that; the bourgousie believes as well. which is why they're trying to control social media and obliterate the idea of free and open source software, and what "my brother in the whitehouse" is doing is trying to control the use of data and the ability to use it independently. I don't think we can make a revolution in this country or the world if we lose.

* Rasha: I'm hearing some situational analysis about political or strategic reasons to grow; has there been a risk assessment, analysis, strength and weakness about the ways and capacity of MF/PL to grow, and what that means? More members, more services, changing server infrastructure, etc? Has there been risk assessment, report, analysis presentation?

* Enrique: in my opinion, i find contradictory conditions. on one hand, the reality of the organization's daily tasks that we have to carry out, and which are done by a few people organized in a certain way(in different work teams), they take on the responsibility of the daily practice of the organization. on the other hand, we're certain that the technology that we're developing and maintaining can be the means to allow us to have better collaboration with the rest of the membership and those technologies could incorporate more participation by more people, which could tend to make us more horizontal. The decision on how to generate changes to the structure (and the directions they should take) should be a daily topic. it won't be resolved here today (or tomorrow) but it could be a project among the several projects we undertake that poses a continuous debate that will help us to see what alternateives exist. what i see in my experience is that attracting volunteer partners in mexico takes a lot of work, and requires a constant dialog, lots of meetings and workshops, and sometimes they have small attendance. and then i wonder how many people are actually interested in committing themselves and proposing initiatives. the majority are not in that frame of mind. based on that, i'm not sure that complete horizontality (a structureless without structure) doesn't meet the reality of our own membership. on the other hand, If we need to create structures to accomodate people who do want to contribute, even if they don't stay for longer than 6 months (but maybe others show up then), how do we have a flexible structure that allows new participants is an analysis that we have to make constantly. we can't come to a specific conclusion right now. it's importnat that we be aware of other organizations that have that structure, and to know about what problems they've faced to be sure that we can learn from them in the future to review and improve our own work.

* Hilary: in my experince organizing, iwhere I found horizontal participatory structures to work the best is smaller scale: a small group of people that have the same vision. Once you have a bigger and bigger group it becomes more complicated. The idea that even if you have a horizontal structure, there's the idea that hierarchy still exists in informal ways that can't be

addressed in the same ways because they are invisibile. It does matter how we approach being in this kind of a committee, whether we are here to serve our own political agendas or whether we are dedicated to serving the vision of the membership as it decides; that's a concious decions. Also more ways to give members entry to participate on committees, in feedback, ways to keep those lines open so that members always have more chance to be involved, create those kinds of mechanisms.

* Roberto: it's a balance to do this on a daily basis, and stay cautions about the effects on the orgnaization, and that the practice within the porganization reflects the world we want to create. when hilary says that the bigger the org, the harder it is to be horizontal -- the challenge is that when we do the daily practice, how do we incorporate that? if we say that a horizontal structure won't work when we are big, then if we're going to yield on that., then we have to take the time to really critically create practices and protocols so that it's not just theoretical that we're going to be vigilante. we need something concrete. on the other hand, there is an element of trust. in terms of the real and radical and ;... it's more than just being vigilant -- we need specific practice so that we don't succumb to existing oppressions. can we apply a bit of trust to let folks operate, and then be able to . sometimes, in this process, it feels likethere was a lack of clarity in how it was set up. we want that to be improved.

* Jack: responding to hjilary about informal hierarchies forming. yes, this happens in both formal and informal hierarchies. i'm not endorsing structurelessness. SRLP has a 39-page handbook and document about how processes work, and how principles guide the organization. it takes work to avoid having the informal hierarchies pop up. I'm also not advocating complete horizontality for the entire organization, because we're huge. It's more like the concentric circles i was talking about. i recognize that not everyone can contribute in the same way (or want to). I hear the discussion about people coming into the process withtheir own goals. But i think if the process is hierarchical, the means can end up prescibing the ends. I think that has happened in MF/PL, where some decisions that were harmful were made based on hierarchy. In order to have the kind of growth we're talking about to address the risks that alfredo discussed, i don't think becoming huge is the only answer. The risks of growth are not just related to capacity -- it's also a risk in terms of what it does to the organization -- more likely to sell out, compromise, ossify, etc. Lastly, this organization and structure is new. we're more flexible right now, and we can make changes now, which is why i'm pushing on this now. the longer we work in a given structure, the more it becomes difficult to change. now we can decide what we want.

* Enrique: i think that the circumtances of the reality, and i speak about the reality of mexico. a violent reality, some provoked by the state. some of our members, just a few weeks ago, experienced a lot of violence, kidnapping. the mafia,in their region, has targetted them with the aim of extortion. i would like to talk about the phenomenon of this, those fighting for human rights, who have in their networks many similar cases. activists in jail. when asked if we should grow or not, and how to grow, the answer i offer is thru this prism that i am seeing reality. it is very evident that we need to accumulate resources and gather forces quickly, grow. improve our procedures and organization, so that the internationalization committee and contribute and continue to contribute. i am in favor of doing it. all these orgs need to be part of networks such as MF/PL, that will enable them to face the risks, challenges of social transformation that is happening today. i think that for them it is more important the effectiveness with which they can get the support they need, that the procedures, horizontality, ... i received a letter from one of our members, commenting on how the current situation, esp extortion, does not allow us to pay our dues. i responded that that does not matter, how can we help? that is why i agree with the vision that alfredo has stated. we need to grow and put ourselves in that process. otherwise the goals of trasformation that we have stated remainout of reach.

* Joseph: a few of my points have already been stated, so i'm going to ask a question: How many of our members actually consider themselves members of a membership organization?

Most of us just look at us as a service provider. Is the structure by which the organization has been operating has caused that to a degree? That's an open question. I'm not sure what the participation was in the membership meeting, how many people voted, what percent it was of the total membership; what percentage of the membership is active? Could we get broad spectrum responses of how members look at the organization? Second point: only one of the membership points we discussed earlier is about growth at all (#2); how does the membership think the organization should grow? I don't know if the members would agree with the proposal that Alfredo outlined. Growth for growth's sake will impact capacity, finances, but growth for growth's sake might not match up with the members.

* Rasha: i have a connection -- i appreciate the realities and comments offered by enrique. also looking at the realities here in the South of the US, we're in an organizing drive to try to grow and strengthen organizing and communities across states and borders. i appreciate the urgency. there's a real call to do this. my question about a risk assessment is to try to highlight what type of growth is it? and i want to know how growth is balanced against stabilitiy and support for existing members. I don't have an opinion right now about how or whether MF/PL should grow, but i would second the observation that some members don't see themselves as members -- there is an "uneven consciousness".

* Josue: i don't know that I've been a part of a conversation at MF/PL where we talk about whether we're growing too fast, whether we should slow down growth, whether we should think about the size. My experience has been, we are bringing people in as fast as they come. There has been some activity where I've wondered whether people are wanting to slow growth, but I've never participated in that conversation. It would be a good one to have, especially if we are going to try to be proactive in doing outreach and promotion. I don't think that we're going to have a revolution this week, month or year, and frankly I hope not because if we do we won't like the world we're gonna get. It's really important for those of us that have the vision to really spend some time working on how we want the world to be. I don't want a world that has hierarchy. I do think that we need lots of practice if we're gonna know how to operate in ways that don't have hierarchy. I really encourage us to look at that. There are interesting examples of very large non-hierarchical organizations. It is fascinating what can be done. Gore-tex is one example of a multi-million dollar corporation that has a very clear structure that his not hierarchical. They have an executive director... I will share some links about Gore-tex. It is possible. I'm also intrigued by thinking about deciding how big it should be; if it gets to a certain size, splitting in half, having it be a relational network of organizations. A lot to play with if we decide to practice living in aworld we want to live in. (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/W._L._Gore_and_Associates, http://www.unusualleading.com/gore-tex-gets-made-without-managers-2/328, http://www.ukessays.co.uk/essays/management/study-of-wl-gore.php)

* Alfredo: we have at some point discussed this very issue. i've always envisioned us as a network of indpenent organizations. that's where we should go. the question is how do we get there? I'm not sure about this, but i think our growth has slowed considerably in the USA. Hilary and Jamie gave me a piece of paper that proves that our growth is what it was over the year.

* Hilary: that's not what that paper showed. it was one year of data, broken out month by month.

* Jamie: it was from 7 years, month by month.

* Alfredo -- that's how it is, though. over the years, i've been writing fewer welcome messages this year to people in the USA. the mexican members outnumber the recruitment in the US, so our recruitment has slowed considerably. this is not a problem. in my opinion, th problem is who we are recuriting and who we are not recruiting. if we are to become this network of organization, we need to bring into our membership a number of orgnaizations that have prestige, power, and prominence in the ocmmunity -- the ability to move a lot of people. if more of our members were like project south, we could do a lot more. The idea

that people in the organization don't know what a membership is, that's because a lot of members don't have an idea of hoiw a large organization functions. we tell the first person who walks in the door what our organization is all about. if that's a 5 or 6-member organization, that person might leave, and then a new member comes in and says "who are you and why aren't we using dreamhost?" because they don't know what we told the previous person. i just left the praxis project as tech directory, but i trained my replacement miles parrish so that he won't have this question. But there is another problem. I do not believe in growth for growth's sake. i believe in growth to address the conflicts and crises that we've talked about. I insist that we take some msort of control over our growth. i want to make sure we figure out who we bring in, from which sectors, which organizations. what is a risk assessment related to this? I think we need to discuss that. MF/PL has never been more secure and stronger and stable than it is today, even after having experienced fairly spectactular growth. the reason for that is because we have more people to recruit techies, to have work groups, to spend to pay for a day or two of labor a week as we go. As we grow, does that increase the risk, or does it increase the resources?
* Juan Gerardo: time check: it's 14:30. lunchh!!!!!!!!!!!!
general consensus for 30 minute lunch, we return at 15:00
* Returning from Lunch
* Juan Gerardo: some summaries from the previous conversation:
** Even though we have a commitment to build another world, strongly held in the mission and vision conversation, we should try to recognize we're not there yet. In this transitional period, maybe we need to keep working with structures and forms of doing things in ways that are not what we're trying to reach.
** Related to growth: if we don't have an organization big enough, powerful enough, our contribution to this new possible world will be insufficient; we cannot think of being a smaller organization, we cannot think of prioritizing at this moment these horizontal ways of doing it, although we should not forget it; tend to come closer and closer to a horizontal way of organizing. In this transitional period I don't know if we can risk doing this before having the weight we need.
** I believe what has been said brings us to thinking about some strategic planning, taking up what Rasha has pointed out about risk analysis around growth. A lack of a strategic plan might be something to bring out in the LC as a contribution to what the mission and vision will encounter in this year and following years.
** I think it's already clear and worrying many of us that the role of members has to be improved. We cannot rely on what members want and need if only 10% are really participating, which gives us an idea that only 10% feel and perceive themselves as members; the rest, perhaps only as clients.
* Juan Gerardo: it's clear there are two positions we still need to bring together: no structure and no hierarchy on one hand, not having enough member support to do that on another hand
* Joseph: with the horizontal suggestion, it's not a structureless suggestion. Horizontal is not without structure; just want to make sure that's clear.
* Joseph: rasha wants to call in and wants to try to connect roberto.
* Jack: seems like decisions were made in the summarizing. It might be what the group has been tending towards, but i don't feel that is what i am hearing.
* Jamie: agree with Jack but have the opposite conclusion. Democracy subcommittee needs some clear direction on where we are starting. Are we starting with: there is a membership, a leadership committee, a membership and the subcommittee figures out a structure. Or is the subcommittee tasked with figuring out how we do a horizontal structure?
* enrique: this discussion is not going to be resolved in this moment. it needs to be processed by the subcommittees formed today and tomorrow. as the work is divided in to subgroups, we will try to formulate proposals to deal with the ideas that have been generated. Secondly, i wanted to pose a response to what joseph said. he expressed a

concern that our capacity will be affected by growth that is not controlled or excessive. he pointed out that tech and finance capaicities (and i would also add the capability of our support team) -- but a growth strategy doesn't necessarily ignore these aspects. for exampole, it can be that the gfrowth is focused to grow our capacities, our income as well as our expenses, so a growth project could take these aspects into consideration. in mexico we have 3 comrades (adrian -- kosa, jesus franco -- tezcatl, and ivan) who are putting in an effort to strengthen our tech team in mexico. we have some resources from our members through their fees and we should be drawing plans this weekend to use those resources. what are they for? We need to stop thinking that the entire project of growth will be the sole responsibility of people who are in the USA. it will be a responsibility shared as long as we have a clear political position about the gowals we are aiming for an our intention for growth. we're not going to attain a growth that will bering new volunteers if we don't express the need to grow.
* Juan Gerardo: have we discussed this enough?
* JOsue: if we aren't making decisions about the structure, then it means we are keeping the current structure. Alternately, let us decide that we're doing sometihng different. better to articulate specifically and clearly rather than backing into a structure.
* Alfredo: i have a long term difference with jamie about what the membership has decided. I think that membership of MF/PL elected a leadership committee and wants it to continue until the next members' meeting. I don't think Jamie believes that, is not entirely sure that is the case. That's one thing we have to get right. I'd argue this: if the LC said you have to be the LC, you have no choice; you can't dissolve before the next LC. However, the LC can make a proposal for restructuring the whole organizatoin and present that to the membership; I think Jack should right that proposal, I will write a proposal explaining why I think Jack's wrong. My hunch is that if we approach it like that, as brilliant as my proposal will be, the membership will incorporate elements of both proposals. I want to know if Jamie is stuck on this idea that the membership has not mandated an LC? Is that the belief generally?
* Hilary: Didn't the membership elect the LC because that's what we told them to do at the meeting? (Yes.) So it is it the cart before the horse?
* Joseph: we created the structure of the LC and then asked them to vote on it.
* Hilary: we can't say that they decided to have an LC.
* Joseph: we created the structure of the LC; we just told them to fill the seats. They never got to choose whether an LC was the correct structure.
* Jamie: I don't think think anyone is proposing that we dissolve the current LC. I'm asking for direction for the democracy subcommittee. Are we proposing going down a path of reconsidering the fundamental structure of the organization? Or is the democracy subcommittee concretizing the decision-making structure of this organization based on the structure that exists, including an LC?
* Jamie: my opinion: we've had 2 elected LCs, we've strongly put forward a democratic movement within the organization, and we still don't have a ratified way of how decisions are made. It's critically important that we do that; we've gone far too long making it up as we go along. It's really important that this LC is able to put forward a process that people can vote on to say this is how we make decisions. I believe the LC is a critical component of the democratic process, particularly around accountbaility. The staff has power in the organization, that's not a problem because they do the daily work. What is a problem is that the staff is not accountable to the membership; we need that system in place. We've buit the LC over several years; we're at a point where we can make the staff accountable to the LC, we have a process for the LC to be accountable to the membership. I feel strongly that we should move forward in this system, provide something for the membership to vote on.
* dkg: I don't think we can come to a permanent conclusion; it wouldn't be healthy for the organization to do that. We need to think about things other than the structure of the LC at this meeting. That said, I don't think the LC itself is a critical component and I wouldn't want to see us claim that LC members could not propose a structure for the replacement of the LC.

If we don't have concrete proposals to discuss we could go around and around; those of us who are less comfortable with a hierarchy, myself included, probably need to come up with some counter-proposals that we can bring to the group and ask us to discuss. I don't want the Democracy subcommittee to be limited and not be allowed to do that; I also don't want to spend the entire two days of this meeting talking about, talking about, talking about, and end up disappearing up our own asshole.

* Juan Gerardo: it sounds like we need to resolve these things, we can't resolve it today, but it sounds like we need proposals to bring to the next membership committee and work with the subcommittees we have now.

* Joseph: i propose that this discussion goes to the democracy subcommittee with the understanding that the LC isn't universally agreed upon. and i think we also haven't discussed the subcommittees themselves and who is in those subcommittees.

* Juan Gerardo: do we agree? ok, we should go into discussion of subcommittees.

== Subcommittees ==

* Juan Gerardo: is it necessary to review which we have now?

=== Democracy ===

* Jamie: it's in charge of codifying our decision-making process and the democratic process of the organization.

=== Membership/Agenda ===

* planning LC meeting and agenda, reporting on membership meeting, and planning for the next membership meeting

=== Promotion/Outreach/Communications ===

* Jamie: this subcommitte is to figure out how to do outreach for members and potential members and a plan for how to do that.

==== Voluntary and Contracted Work ===

* In charge of developing a position on why we hire, why we don't hire, how we work with volunteers, and the roles those decisions make in our organization.

* Roberto: I don't want us to lose that we have a pending conversation about the internationalization team and language; is this the part to bring that in? Don't want it to get lost.

 * Roberto: I would propose Internationalization/Language committee: responsiility to make as seamless as possible that all communication both external and internal is translated, have clarity on both sides; I understand folks saying that all committees should work on that, but that doesn't allow for uniformity; especially when you're trying to do language with intention, there should be a structure that offers a birds-eye view of all the moving parts. Making sure that all the parts around language justice. It's important in an organization that is trying to be intentional about the political principles held up by language justice practice, it's important that there's a structure that allows for a birds' eye view, as opposed to language being siloed in a subcommittee; needs to ensure uniformity and best practices on all fronts; make sure entry points into the organization are all universally accessible. Not having that birds' eye view makes it easy to leave some things less accessible. Need to have a written out, assessed,

decided on standard practice for language justice.

* Joseph: is there a subcommittee that deals with the overall finances of the organization, or is that only handled by the staff at this point? (Only by staff.) If there's not a subcommittee for it, it should be something that the entire LC discusses; if we do all the organizing and infrastructure building, if we're not solvent, that's for naught. Not sure whether I want a finance committee or not.

* Mallory: it should probably be for all of us to be aware of reporting done around financial stuff; all of us should be aware of the financial situation.

* Rasha: I am uncertain about the division between promotion & communications and membership & agenda subcommittees as described; membership & agenda seems to focus around meetings, setting agendas for LC and membership meeting. The Description of promotion & communications seems to discuss strategic communication with members about goals; that's definitely interesting but not necessarily about promotions. I don't know where engagement with membership falls; part of the reason I signed up for promotion & communication is about those two first sentences which sound like much more susbtantive interaction with membership.

* Alfredo the way it was conceived, agenda/membership's committee was to set up the structures of the meetings that the membership participates in, incluiding the LC meetings. it's to decide the processes of decision-making because there were doubts about the current membership meeting structure meeting the needs of the organization and might fail. The supercommittee that oyu're referring to has several responsibilities: the communication with the membership and among the membership, and the communications between the members and the rest of the world. There is a political agenda behind making this division.

* Juan Gerardo: I'd like to propose that we include in the agenda & membership subcommittee something like strategic planning, which includes development of the political vision of MF/PL.

* dkg: All of these subcommittees need to be thinking about the political vision of MF/PL. The nature of the democracy structures that we organize will reflect the political vision; the promotion and outreach will reflect the political vision; all of these subcommittees need to keep political vision in mind, frame explicitly what political visions we're pushing for. We need to collaboratively work on the politics; that can't be relegated to one subcommittee.

* Jamie: I think what Juan Gerardo is proposing is that one subcommittee, meeting & agenda in particular, take responsibility for organizing this conversation with the rest of the LC in a coherent way that encompasses the entire LC. I'm hearing what Rasha has been asking: what is our situational analysis? What is our strategic thinking? Is there a document about this? The direct answer is no.

* Rasha: Yes! in the current description, it seems like the membership/agenda subcommittee needs to play a facilitation role. i agree with dkg that all these subcommittees need to play a part in the synthesis of strategic work for MF/PL. promotion/communications seems to be an organizing role; both bringing ideas and strategies from membership to the larger organization, and engaging members with organization projects and goals. is promotoions/ communications an example of talking about collaboartion and memberhsip around projects or is it just the membership meeting? are there other projects? i think there should be. My hope is that the whole body can engage with strategic planning, because it flows across the whole thing. there was a meeting at the allied media conference that felt much more substantive than just a workshop.

* Juan Gerardo: no subcommittee has a decisive function. every subcommittee processes, generates proposals, and brings them to the whole LC for decisions. I don't understand why anyone could think that the subcommittee could decide for itself -- it just generates ideas and brings it back to the larger group. when you talk about strategic planning it takes a longer time and can't be done just in a single meeting.

* Joseph -- this is the first time i've heard the subcomittees described as working that way.

that wasn't clear to me before, and i think there's also a question of permanence of the subcommittees. once the democracy subcommittee makes a proposal and it gets taken up by the LC and approved by the memberships, does the subcommittee go away?

* Jack - this is a broader reflection. when we talk about ideas, often there are requests to go out and write a proposal and bring it back to the group. i'd prefer to do more interactive hashing out collaboration together. at a meeting like this, we have an opportunity to work together, rather than disappearing and coming back and with a separate or countervailing proposal.

* Alfredo: here's another alternative: collaborative thinking is going on all the time; there is no such thing as an original idea; there is no such thing as individual thinking; it doesn't exist, it's a bourgeois myth. Our skill as activists and organizers depends on our ability to constantly be doing collaboratively thinking, so that when we break into committees, we're bringing the thinking of a lot of people into that small subcommittee. I've been doing this work for a long time, I guarantee I've never had an original idea in my life, so I intend to bring the thinking of tens of thousands of people to subcommitees. That doesn't mean it's the most efficient way of bringing that thinking together and that's a question we need to analyze. The quesiton is which structure functions best to assist the flow of that collaborative thinking. The reason for the subcommittees is that we have so much work to do that we couldn't visualize doing it as a full committee, so we short-cutted it.

* dkg: that shortcut is in itself creating additional work for all of us.

* Jamie: I think there's the same process under different names; breaking out into subcommitees and coming up with proposals is the same as rotating faciitation. That subcommittee is responsible for facilitating the conversation around that. It's important to have that rather than having all conversations in the big meeting.

* Mallory: I really like the name "strategic planning committee"; rather than focusing on the strategic part, which we're all doing, that committee (agenda & membership) distills out our strategic and political direction into planning, dealing with meetings, dealing with next steps. I don't think that it takes the strategy out of our other committees; just the act of being able to understand what the next step is, how to engage the membership in meeting form is what that commitee does.

* Hilary: are there other committees that people would want to form? Is there another proposal for a way to divvy this up?

* jack - i think it would be useful to restructure the committees. Hard to come up with this stuff on the fly. SRLP has a collective development team. what is the democracy committee supposed to do after it does it's initial job? there is always refinement, etc. Where can we shift responsibilities from one team to another. a finance team could be useful. it is one of the places that has been the least hands on in MF/PL. we don't think about fundraising, except with member dues.

* jack - the problem with proposals is that the expectation of having a finished plan to propose is not how i work

* Hilary - one suggestion is whether the democracy and membership committees could be merged. i think promotion and comms is too big for one committee, internal and external.

* Alfredo: the idea behind the promotion and communications would be that the internal communication feeds the external communication, and that they can't be divided. I was hoping that the subcommittee could agree or disagree with that, and that would start anohther conversation. Jack, the reason that i want concrete proposals and counterproposals is because that's how my mind works, having been trained over years. I need something more specific to work from, maybe with more specific examples of why it might be better one way or another. i need an argument.

* Enrique: for the voluntary/contracted work committee, it made sense to make a concrete document that we want to propose for discussion. if that committee will continue... we developed a document with an introduction describing the current condition of the

organization with regard to those topics, and we brought some proposals for how that might change. and we brought some proposals for other subcommittees that seemed to be relevant for their topics. the proposal for the promotion and communications committee ihas to do with the nature of the organization and how it can be strengthened. I don't know if in this moment, if i can bring this proposal to this meeting if we now start to re-think the subcommittees. what would be the purpose or use of this document and how would it be used for discussion. i think it's important if there is no alternative proposal to the 4 subcommittees it would be good if at least we could express what needs to be expressed from the proposal, and to hear what criticisms there are of the subcommittee structure itself. If one or more new subcommitttes need to be included, that would give us the opportunity to go into the process of creating an organizational structure within the LC. this would be the necessary aspects to begin the discussion instead of starting as though we have a blank slate.

* Hilary: Do we want to talk about these subcommittees each in turn, or do we want to split them up? We need to hit all these issues, and whether we want to do it all together or split up into small groups may be a way to move forward.

* Juan Gerardo: there are ideas coming up; could it be that these ideas, independently of how one may evaluate them, be an input for the subcommittees to work out instead of trying to today reorganize subcommittees and things? Could that be a way to move forward?

* Jamie: i will make another proposal for moving forward. let's say that subcommittees have a 3-month term and at the end of that term, we need to revisit the setup and decide what subcommittees we'll have. this is the first subcommittee setup we've had ever. let's make sure they're not permanent because i think people are hesitant about them because they seem permanent.

* Josue: are we talking about the four that we set up?

* Juan Gerardo: yes; internationalization is still pending.

* Josue: my friendly amendment would be that we also have the internationalization subcommittee for this initial three-month period.

* Juan Gerardo: calls for dissent or reaction, response?

* Roberto: should internationalization be part of that decision?

* Jamie: no, internationalization needs to be a separate decision.

* Juan Gerardo: the ideas that have been brought up should be taken [into account by the subcommittees as they currently exist.

* Jack: while we work, we should keep this in mind and not push them away. they should be part of the work that the subcommittees take up.

* Joseph: what gets a formal vote, and what doesn't get a formal vote? lots of this seems to be wait for disapproval?

* Alfredo: we have two extremely serious problems at MF/PL. First, one of our co-directors is going to disappear; he thinks he'll be able to work one day a week; (children make that hard!) Second, the staff of MF/PL needs to get some direction as to what we should do. The staff right now basically runs the organization; the co-directors run the staff, the staff runs the organization; the staff gets no direction from the LC. I insist that the LC has to give the staff some direction; we can't go on this way. That's one of the reasons why I'm pushing these committees, to get that direction; not having it is a dangerous situation. We need to think from a process point of view about what we can do here. We don't need to fix the Jamie, but we need to give someone the power to do that.

* Mallory: having been on the staff and in weekly meetings, I think the staff is the best body to run the organization. The staff should be directly accountable to the codirectors; that hierarchy makes sense, and I think that's what our membership would expect: the codirectors are running things, they get staff to help do that, the LC comes in for overview. We're already integrated a bit: some of staff and codirectors are in the LC; but more reporting to us, the LC, from staff would be helpful; quarterly at the most, just to know what people are working on, get a financial report, etc. Might also make our work more virtual, less dependent on phone

and face to face meetings.

* Juan Gerardo: i think this complements alfredo's remarks, but doesn't address jamie and his future.

* Jack - those are huge thiings we need to consider. if we can decide on subcommittees, then we can move to discuss the situation with jamie.

* dkg: I agree and also offer to babysit for Jamie if he needs it.

* Juan Gerardo: let's go back to the internationalization subcommittee. I agree that as a value of each of us and a principle of the LC and membership, we should of course have a profound respect for languages, cultures, so forth. What I doubt a little bit is that we need to have a subcommittee specifically for the language problem. If we have the value, principle, and respect for other cultures, why have a subcommittee that works on this? I do see the need for having an internationalization committee to connect, give voice, pick up the problems of other countries where we have MF/PL chapters. The subcommittee should focus on relations with the different countries. There may be specific country problems that need to be worked on before they are discussed in the LC meeting. That I think could be an important task for this subcommittee. If we were an organization that has as a mission intercultural affairs, of course language would be a priority, but we're not that type of organization, our mission is not in that direction. If we're going to approve this subcommittee, give it this other task.

* Mallory: my original comment was that translation work/internationalization is an important part of communication; those two committees would need to work very closely together. Might make sense to put that work into the communications committee. Second response, hadn't thought about what Juan Gerardo was just proposing; would support that as a twist to the internationalization committee.

* Josue: if this organization had started as a bicultural/binational/bilingual organization, the culture of the organization would have this attention to language. Since it is something brand new and we've added it on top of the organization that existed, it would make a lot of sense for at least the first three months that is paying attention to how we're integrating this new culture to the way we do the work. It will come up for every subcommittee; it will be helpful to have another body to ask for advice, get leadership and direction, so that we can imbue this into all of the subcommittees moving forward. In three months we can decide whether we still need it or not.

* Roberto: I agree that the internationalization committee should work on our relationship with other countries; when we're tlaking about other countries that don't share a language, we have to have a tight language structure. I would parallel this to MF/PL: one of MF/PL's goals is using technology as a great equalizer, as a tool for democratizing the world. I would offer that language justice does the same thing, serves the same purpose. When I hear folks say that's not our main mission, of course we're going to be aware of it, we're good political people, I think about how political technologists feel when people try to fit technology into other spaces, say "of course we're going to integrate it, why wouldn't we?" My point is to make this a parallel to the technology work, the history of trying to get folks who don't do tech work to understand why it's important, why it's not an add on thing that we don't assume will just be done. We need to do it right, we need to have intention, that means we create a container to do that. For the political and tech goals that MF/Pl is trying to achieve, then yes, we need a specific container whose job is to make sure that this very political piece gets rolled out in a way that meets our political goal, everyone's voice is heard, we have the structure to keep up the pace. If we're talking about our growth, we can barely keep up with the level we're at now. Someone has to bottom-line that structure, especially if we're going to go on a more international focus for growth, have more than two languages.

* dkg: I work with other international organizations that deal with people who speak many languages; most of those have punted on the language question. That's an American Football metaphor: they didn't actually bother to deal with the language question. We're in a situation where we have a politically-minded group of people confronting these issues and wanting to

deal with these issues; I think we should do it.

* Jamie: I'm in an interesting position of agreeing with what everyone has said except for the part about a subcommittee at the LC level. That's my point of confusion. Maybe this is the envisioned work fo the subcommittee; I think the LC should make a statement about our commitment to language justice for the organization and should provide a clear and broad directive to the staff on the value and importance of it. If that's the envisioned job of the subcommittee and we feel a subcommittee is necessary, I think that's good; it's not the job of the LC to implement these plans. We have a staff internationalization team who we met some of and who needs all the support we can get. It needs the support of the LC so that we can tackle, with the direction of the LC, these difficult implementation details. My main question is: is that the envisioned scope that people have for an internationalization subcommittee? If not, what is the scope?

* Rasha: I heard there's an internationalization team on the staff--awesome, but the first I hear of it. Who's responsible for setting up the translation on LC emails, or for this meeting, or for produced materials? Is that the same group of people who's repsonsible for translating support.mayfirst.org? If there isn't going to be an internationalization subcommitttee on LC, who are the people doing it, and how do they know what the scope of their work is.

* Jamie: the internationalization team had three meetings in prep for the LC meeting; we're largely responsible for the mess of computers and speakers on the table. We spent a lot of time trying to figure out how to provide simultaneous translation in person and remote. This is the same team that translated all docs for membership meeting; that was the first time the internationalization team really coalesced around a project. Everyone who came to the membership meeting appreciateds the enourmous amount of work they did. The internationalization team hasn't taken on how translation works on the LC email list.

* Roberto: the i18n manages to do this and has been doing work and holding it down, and i would also offer that the work doesn't meet the scale right now, but part of that is capacity. they need attention to get there. the scope of a 3 month subcommittee should be comprised of some langugae folks and some tech folks to come up with a comprehensive langugae plan for the organization. we've had some conversations about the use of SMO ticketing as a translation pipeline. we've talked about what kinds of equipment MF/PL should have to work with. 3 months to come up with a concrete proposal that works within our resources and politics is the scope i'm asking for. then we can get a plan and an outline. on a personal level, i'm really jazzed about mf/pl and being on the lc. but on a personal perspective, the subcommittees are good but none of them take advantage of what i can provide, my linguistic experience. And i would happily work on any of them, but here we have an opportiunty to transform and transition MF/PL to create a plan or an outline that can work as a baseline or foundation for future work.

* Jamie: I think your proposal of the document that should be written is an excellent one and we should do it; the problem I have with the LC writing that document is that we have an internationalization team of volunteers who have worked hard over the last six months and they want to write this document. If we come to them and write this document and ask them to implement it, then we have an organizing problem. If we as the LC comes up with a vision and then ask the internationalization team to write the plan, we'll be more effective in our organizing efforts.

* dkg: that means the internationalization team IS the group providing leadership in MF/PL; we should honor that; if there's an LC subcommittee they should engage the internationalization team. The idea that an LC subcommittee does not work with the team to come up with a plan would be a mistake.

* Juan Gerardo: there are two parts to this discussion: the ideological/political part, which I think has no real debate, and the logistics part. If we agree that the political ideological part has no debate, then it would seem like the task is a staff task; the other part corresponds to the staff as it has been happening. I would propose that we continue that way, and that if it is

needed to give the staff part, the logistic part, a more clear and profound vision of the importance of language justice, that be done. If you want this internationalization subcommittee to do that for three months, that wouldn't be any problem. That would not interfere with what the staff has been working on and has prepared.

* Rasha: it makes sense that a team and subcommittee work together; but without a specific structure on the LC level to work through, it's unclear how cncerns on the staff team can have a clear voice on the LC. That's also a reason for having a subcommittee to coordinate with whoever s ww

* Jack: is the i18n team staff or volunteers?

* Jamie: staff is people who attend the weekly staff meeting and commit to regular weekly labor that the organization needs. there are two teams that work as part of staff: support and i18n. there are only 3 paid people: ross, hilary, and dana.

* Josue: is there one person who can communicate between the staff and the i18n

* Jack: side point: way that we refer to "staff" confuses me. This whole thing points to some of the difficulty of what i see in MF/PL. i just don't get the structure. there's no tech subcommittee on LC, but some support team members are on the LC and others aren't. some of these decisions aren't serving us well. I hear from roberto, who is perhaps more dedicated to language justice than anyone else here, thinks we need this language subcommittee. If he sees this, i think we need to defer to his judgement. It would be like if i came to MF/PL and said we need to work on gender identity work, and people were to dismiss that, i would be pretty pissed off. I'm not articulating it well.

* Alfredo: you said that the work groups aren't doing us well.

* Jack: no, i think they are doing amazing work, and the folks in those teams are doing excellent work, and if we're not including those people in the LC decision-making process, then the divisions within our organizations aren't serving us well.

* Roberto: every organization has its own strategy and history; every organization progresses and matures and develops. Even though I believe in the opportunity i also believe that there's a possibility that MF/PL maybe hasn't reached the right point in its trajectory to be ready for the capacity or political will to integrate these issues and work with them in a concrete matter. And maybe the day will become when that is possible, and then we will be ready to do the work.

* Enrique: even though the time we dedicate to preparing our proposal in the voluntary/paid subcommittee we already had experiences to share based on what we've done for mf/pl, and with other organization, the document we brought with us has proposals for the outreach and communications subcommittee i see the advantage of creating the i18n subcommittee based on the experience we've accumulated during the last (year?) and roberto's professional experience can generate ongoing proposals for other subcommitees. the only thing that we need to be clear about is what level do the proposals work? the strategic proposals within the LC should have a certain profile, and when then i18n team (at an operational level) shares those directions then we're talking about a different level. Jamie's preoccupation in thinking that if there's clarity we can deal with this on both levels, then i'm in favor of the i18n subcommiteee and i think we need to endorse it.

* Juan Gerardo: let me ask the committee: would we feel ok with agreeing to having the i18n subcommitee work for 3 months in a complementary way with the i18n team (that is to say, not to substitute or repeat the work that the team has advanced), and we'll see with the other subcommittees in 3 months how it goes.

(We all agree.)

* Alfredo: we need to figure out what the subcommitees are going to do tomorrow.

* Alfredo: the staff is in very bad need of direction. We've had tons of meetings related to the USSF; it gives an idea. Joseph and I check in with Jamie and Enrique, we try to collaborate with the staff, but we don't have an overall leadership committee direction as to what to do right now. That's the kind of stuff we need from LC. It would be much easier to do this kind

of work with direction from the LC. There are a million things those subcommittee could do to clarify the direction we should go in.

* Hilary: which subcommittee does that fall under? are you going to say promotions and outreach? everything is there and it's driving me crazy.

* Mallory: the proposal about what to do tonight and this morning. tomorrow morning there is going to need to be a review. maybe we could write up the description for the new i18n committee before tomorrow but i don't think we need to write up tonight.

* Joseph: other members of the i18n-team are committed to other subcommittees

* Jack: this is in response to the possibility that communications and outreach gets thrown everything related to the outside world. that committee is getting overloaded. The more i see being put on that subcommittee the more i worry about it. maybe there are separate things that need to be addressed.

* Hilary: the thing about that committee more and more is that other committees have discrete tasks and that one is so broad; i wonder if we could do the discrete tasks indpendently and then put the broader work on the shoulders of the LC as a whole.

* Alfredo: we don't have options here; something has to come out of these committees immediately because we have a staff that on Monday goes back to work. What I'm proposing is that we limit the expectation that we have of these various committees. We have been limiting the expectations of the promotions and communications committee. I don't think any of these committees is going to finish these works. The question: what do the committees come out with the at least allow staff to function? I don't want the staff to continue running the organization without some acknowledgement, blessing, and direction from the LC. I think that's bad for three months. We have to give some direction to the staff; these subcommittees can help with that. I don't expect a big plan. We do need to rethink the promotions and communications committee. The staff can't just continue running the organization by itself on Monday morning.

* Enrique: i think it is necessary that the subcommittes offer some sort of direction at the end of tomorrow. I think that the promotion and communication subcommittee receives too many proposals and has too much weight. your mission would be at least to process the proposals and return them as rubrics of work that might systematize the proposals (sort of a triage?) this would allow us in a larger LC session to clarify the general exit strategy for that committee, to help it figure out how to do its work over the next 3 months. for exmaple, we might need to figure out how to put more people into the subcommittee or to see what we have from the rubrics that come out of it. the results should help us clarify the decisions we have to make.

* Hilary: Who is interested in being on that committee? it's not clear who the members are yet. How are we going to facilitate each subcommittee meeting tomorrow? You're asking this one committee to decide the staff role in projects; the other subcommittees are dealing with bigger issues; this feels like too much for three people on the promotions & communications subcommittee.

* Juan Gerardo: we're trying to anticipate what will be discussed tomorrow. i agree with alfredo that every subcommitee should try to have projects that go to the staff. one part of our job is to forsee jobs that need to be done in the future. but each subcommittee should propose specific tasks that go to the staff. one way or the other, proposals need to be operated; maybe some in short term, some in long term; but in either case, it has to go through the staff.

* Joseph: Rasha says she'll be on comms/promotion. I had the same feeling as Hilary. I don't know what direction my committee needs to give to the staff; I have the same ideas about the democracy committee. It seems like what Hilary's committee is doing is much more staff oriented.

* Alfredo: i have a proposal. what if each subcommittee were in its own way to assign the staff a responsibility that the staff would implement and report back to the subcommittee? then the subcommittee can discuss its own work and figure out its own plans. the byproduct

(goal?) is to have more integration between the staff and the LC. it would give us more information and would help us figure out what each subcommittee and the staff should do.
* Jack: the whole meeting has clarified in alarming ways what the structure was supposed to be: mallory says that the staff should be running things, because they're good at it. I don't feel comfortable giving the staff assignments. this division between staff and lc feels like a division between labor and vision, which i really don't like. the people doing the work need to be the ones to make that decision. I didn't understand my role on LC to be to assign tasks to staff.
* Alfredo: Dropeth my jaw.
* Enrique: how i see it comes from previous information. the codirectors invited the staff to be here today to participate in this meeting as observers, which is one form of making participation. On the other side, whatever members have the prerogative or right to participate in the election of the LC, i think those are bridges that are there that make this division between the LC and staff not be what you describe. it makes them not be a hierarchy. on the contrary, i tihnk there are enough bridges that already exist. Dana's presence, for example, and the rest of the staff that are also part of the staff that are here demonstrates that. how i see it, those member organizations that want to be part of the activity of MF/PL of the staff that more than 30 people support, what they have as alternatives for these organizations is to participate in the election of the LC and not only to give strategic direction, but i think that not all members are able to participate on the operating aspects even if they want to. how do you then make that link between the day-to-day work and the membership? there are different channels to do that, and one of them is the LC. I don't see it as a hierarchy, i see it as the responsability to go back to MX and report the discussions we had and the aggrements we had, but i don't feel uncomfortable with it. I don't feel uncomfortable having a little bit of authority; on the contrary, i feel more responsibility as a result, to make the members in MX into participants in these debates. The promotions/ outreach work is very important and related to that. For that reason, this structure that we have now makes sense, even though i do believe it can be improved.
* Alfredo: What surprises me is that i see a contradiction between the traditional contribution you (jack) have made to these discussions and what you just said. I've always thought of you as a person who is intent on making sure that the LC is respected by the staff. You made a huge proposal to this effect last year, and were heading up a workgroup last year to do that. I've always felt that you thought the leadership role should be respected. The problem is that we can't have a staff running this organization with the structure we have because the LC is in place to make those kind of decisions. no one is saying that the LC needs to give staff day-to-day direction. that's the codirector's jobs. the LC needs to give staff broad strokes of what to follow and those aren't currently well-defined enough.
* dkg: If there are people who are doing the work in the organization, I fully believe that htose people need to be empowered to make the decisions about the work they're doing. Also, as someone who does work, I realize you can lose sight of your bigger picture goals and can just not know what to do. I would like to think of my role on the LC as being a sounding board for people who are trying to do work and are concerned they're losing sight or don't know what the next steps are. As someone who does work, I very much appreciate the idea of a committee of people who can give me direction and point out where things are going wrong. As someone on the LC I feel very uncomfortable being in a position of authority to tell people what to do.
* Jamie: Jack and I had a really meaningful conversation during the FBI raid where she expressed her appreciation to Jamie for being in a participation of risk of going to jail; I said "me being in jail would be bad for me, but since you're on the LC that gave me direction for what to do it woul dbe worse for you." That's what I appreciate from the LC. There are two things that sound different but are the same thing: I'm going to tell you what to do, and I'm going to share the responsibility for what happens. As someone who does the work of the

organization I need a big group to share the responsibility with me. I can't do my work without you telling me what to do.

* Juan Gerardo: there is also a difference in commitment between a person as staff who is not a member of the organization, and a staff member who is also a mayfirst member. if i were in the staff and not a member of the organization then it means i don't care to decide what needs to be done. i'm only interested in doing what the LC asks me to do. But if i'm interested in the decisions, then i would commit myself to sorting out what MF/PL does and to do it. those who wanted to be here are commiting themselves to being part of the organization or to being here have a different perspective.

* dkg: to clarify: ross is not here because of a ban on travel from MA, not because of any lack of commitment.

* Hilary: the way i saw it was that the membership elects the LC, which is tasked to translate the interests of the membership into tasks that the staff carries out. One thing that could mitigate the separation of duties is to make sure that representatives of support team, internationalization, and staff is to make sure representatives from them are heard at the LC, some way to provide feedback. It is strange that we don't incorporate the support and internationalization teams into this in a formal way. Maybe this is part of something that the democracy team would consider or think about as potential

* Jack: responding to what jamie said before about the symbiotic need of staff and LC. i'm almost on the verge of being disruptive to the process - i'm realizing that maybe this isnt' the right process for me. at SRLP, the entire staff was a part of the collective. they always did get in a two-way manner directive from the rest of the organization. they were invested with the same level of decision-making power as the rest of the larger body. What hilary suggested about integrating staff into the LC would be an important step for me. I'm not sure i can keep being part of the process if that doesn't happen.

* Mallory: but collectives aren't the only way to organize

* Jack: I understand, but I might not be able to participate in this structure.

* Alfredo: i don't want to see people leave the LC because they're having trouble with it. Jack, if you're on the LC, please stick it out and make the changes. leaving is not a good alternative.

* Juan Gerardo: i agree with Alfredo - the questions you raise make us think and reconsider. i may have many proposals that may not be accepted, but that does not mean that i leave. i think your

* Joseph: I think characterizing what she's feeling as a "sore loser" is inappropriate. She's expressing disagreement with a process and is disagreeing with how the organization is being structured.

* Juan Gerardo: I didn't mean that. I don't know why it came across that way.

* Joseph: I think that it did; I think that Jack has been ganged up on all day.

* Alfredo: it didn't come across that way to me. there are serious political differences here, and there are people who put a lot of work into the organization. What juan gerardo is saying is that what she is saying is making important contributions and her influence will be felt (eventually)

* Jack: what i'm saying is not that i would leave because my proposals don't get agreed upon, i'm just saying that i'm realizing what kind of organization is happening here. And i think that there are forms that i can work in and forms that i can't. I didn't mean to be disruptive with a threat of leaving, i just wanted to make clear what i'm expecting and what i feel like i can contribute.

* Mallory: I come from a collective background as well; it's good to be inspired by where we come from. My collective experiences have been varied but mostly awful; that hasn't inspired me, but people who have had good experiences with different types of organizing should be bringing those perspectives in, especially at the leadership level. It's hard to reorganize MF/PL entirely, but we have power and control over the LC today, tomorrow, and for the next

three months; we can perhaps influence that structure with things that inspire us. It's hard for us all to think about large restructuring. No organizing structure is perfect, most have to make compromises. We're not one thing or another; we're an amalgamation, and that comes from the perspectives of different people here.

* Enrique: a proposal from a few hours ago: the proposal was that we contemplate the projects we're going to disucss tomorrow, that we contemplate a rubric of proposals to resolve the debates around hierarchy, democracy, structure, participation and control of membership in our processes. This is about a continual analysis going on throughout the year. It will allow us to have a better understanding of the alternatives we have and the experiences that other organizations have had about participation and structure that are not necessarily being represented....we need a lot of dialogue; for that reason we need to work on our proposals...hope that we have the maturity to do it.

* Juan Gerardo: anything else? Tomorrow morning we'll try to review quickly what we'd like each subcommittee to produce during the day/morning; as soon as possible, start with the proposals of each subcommittee. We'll be breaking into subcommittees, but before that we'll have a short discussion on what's to be expected, taking into account what we just discussed about our needs.

09:00 tomorrow--coffee, bagels, etc
10:00 meeting starts