May First/People Link Leadership Committee Meeting
10 February 2013

https://pad.riseup.net/p/mfpl-lc-comms-2013-03-10

GLOSSARY OF TERMS/ACRONYMS:

LC = leadership committee
i18n = internationalization (adapted from Drupal/other software projects, 18 letters between the "i" and final "n" in "internationalization."

* Alfredo: would like to propose:
** Break up into groups
** Take two hours in those groups, until about 12:15-12:30pm EST
** Then evaluate whether we need more time.
* Who's going to what groups? We've got five groups. You can be in 2-3 groups, but it probably makes more sense to be in just one today since we've only got 2 hours.
* dkg: how are the remote folks going to participate in the groups?
* Jamie: Aaron and Rasha aren't online yet.
* Jamie: Unlike yesterday we've got a wealth of interpreters and technical expertise; I suggest we divide into groups without regard to logistics, then evaluate whether we can logistically accommodate that.
* Mallory: What groups are they in?
* Jamie: Aaron is in the job volunteer group, rasha is in both democracy and outreach/communications
* Alfredo: can we proceed along those lines?
* we have 5 working groups - Democracy - jamie, jack, dkg (rasha and mike are also on this team but not yet present.)
* Enrique: i have an observation -- the voluntaqry and contracted work has questions for other committees.
* Enrique: we want to plan what we can do with the leadership committee, but the only thing that
* Alfredo: i don't think that there will be a problem with that
* Josue: What Enrique is saying is that we did our job! (jokingly) 2.5 hour meeting on Thursday night was part of this. For our committee to move forward would be for us to actually look at our proposal; we're interested in participating in other committees.
* Joseph: does our committee have work to do?
* Alfredo: yes, it does
* Jamie: Hilary prepared the financial statements for last year; we've got copies here. Not making a proposal or sure how we do this; just letting LC know they're available and can be included in the agenda.
* Enrique: i have a proposal that would bring forward for the communications committee that is very pertinent. we need to share with each of you what we will be sending around. i don't want to disrupt the process of the committees' work, but i want
* Alfredo: promotion and communications: : Hilary, Mallory, rasha, Enrique. (Jack is interested in being on it but is supposed to meet with another subcommittee.)
* Voluntary and contracted work: that work is done (for the purposes of this meeting)
* Membership and Agenda: Alfredo, Joseph, Juan Gerardo
* Internationalization: Roberto. dkg and Joseph are interested in being on it but also are supposed to meet with other subcommittees. Also any internationalization team members who are here and aren't translating can meet with that group.
* Jack: since we made a point of the interaction b/w i18n subcommittee and team, shouldn't

members of the team who are present feel free to participate in the subcommittee.
* (group agrees)
* Jamie: Aaron was in the jobs committee; he's not online right now; someone needs to monitor when he comes online so he can be included and connect with a subcommittee. I would propose we assign him to Internationalization subcommittee, when he comes online we can check with him to see which team.
(logistics)
* Enrique: all the committees are confirmed. i'd like to ask your opinion what committee should send a proposal to form a cooperative that represents mayfirst in mexico? we're making at different times a growth process in mexico. we're at a point where we can't continue depending on just one person for all the administrative work in mexico (myself) -- the fiscal administration, etc. we have a proposal to put together from our mexican membership a cooperative process to represent mf/pl in that country. what subcommittee would be appropriate to go over this proposal?
* Alfredo: does this go to a subcommitee
* dkg: my understanding is that subcommittees are coming up with proposals to bring to LC as a whole; this sounds like a proposal that's coming to LC as a whole. If there's a subcommittee that Enrique has questions for and would be relevant to to refine it... I don't know what state the proposal is in, if Enrique has been charged to set it up himself, get feedback, etc; if there's a subcommittee that you'd like to take it to, go for it.
* Roberto: if it's already made (a final plan) then our committees aren't following exactly where this would need work if it's already ready/.
* Alfredo: what if we take enrique's proposal first when we reconvene?
* Enrique: the proposal wasn't written out in e-mail, but we can present it here.
* Alfredo: we did approve a 3 month work period. no one is expecting any subcommittee to completely transform society. some subcommittees might need specific stuff. some might need a generalized plan. Don't Panic! the LC itself will take it up. We can discuss what to do if a subcommittee is overwhelmed.
* Juan Gerardo: If I may suggest, we try in each subcommittee to define a goal for the project; the resources required, if possible; the benefits expected; what priority it should have; and, if someone has an idea of a budget, that would more or less give the LC enough information. As much of that is possible (Mallory: kind of like a chart.) If you only get to goals and benefits, that's where you got to, but if you can complete more it will be easier to analyze.
* Enrique: perhaps mallory could show us her proposal format? it could be useful for the other subcommittees
* Mallory: It should be freeform, but wanted to identify what we're already doing plus new proposals; if there's any cost; who would be responsible for the activity; which priority does it correspond to; goals, outcomes, benefits could also be included. Every group can decide depending on the discussion.
* Hilary: because we haven't really developed a process for how we're working in the LC there wasn't clear guidance on what kinds of reports would be useful. In terms of budget or finance, if there are specific requests for how to lay things out, maybe we can think about that so that next time we can make sure we have stuff here that helps people plan.
* (logistical discussion of where subcommittees will meet)
* Breaking out into small groups; groups will try to post notes in separate pirate pads with links here and in IRC. Reconvening at 12:40pm ET.

We're back!

Plan:
* Hear proposals from Mexico members of LC

* Break for lunch (~30 minutes, possibly less)
* Come back together for subcommittee report-back

Proposal from Enrique/Mexican members
* during the last year, the Mexican members of the LC have been discussing - administrative, financial concerns
* we have an anual cycle
* the members in Mexico have started paying their dues for the following membership cycle
* the process has a shortcoming: it's depending principally on me (Enrique). I'm in charge of finances, communicaitons with Mexican members, discussions about fees, technical support... workshops on the infrastructure of MF/PL. Those are the principal tasks that I've undertaken.
* That is a structural weakness that we need to work on. We need to see who of our membership wants to strengthen the organization of MF/PL in Mexico. I'm sure that there are people who want to participate in this way.
* We need to know how to come together and formalize an organizational space that has a legal representaiton, takes on the administative tasks for our organizaiton in Mexico.
* Members of the LC in Mexico have had 4 meetings since December
* (missed some notes)
* We want a form that fits within our form of membership in Mexico and the US
* [notes above this line are probably less accurate than notes below this line! --jack]
* we want to make a legal cooperative to represent the group.
* legally, the way we operate in mexico is through an intermediary, who has the ability to process funds. we are forced to find an alternative. It begs the question, how much are we expanding and how?
* we have 7 (?) points to set up this cooperative.
* the cost is minimal -- we need about $200 to do so, and possibly we need to add a couple other costs (food, travel, etc) to make the process complete to see who is interested in joining. It won't represent more than $500 maximum.
* that's why we feel principally that this is a political decision to take place and we ask that this action be taken today.
* Juan Gerardo - i want to add to the risk analysis piece, having Enrique be the only person in contrast to having a coop. Up to a 32% income tax level if you are an individual. A coop, though, has two options: each of the members divide the revenue or the coop declares. if a coop makes a tax declaration, it has many ways of including expenses to lower the tax implications. Or dividing it among 50 people, your tax implications are much lower also. Many members will also evaluate a proposal like this if it is coming from an entity like MF/PL. The former La Neta members had relationships with Enrique, there was less issues with trust. For new members, though, having a coop would provide more legitimacy.
* Juan Gerardo: in DF now, there are new programs for promoting cooperatives that might be able to provide additional assistance, equipment, etc.
* Jamie: legal question, not political: does the legal form of cooperative in Mexico require a certain form of decision-making?
* Juan Gerardo: there is a Mexican law for cooperatives. The law has the principles and values, legally stated in the law. It has how a coop should be administered, what decision-making the general assembly has, and what decision-making the administrating council has, akin to the Leadership Committee in MF/PL. Those are both legal forms of administration in the Mexican coop law. There are certain criteria for managing the cooperative by law. But when you write your bylaws, you can complement or detail what the law states on management, administration, internal controls, etc; the members together complete the bylaws in accordance to the needs of their coop and how the members want to administer and control activities of the cooperative.

* Enrique: to complement what juan gerardo said, the coops are comprised by members interested in joining individually. the cooperative would not be comprised by orgs but rather by individual members of those organizations. another important aspect is that we've contemplated a specific type of coop that is a coop of consumption. those who join this type of cooperative do so to obtain a service or product at more favorable prices, for example wholesale goods for later distribution. we feel that this figure is adequate for what we can use because it gives us a legal framework we can use for the services we provide to the membership. it doesn't align directly to the political values we bring to the membership, but there is no framework in MX that does that. not all members would be interested in joining, but this would create a relationship of benefits of the groups that members would have. if we could get 10 members, their membership would be voluntary, and their contributed work (also voluntary) could impact the rest of the membership.
* dkg: it sounds like you've thought this through; it sounds reasonable to me. Two clarifying questions: I don't know what the framework is for membership for these coops. Would the rules for coops require that you accept new members who just want services at reduced pricing without having joined MF/PL as members? (No, says Enrique. Enrique agrees that it's not just a flood for members who want cheapest service.) Second question: are there other legal obligations imposed [by the coop form]? E.g. does it provide an extra hook that law enforcement officers could use to get at data, equipment, servers? Any additional catches like that?
* Juan Gerardo: The coop is not obliged to incorporate as a member everyone who receives the internet services [from MF/PL], neither by law nor coop practices.
* Enrique: i think there is no difference in legal terms the obligations or rights that we already have at this moment. in any case, there is a political difference in the circumstance of being a cooperative will allow us better political position to confront legal issues.
* Mallory: I think that having more than one bank account, just managing ourselves financially in more than one country, is a problem; I also recognize that because dues in Mexico are low, we do need some way of collectivizing the money so we don't get killed in wire transfers. E.g. it wouldn't be tenable to set up one bank account in the U.S. because of the bank transfer fees eating so much of the dues. The political side of being in two countries should not depend on where the bank accounts are; we do however need a bank account in Mexico because we need to be able to collectivize those funds, buy equipment, etc. My worry: because I think bank accounts and borders are a construction we shouldn't worry about, I worry about all the hoops we need to jump through, work we need to go through, so that you're not incurring a huge amount of income tax on that bank account. I don't want this to bleed into us having to conform into the rules and legalities of being a nonprofit in the US AND a cooperative in Mexico and have to manage that all the time; it seems like it would be a huge waste of time and we should avoid it.
* Joseph: follow-up to Mallory: how is money currently handled to send money to Mexico for servers etc?
* Jamie: the current system offers the members in MX for 1 year in which we did not ask them to transfer funds to the US. we provided them access to our server to be able to collect and spend the revenue without a requirement that the finances have to come to the US. i made this decision as director, and enrique and i have continued it as co-directors. to date this year we haven't requested or received any funds from MX.
* Mallory: your intention at this point, a year later, was to ask members to start paying via PayPal to our US account?
* Jamie: No. Because of the legal requirements in Mexico, we determined that it is not practical and also...I've spent hours on the phone with Enrique explaining what a factura is, it can't just be translated into English. We determined that not only for cost reasons, but for political and tax reasons Mexican members need to pay a Mexican entity for their dues. That's why we decided we need a bank account in Mexico. I don't consider it viable to

change to Mexican members paying to the US

* Jack: i think that there is a political importance to having a mexican entity that's formal in some way (inc. a bank account) -=- i hear what mallory is saying that these things are constructs, but they have an impact. and i think that this proposed framework might help us confront some of the imperialist/colonialist challenges that we struggle with; I think it has political impacts in addition to financial/tax impacts.

* Enrique: this is an issue for many of our members in mexico. what they need is to get a reciept and there isn't any receipt, except for reciepts that go throught the gov't. the tax system in mexico is based on the consumption that people make, not on income. for the gov't to get its taxes from the consumption., it needs to have influence and control on the consumption and receipts. it's a gov't authorized receipt. we've had experience with members in .ni and other coiuntries in latin america with simialr systems, where we cannot offer a receipt about (.e.g) a paypal transfer. they need to deposit it in mexico, and receive a factura. the funds we've had in our bank account cover our spending for taxes and the annual meeting. so to pay MF/PL [...] they need to plan the use of the assets that they have.

* Mallory: Enrique brought up the point: MF/PL has members outside of US and Mexico. Hard to do outreach to them for two reasons: 1) we're asking international progressive orgs to host websites in the US subject to all our shitty laws about content etc, and 2) about money. E.g. with Palestine, there are a few members who pool their dues together and do one wire transfer to Mallory, because you can't do online banking in Palestine, no PayPal allowed in Palestine, wire transfers are the only option. There are peculiarities in many different countries. I think it's worth going through a lot of effort for Mexico, but this is an issue for lots of countries.

* Rasha (by proxy via Joseph): how does this question relate to the idea yesterday that MF/PL may develop into a regional network of coordinated nodes? There was a discussion yesterday about growth where this came up, that MF/PL could evolve into a more decentralized structure or a federation of infrastructure. This is just in my mind as I'm listening; it feels related to Mallory's question. Just want it to be held in the frame

* Juan Gerardo: I think this is part of the long-term strategic planning that MF/PL has to do. One of the things we already talked about yesterday was how convenient is it to concentrate hardware, technology, groups from MF/PL. Where is the risk: is it in concentrating or in spreading hardware, technology, and bank accounts? It is a strategic quesiton which we have to consider in our strategic longterm planning.

* Jack: that idea came up a little bit in the democracy subcommittee in how this relates to the idea of expanding into a federation of organizations. to me this is a good direction to go in general. it's also made me think of ways that we can connect more with other groups that do similar work (including electric embers on the west coast of the USA http://electricembers.net/). I think this work with Mexican MF/PL would be a good step to take, and would provide us with a good experiment with a federating process where we already share a lot of trust and principles.

* Enrique: i think that we need to consider the particularities of each country, the conditions of the struggle in each country. using mallory's example (palestine) for us it would be very good to know if there exists among them the will to combine their forces which is basically what we're trying to do in mexico. possibly the conditions in palestine-- they might not be able to have a legal cooperative like we're talking about, but do have enough of the flexibility to achieve and get some sort of collective model of expression. I would not like to say much more, but i think that flexibility is extremely important.

* Joseph: does the cooperative still fall under the larger organization structure is? is this just the legal framework?

* Enrique: i think that not immediately, but as it develops/exists in the coming months in forming the coop, there will be a new group of volunteers, specialized in the issues of our membership in mexico. surely that group will develop and gain the right to participate and be

present, and we can consider the relationships. it's not going to happen right now, but we have to work toward it and concretize it.

* Juan Gerardo: The legal aspect of this has to do with what we need as an international organization; aside from what we've said for Mexico, the invoices etc. I understand Joseph's question is more about the relationship between the Mexican group and in the US, will that change? First reaction: it does not change it. Second reaction: if in any moment, for protection purposes of the whole organization, we need to establish a more legal relation between the coop in Mexico and the nonprofit organization in the USA, we'll do it. This could be a contract, an agreement, any legal form which we might decide to have to relate both organizations. If that is not the case, I think that the relationship as such does not have to change. We are part of the LC today, next year maybe we're no longer on the LC but we're members of the organization; in our case I think the social link between us is much more important than the legal link. if we ever need it, we'll do it, if not, we'll continue.

* aaron: i'd like to speak up as well. i think there is not a big difference in the objectives that we're looking for. this is a question of ends -- it's a set of outreach ... right now there is a possibility of registering and dealing with this financial piece. i think the best decision that has been taken at this point is to visualize it as a coop, and that's what i would propose.

* Jack: i think that there are some structural/socio-political implications that this will have. I'm not worried about those, but i think we will need some thinking about how that is going to stay linked politically and socially as separate legal entities that are autonomous and still interrelated. Some of that work might need to be slightly formal in terms of structure, but i think that's a challenge that we can look forward to.

* Alfredo: can we take a vote on the proposal brought by Enrique and Juan Gerardo? We're going to take this vote person by person because it's a legal and political issue. Going to go around the list, say whether you approve or disapprove or abstain?

** dkg: approve
** hilary: approve
** jamie: approve
** josue: approve
** mallory: approve
** jack: approve
** rasha: abstain (don't understand clearly, but don't have any blocks)
** joseph: approve
** enrique: approve
** roberto: approve
** mike lee: absent
** lourdes: absent
** juan gerardo: approve
** aaron: approve
** alfredo: approve

* Alfredo: we basically have three abstentions, the rest are yesses, the measure carries.

* dkg: You talked about the possibility of in the future creating a legal relationship between the two entities; could we somehow make use of NAFTA? NAFTA provides some measures that might be used.

* Mallory: we could also probably be persecuted under RICO.

* Alfredo: that's a serious suggestion; I don't know what the implications are politically and all the rest, but it would be really interesting to explore that from a left wing point of view!

* Alfredo: points of procedure: we're gonna take 30 minutes for each subcommittee report. That means that essentiall you tell us what you talked about, and maybe some people thank you for it, but it's not going to be an extensive discussion; we don't have that time or resource. The agenda & membership subcommittee, which has been charged with figuring out what the LC should do, has a proposal that relates to the issue of an ongoing discussion. I think while

we wait for lunch that subcommittee should report on its work, then we can go through the regular set of reports after lunch. (People seem to think this is fine.) [discussion of logistics for that presentation]
* Mallory: wanted to open up a conversation more about the Mexican coop proposal; we can do that during lunch.

== agenda and membership meeting reportback ==
* Alfredo: agenda and membership: we started with the membership meeting and raised a series of problems that the membership meeting has traditionally had.
** Real problem with attendance. We don't get enough people from MF/PL at those members meetings to make it a significant event of decision making; that really affects the quality. Last time there was a hurricane looming over the NYC meeting; still, it just wasn't enough people. We don't do enough outreach or get enough involvement.
** Location is a second problem; we think the Brecht Forum is a problematic location for many reasons: hard to get to, tech setup is difficult there, just not a good environment for this kind of meeting.
** Tech setup was a problem: started too late, takes too much meeting time to get tech setup.
** No real debate; no previous preparation for debate. Discussion of issues facing LC is very weak, one day, not enough time for people to sink their teeth into all of these issues that the org faces.
* We think there's a problem of who's going to the meetings combined with what they actually do when they get there; we want to address that problem.
* A number of minor ways of addressing it:
** Being more creating with our reports to the meeting, rather than just written reports perhaps video presentations, things like that.
** Crux is that we think the membership meeting should be ongoing. It should be an ongoing process, not a one day process in one location. That would mean organizing periodic membership meetings, perhaps every month, perhaps regionally, by sector, by political priorities, whatever way we decide in the longterm. Bringin members together with an agenda that reviews the work of the organization, the politics, and how those things are walking in step with the work people are doing in particular sectors. MF/PL has a huge arts sector: artists, filmmakers, music makers. We don't bring those members together to talk about what MF/PL should be doing in terms of their work. We have award winning filmmakers that are showing in huge theaters. We don't bring those folks together to talk about what we can do; that's just one example, we have all kinds of sectors of people like that, including technologists.
* How to do that members meeting is something we need to figure out, but it should be an ongoing process; there should probably be one international membership meeting a year. But these monthly meetings are very real membership meetings with them making decisions about stuff; they then communicate this to the LC constantly, providing a constant flow of concrete directive to the LC so that the LC has something to implement. In implementing this the LC then talks to all the other sectors, rest of the organization as well. Out of those smaller meetings, everyone in the organization will know what they talked about and what decisions they made; from that the information and sense of cohesiveness flow. We think that then feeds into a number of different issues, including democracy, recruitment, and how we make decisions.
* Roberto: i would like to interject an observation. when we had the last membership meeting, we had a hurricane. this meeting, we had a snowstorm. so either the cosmos is not down with the leadership of mf/pl meeting, or: this strengthens my argument that we should be meeting somewhere else like atlanta
* Aaron: or mexico! the climate here is beautiful!

* Joseph: having meetings in other geographical locations was discussed!
* Joseph: one of the things we discussed is that the LC should be meeting monthly; the current schedule is roughly quarterly, but that's somewhat ad hoc. Given all the conversations about how much work needs to be done, the ongoing necessity of the LC, is that we should just be meeting monthly. The rough program of each meeting would be:
** Reports from staff on general scope, including financial stuff, legal stuff, things like that.
** Current projects that the organization is involved in, amount of resources that work is taking up (rather than only a larger recap at member meetings, more piecemeal)
** A service report: any major tech issues that needed to be addressed, how reliable are the services we're providing, other kinds of things.
* Structure would break up amount of material to cover in a given meeting, to make the meetings shorter, increase participation in LC phone calls. Attendance in some of those ongoing LC meetings has been chronically low. More regular, planned in the future, shorter.
* Hilary: if we're having monthly membership meetings and monthly LC meetings are we combining those? Otherwise we're constantly meeting; if you do too much meeting and don't have time to do the work...
* Aflredo: the monthly meetings are not of all members. they're by sector or region. we don't expect that our NY members would meet more than once or twice a year. the LC meetings are by phone every month.
* Hilary: even monthly meetings need some sort of facilitation. they don't organize themselves. time/labor?
* Roberto: my question was the same as hilary: are we going to have two monthly meetings? if so, how does the feedback work? based on what alfredo said, and hilary's concern is still a valid concern.
* Mallory: we have absolutely no way of knowing which members are in which region or sector, other than the few we have in our heads. We know what their websites are, that's it.
* Joseph: as a followup -- how is e-mail working for people? is e-mail sufficient? the 3-month subcommittee work ok, and we facilitate the discussions via e-mail? part of the idea with the phone call was to supplement e-mail then we could make sure to keep it short.
* Jack: i hear the challenges of a monthly meeting. i still like the idea. maybe we could find something in between quarterly nad monthly that might be better. very short monthly or somewhat longer bimonthly meetings might help us work together more. i feel like the engergy that we have now in this groups would make that work.
* Alfredo: we need to take the third part.
* Hilary is not against meetings.
* Joseph: this is something we can take up via e-mail, and this decision (monthly LC meetings) might be something we can come to today.
* Josue: I'm wondering where the regular membership meetings cross over into promotions and outreach, and how we activate our membership across other committees.
* Juan Gerardo: how hungry are we? i'd be fine taking the break for lunch and then come back.
* Alfredo: reconvene at 3pm.
* Reconvening now!
* Juan Gerardo: we discussed that we could work on a broader statement of politics that have to do with several aspects of development besides tech: economic, social, environmental, political. We could review this statement later which MF/PL can adapt. The way to do it is to contrast the principles of market-centered development models with a solidarity-centered development model.
* In case of gross national product development we can speak of life quality and achievement of people's vocations.
* Instead of the law of the fittest, we can speak of economic, social, and political participatory democracy.

* Instead of materalistic social welfare, we can speak of social well-being as a human right.
** Today social welfare has more to do with budgets and production costs than with social well-being as a human right.
* Instead of money as the source of power, we pronounce work as the source of power.
** (Connect with cooperatives as a concept.)
* Instead of law of supply and demand, we can speak of the interchange of equivalent work.
* Instead of unsustainable production that has to do with laws, obligations, not with decisions of people, we can speak of sustainable development and all its values and principles.
* INstead of cultural individualism, we can speak of cooperation and solidarity.
* instead of private ownership of science and tech, science and technology are humanity's heritage
* instead of macro development, social and economic local development.
** This means that instead of big industries concentrated in small areas generating big cities and transnational economics, better for quality of life and stability is local and self-sufficient for most of the needs of humanity (local generation of energy, administration of natural resources, local production and consumption.) Totally different than current market economy, globalization of markets and finances.
* This political statement complements what we have with our statement of unity; gives us a broader framework for MF/PL political activity. The idea is not to approve it or discuss it today; each member of the LC should receive it, meditate on it, and we keep analyzing it in further LC meetings until we can refine it and have a political statement which is more inclusive and also identifies us more with many political left movements.
* Alfredo: is it okay if we go in the order in which these appear on the wiki? Democracy, Promotion/Communication, Voluntary/Contract, Internationalization?

Jack: point of process: last team wanted approval on more-frequent meetings. maybe we should have a list of those things that we need approval, we could talk through them when proposed, and then vote on things that need approval at the end.
* Alfredo: make discussion of the points we want within the half hour; take up voting at the end (discussion can happen during voting at the end.) We know this is rough in terms of time.
* Mallory: if we rear-load our meeting with all the decisions, everyone who has to leave will miss it.
* Alfredo: let's cut down presentations to 20 minutes each?

== Democracy ==
https://pad.riseup.net/p/mfpl-lc-democracy-2013-02-10
Jack: we came up with an alternative model for structuring MF/PL. we have this picture which has a core with concentric circles. the outside is entire membership. the boundary of member v. non-member is statement of unity. inside that, there are teams that do different kinds of work. for example: i18n, support, org-dev. we didn't hammer out all the teams. Within and overlapping that was staff. these are people with daily or weekly concrete work committments (paid and volunteer). this is not flat, but it is flatter. that's the sketch of what we envision. we talked about the boundaries between these things, and how we encourage members to move into parts of the teams. Concrete things people agree on are how we treat each other, how we make decisions, what processes we follow for that.

 * scope:

 open questions:
  * what decisions are being made, who initiates, who needs to be consulted, who needs to approve, who needs to be informed?
  * conflict resolution between teams: decision-making should be how it normally works, and

conflict-resolution is for when decision-making process breaks down
  * structure needs to provide ways for members to engage directly, and it needs to provide ways that we can determine when membership is engaged.

Jamie: there's still an idea of a memberhsip meeting and decisions that the membership makes for the organization. Similarly, the inner/trenches circle also has meetings as a whole, decisions that they need to make. There is a separation of decision-making along those lines.
* Jamie: conflict resolution--another way of framing that is ther eneeds to be a process for working teams who are expected to follow a particular criteria and principles for the organization, for what to do when a team doens't follow those, and how to work that out within the teams. Not necessarily about individuals' conflicts.
* dkg: I think the vision was that the teams themselves, that the boundaries for becoming part of a team is a very porous boundary. Any member intereste din the work of a team should be able to easily join that team, contribute and influence the direction, and take part. There was a concern that it might make the teams less engaged back with the broader membership; the htought was that teams would have a responsibility to regularly contribute mentions of what they're doing; the Lowdown is a mechanism for that, more content about what groups are working on.
* jack: the lowdown is one method for getting info to members. we want to make sure that it's a two-way street, so there need to be clear channels for info coming back to the teams. members who are strapped for time shouldn't have to commit to a full team just to send info that the team should be committed to considering.
* Dana: from experience of being at first membership meeting, didn't have a clue what it meant to be a member, why we were voting, how these decisions were made; I didn't have enough information as a member to be a part of this, if I knew that there were ways for members to participate

Concerns:
 * clear distinctions for who is repsonsible for making decisions for organization as a whole
 * decision-making must involve people who are beyond just staff for perspective
 * if it affects you, you should be involved in the decision.
 * membership meeting should not be the only means of membership engagement, it should be ongoing.
 * federation? this raises interesting questions w.r.t. mexico

we don't need a concrete decision from this body, but we do need feedback from the LC. what are the

* Enrique: yesterday, two times there was made a proposal concerning this committee. i insisted that we consider this because it's very important that all the organizations have their own organization and their own structures, distinct. we need to be familiar with their processes and their structure. to me that seems very relevant. we should take the opportunity before the membership meeting this year to make a dialog with the membership about our own tasks organized with the goal of finding spaces of democracy and participation.
* Joseph: The outer boundary as you stated is the statement of unity; where do dues come into this, is that a part of it? Another question was the international question, are there correlates in nmultiple countries, or are there joint teams?
** dkg: didn't explicitly talk about how dues fit in; everyone was assuming that in terms of concrete decision making that people would be dues-paying member minus whatever allowances we give people who can't afford dues but are active members. Re: multiple countries, that is to be particular to the different types of teams; some teams may need to have

distinct teams in different locations and that might be in different countries, might be different places in the same country. We hope this involves cross-pollination of idea between different teams (don't work in isolation!) and teams in different locations. Hoping that many teams would cross national boundaries.

* Juan Gerardo: In designing this model, did you take into account that as per today only about 10% of the members participcate? When would we have enough participation for this model to improve the democracy we have today? There has to be minimum participation for htis to work and improve our democratic process. The other: the outer circle is the boundary between members and nonmembers, but staff includes members and nonmembers?

** dkg: there was a strong sense among democracy subcommittee that we want staff to be members. (currently all staff are members in some way.) We expect that staff will be members, we want to work with people who share values, principles, commitment.

** dkg: taking into account percentage of members who participate: that was a specific concern we have with the history of the organization; even when we've done voting we haven't had sufficient participation. We hope this model of regular, concise reporting to whole membership and easy channels of input from whole membership would encourage active participation in these teams that are the most common decision-making parties; similar to proposal of ongoing membership participation so that the big membership meetings are more participatory with people more briefed on the issues, more engaged.

* Mallory: when talking about the teams, they're open and very porous things that anyone can join; we think especially when talking about tech it's not good enough. We need to encourage participation by women and POC; if you leave borders open you'll wind up training up, more able-bodied white men. Another point: reporting--would be nice to see reports coming to LC. Working with the lowdown is good ideas, but having a simpler goal of regular reporting to the LC first would be good.

* Jack: clarification: in this model there isn't an lc. so the equivalent would be reporting to the teams in aggregate and to the whole membership.

* Jamie: I think the job of the democracy subcommittee is to incorporate the responses from this discussion, answer the quesitons that are completely unanswered now, present something more concrete and formal within the LC. Individual members of the LC not on the democracy subcommittee are encouraged to give more feedback!

= promotion and communication =
https://pad.riseup.net/p/mfpl-lc-comms-2013-03-10
* hilary: my notes are funky and haphazard. but i will collect them and present. we started with an assessment of what our communications work is. we identified things we're doing now and ways that we can improve and change.
* Re: the way we communicate now, a key place is our website: support portal, control panel, wiki, calendar, email addresses, entire digital identity.
* Current networks, partnerships and alliances; current groups are APC, MAG-Net, USSF, WSF
* Events calendar as something we need!
* Social media: how we're currently having present on identi.ca and Twitter
* Lowdown: newsletter for communicating with members
* General member engagement & recruitment
* In each area, we tried to look at new propositions, general purpose, define a monetary budget, ID who would be responsible for bottom-lining each.
* Website: we need a complete website redesign. Create easier navigation, way to find and use info more effectively, establish better digital identity. We can envision $2000 and the need for a project manager that we did not name. That's probably lowballing it.
** Mallory: implicit in that is figuring out how we can relate the rich content in

support.mayfirst.org better, either via the front-facing website oor something else. So much goes on there, we're picked up on Reddit sometimes!
* Hilary: networks/partnerships/alliances
** Ones I identified, a couple more: Observatel.org (Mexico), Southern Movement Alliance, Electric Embers.
** Ways to support social movements with tech and capacity, provide education about tech and alternatives, engage with members beyond just being a service provider, guide the future work of MF/PL.
** WSF contact has been Mallory but we might need someone new or to pull back; MAG-Net we're just joining, Hilary is liaison; APC, Alfredo and Hilary; USSF, Alfredo and Joseph; Southern Movement Alliance, Rasha, Roberto, Ross, Joseph; Observatel.org - Enrique. $5000 budget towards this; even as we identified representatives, overseeing this would be the co-directors
* Strong events calendar: position ourselves externally.
** Track future events at which we should have a present
** Past events that we've been present at
** Use these events to engage with members
** Conferences: AMC, National Conference on Media Reform, People's 100 Days Actions and Events, WSF, USSF, APC meeting.
** Maybe $3000 budget; no overall project manager yet, but we think there should be one.
* Social media
** Didn't talk in depth; right now it's being handled by Ross and Stephen, and that's great. No plan.
* Lowdown
** Currently goes to everyone who is a member or billing contact; unclear who reads it, how they use it, if anyone reads it, if it's in a good format to be read, how you track it, find it, etc.
** Potential for Lowdown to be revived; better web format; better curated; use to engage membership, increase clarity of what membership is, tool for outreach at events and physical spaces, tool to promote our work in media (e.g. placing articles), feature more info about members, possibly profiles, talk about volunteer work, political strategy, sections dealing with things like i18n efforts, politics, creating specific columns that cover issues in more constant ways.
** Didn't identify a dollar amount; in temrs of management, two models: a potential staff position to manage and develop content, or a committee project on part with support team or i18n team working on getting content, member engagement, etc.
* Member engagement/recruitment
** key problem: database doesn't track who our members are, their issue areas, locations, etc that would make it easier to engage with them. Need a process to find this information.
** How members get involved: if you want to join and support statement of unity you're just let in; perhaps we need a different process for membership acceptance? e.g. different projects to engage in, different groups to get involved (possibly overlapping with teams idea from Democracy subcommittee)
** 4 categories of membership: 1) want hosting, don't care who MF/PL is; 2) want hosting, like MF/PL and political princples, can't do more or might not want to do more work; 3) organizers who really want hosting/tech support for movement work; 4) organizations committed to technology as a front of struggle. Need to figure out how to both educate and orient new and existing members about MF/Pl, different opportunities for collaboration, engage members ready for that kind of collaboration.
** Recruitment should be something that the whole LC takes on as a project as opposed to making another committee. Need to do more engaged and active recruitment for both strategic partnerships, bringing groups in that you can work with; also to find new volunteers for committees. Perhaps create a budget for related activities, e.g. going to meet groups etc.

The committee could determine actions that the LC could take on as a whole.
* Juan Gerardo: did you talk about an alliance with the center for popular economics (us solidarity economy) -- i think they would be compatible as an alliance. also, It was not clear to me if we have target members to work on. it seems like it's still open and open to the statement of unity, and i think it might be good to be more than the statuement of unity, to have targetted member outreach and recruitment, and to consider reaching out to other countries.
* Mallory: we discussed that, but if the committee is tasked with targeted recruitment, we'll need to learn targets from the rest of the LC, and then recruitment also is probably based on

* rasha: i see a common pattern of members not understanding their membership: we can figure out how to make more robust what it means to be a member of MF/PL, participate in democracy and projects of organization.
* Rasha: glad to hear a structure that provides ways to engage members and methods to determine whether members are engaged, and methods for members to make decision-making recognition of unevenness and differences in way members expect to engage in MF/PL. many of the members are themselves organizers or organizations that organize; I don't know that most of them are looking to be actively organized by MF/PL. There are roles and expectations that folks have; those are different across different members. Encourage us to reflect on a readiness to engage at those different levels without an expectation that everyone will be very engaged with a comprehensive political statement coming from MF/PL; that might not be their expectation of the leadership role of MF/PL.
* Enrique: 3 things: 1) a complementary comment about hilary's presentation: when she mentioned the necessisty of having people participate in events, we really need to have an accessible calendar involved when we redesign. that needs to be included. We need a link with our members. when the co-directors receive an application, it's an opportunity to start a dialog before you offer the resources of membership. whatever way that we try to have a dialog with those people who are making the decisions for their own organizations, we should try to ask them questions about what mf/pl is doing, what our members might need from us, what political projects are already in process, and what their positions are in relation to our own processes. That will give us more proposals about how things are structured, and we can learn more about each organziation. I also think tha thte focus each members should have is that to establish with new members, all of us here could be constructing e-mail lists to share ideas with other organizations so that the people in those groups will have their own work strengthened. for example, if there are four organizations that we want to incorporate, we could mention those groups, and if there is no disagreement, we could take a step to actively promote and recruit comrades who we need. it seems like we could do a similar process. we could communicate what our needs and perspectives are. we could do that within our discussion and reach out and incorporate those.
* Josue: Jamie and Josue in working on the Progressive Technology Project (PTP) database, we have 67 organizations using PowerBase and hosted by MF/PL. There was an early conversation about how those groups become MF/PL members. We've not discussed it nor have we done anything with it; those groups could be another place to start with targeting.
* Hilary: our list wasn't inclusive of groups to work out with, alliances, networks, etc, please send; this isn't a comprehensive list.
* enrique: we were thinking that if this is a task that everyone will assume, of members and volunteers, then it's necessary to think of a draft of a proposal that would cover the expenses of the recruitment work. if it's necessary to take a trip, how are we going to do that? each recruitment might not be the same for everyone. the expenses might need to be propsed/... we decided not to insist on this, but wanted to clarify that in recruitment that we discussed whether there should be a salary. we put that aside. in recruitment, it's very powerful to say "if we're inviting you to MF/PL", it's effective to say "we're volunteers". we might have

expenses due to recruitment, but we don't have a propsal.

* Aaron: i also think for technical questions i think that this strengthens the power of the membership. so we talked about volunteers; i wanted to mention -- if you talk about generating mateirals, proposals, graphics, etc. you need different materials. i noticed tha tthere are 3 different organizations that were doing media marketing. im not sure if they're international at this point. This is just another issue that can be very powreful if we're tlaking about bringing in members. it's necessary to know who is doing visual communication.

* Roberto, translating Aaron: branding and brand identity and visual identity and social marketing are very relevant. there are groups like amnesty international that are undergoing major changes and we need to be aware of these changes.

* Hilary: if we're not voting on these principles, what are our actions? Flesh them out as a committee more? ID potential managers?

* Jack: budget decisions are impossible in isolation!

* Jamie: do just as you said Hilary, as an LC we'll have to discuss and approve more.

* Hilary: send any additional comments, changes, etc to the group.

= voluntary and contracted work =

* Josue: we met before today; details of this proposal are up on the wiki. (https://support.mayfirst.org/wiki/projects/leadership-committee/labor)

* 1st section we focused on was around volunteer labor; we think we don't lift that up enough in the organization. Concrete suggestions:

** Encourage different areas of the organization to create more opportunities for volunteers to participate in; think about campaigns, events, work, create opportunities for members to actively participate.

** Survey our volunteers, get a better understanding of their motiviations, get them to participate in helping to better understand what the job descriptions are for paid work, since some paid work is inside of a whole lot of volunteer work. Get volunteers to have more ownership in that process. Learning motivations can help us understand how to bring more people in.

** Shine a light on the work of volunteers and its activist nature in the context of a political development strategy. how do we better describe the political nature of all our volunteer work?

** Concretely offering acknowledgement to volunteers: through publications, an annual celebration, volunteer of the month, any ways to highlight contributions that people are doing.

** How do we get more volunteer labor? Quantify/qualify it? Give it proper attention since it has built this organization and is driving the future of this organization.

* Paid labor piece:

** We should hire someone to do outreach work. (Though that was countered by Enrique earlier!) Went into some detail around outreach; clearly stated here that it should be in that committee; seems like that was contributed by Enrique to promotions/outreach committee.

* Juan Gerardo: did you think about how to screen possible volunteer workers who may become FBI agents? Can we think about it? Can we prevent it?

* Josue: we should talk about it but sometimes thinking about it does more damage than not.

* Jamie: I agree it's critical; if you try to stop it the wrong way it makes the matter worse. the most effective way to address it is to define characteristics that are counterproductive to the organization without regard to intent or reason for them. Don't have an answer on how to do that, but it's an approach to help fight against disruption.

* Joseph: let's clone ross!

* Jack: in terms of should we hire someone to do outreach work -- maybe an outreach coordinator could be paid, but not the individual outreach workers. In this conversation and

in others, there have been questions from Juan Gerardo about how to screen people, how to differentiate between contributors. This makes me think that membership itself might need to be reviewed so that we can look across the organization and see what people are trying to contribute to the organization. That is: i think -- volunteers should all be members. but then do we need to figure out what kind of screening happens for members.
* Hilary: are there volunteers that are not members right now?
* Jamie: There are some. (Rafa?) Most volunteers have association with organizational members. I don't know to what degree it is; for the most part I don't think that's a particular issue right now.
* Rasha: could skill shares/skills building/leadership dev opportunities be included? Might be crossover opportunities here with outreach, especially at events.
* Josue: yes. this is all interconnected! how do we craft opportunities that can do things on multiple levels at the same time.
* Hilary: different ways of thinking about orientation, too.
* Josue: we want to plug in these concrete ideas to the bigger picture; Enrique participated in promotion committee, these concrete ideas should be added into the appropriate places.

= internationalization =
https://pad.riseup.net/p/mfpl-lc-internationalization-2013-02-10
* Roberto: my first question for the people in the i18n group -- carlos, penny, josue, aaron, nadir -- do you want to present different points?
* consensus seems to be roberto.
* diagram! we sent this to rasha. broadly, what we've been tlaking about we identified 3 areas that were immediate priorities: mid-term and long-term goals.

we're thinking that the two most basic components you can see:
 * cultural integration
  * vision, political integration
  * social marketing/branding -- these are important because we're integrating activists from two different countries.
 * linguistic integration -
  * internal
   * documentation (in wiki right now -- public can access this)
   * e-mail (ones we send among each other)
   * meetings like this one with conferencing over the phone.
  * external
   * web site
   * lowdown newsletter
   * outreach

three priority areas:

 * process we use for translating documents -- lowdown, notes. trac system isn't useful for us for translation for various reasons. for non-technical folks, it's not "user-friendly". we need a system that a person who has no technical background could still use and actually drive it. we also want to be raising people's tech skills but they need to be able to access it in the first place. Penny is going to look around from the point of view of a translating user to try to find something easiest from the original document to the first translation to maybe even handle revisions, styles, fine tuning, and afterward think through what the final version of the document is. this is first going through the i18n team and then it will come to the LC. there is also a personal component.
 * we need political declaration that expresses these politics as focused on language. we need

something that informs our processes, technical and mechanical processes. Roberto took this on, and will start from the declaration for the USSF, and take pieces and use it to reflect the work that MF/PL is doing, specifically wrt the i18n team so that we can test it out after we discuss it.
 * the mechanisms for providing linguistic accss in our spaces -- in person interaction, liek the membership meeting, the great thing was that everyone there was techies, and we achieved some good communications. but that's not usually enough. if i use the phone, i have to lose content. carlos will make an investigation to review what systems are already in place, and what sort of ocnference call systems might enable all people, not just people who cna use a computer, we want to use tech that professionals use. this might mean a mixing board. these are probably not open source programs. how do we achieve this quality? are we going to make it ourselves? are we going to find something open source? anohter interpretation of this.... basically we need to figure this out within the i18n team and at the next membership meeting we want to have something that will be a more open process, but we're going to be experimenting. if we're going to be having a more ...

a more long-term plan/priority is that in our daily communications we need a protocol of sorts -- many times the e-mails only come out in one langauage -- and that's usually english, and we understand that, but that's actually not enough, because the work of the leadership committee is that if we're supposed to be making decisions and communicating with each other, that's not happening when only one language is present. For me, it's the responsibility of each person to write each message in multiple languages if they can, but some of us aren't bilingual. different people use friends, some use software, but we're just sending stuff directly to the list. so how are the members who don't understand supposed to be able to access this? we need to be able to deal with this. moving on, we need to handle tools, plans, payment.

up to now, there hasn't exsisted perfect tools for translation or interpretration. esp. for spanish, the language changes country to country. so what we would hope is that there is some way to do this by hand ourselves. so how are we going to do this? in previous times, the volunteers we've had have not been enough. the last two lowdowns took a really long time to get the translations out. we didn't have enough volunteers for the spanish ones. it's very upsetting. If we had some way of augmenting the volunteers, if we had some way of getting the contributors to just fill in the gaps, maybe we need to consider some ways to proceed with this. Maybe some sort of salaried postion (maybe not full-time). but we'lll need more volunteers, and we'll need to be thinking about other poeple as well.

we need to think about what we're going to do now, and what we are not yet ready to do.

* Carlos: there is a common thing going on between the communications that we need to discuss in terms of the communications and redesign of the website and the internationalization process; we can combine both so that the process of translation can be combined into one system that we can do the translations: write, edit, approve, revise. Process for articles in Lowdown to be written and translated.
* Carlos: proposal is also to change the name of the Lowdown, because it is a very US branding name; this is an opportunity to have not only an international, but to signify the quesiton of struggle at an international level. Not changing because it's a bad name, but there might be better names, an opportunity to encompass the worldwide struggle, question of technology, question of open source. No solid suggestions right now.
* roberto: we were discussing this in the group -- lowdown has no real translation into Spanish other than "la neta", etc. and "la neta" is already taken. we need something that works in both languages. we need something like that that could also be more universal. oh,

and: the research that carlos made about tech for meetings in person and audio, but we haven't been thinking about visual languages, including sign language. a rising tide lifts all boats. at one point, we're tlaking about starting this process thinking about visuall access to accessibility. we're not just talking about Deaf members, but it's also different mechanisms for communications. video enhances audio as well, so that's also part of this proposal.
* Rasha: i appreciate the clarity and specificity of the i18n committee.b this confirms the value and power of having this work represented as a committee. I appreciate the leadership by everyone on this team; it's modeling leadership for the movement as a whole. I am grateful.
* dkg: it sounds awesome; I'm also terrified of the amount of work.
* jack: in terms of the software tools -- this is an obvious area of collaboration with other teams. drupal!
* Hilary: i'm guilty of the english-only e-mail. i wanted to know if there's a good mechanism i could put in place because i don't have the language skills. (other than throwing it into google)
* Roberto: i'm not sure. when they're short, we might be able to help. when they're longer, we don't have the capacity.
* Penny: I would also say, if ther'es something very important that needs to be translated, we use the Trac ticket system. The ticket system, we're not alerted very quickly, emails need to be translated relatively quickly; the person needing translation would have to come back, translate, etc. If it's something important you could ask the i18n team, you could contact folks.
* Roberto: i push back against the idea that it has to be for things that are important. i think we need to normalize the process.
* Alfredo: does the subcommittee have any action needed
* Carlos: with the calendar, we talked about having [timelines for different i18n tasks] so we can follow through. e.g. the issue of research; we should have, within a month, some sort of report. There has to be follow through; I can take the lead on our current issues and timeline to provide a report within about a month.
* Roberto: the report goes to the LC, not just to jamie. another point about volunteers. just as technical work is always good to be open for any volunteer, the volunteers who are acutally doing the tasks, we want to open the opportunity to translate the documents, we need a mechanism that will facilitate the translations. we have been thinking about how to amplify the work of the volunteers. how do we make it so that anyone who can help with the translations can do them. otherwise, wwe're just preparing folks to fail.
* Mallory: i keep trying to zoom us out a bit. we have an issue with our e-mail system where our e-mail system wasn't allowing arabic characters at all. there are other language issues that we deal with other than just translation issues.
* rasha: what kind of LC planning/reading/decision-making process do we want to conduct over which channels? Given my commitments and organizing roles I'm not always able to handle ad-hoc email discussion; should we reconsider what we talk about how? If it's hard to translate maybe it's better suited to a phone call.
* Alfredo: I opposed making this subcommittee, but now I agree with it; you did an outstanding job and I see things differently than I did before.

= PROPOSALS =

* Alfredo: there's an action that the LC has before it. Subcommittee on agenda & membership is proposing that the LC meet on a [monthly] basis by telephone. That is a proposal that we're making to the LC. Our subcommittee thinks there's a difference between monthly and quarterly meetings that is more than just frequency; there's a quality of relationship that develops when you have more frequent meetings by phone. We're trying to gear into the

quality of relationship and development

* Alfredo: those of us who are LC veterans can see the difference it makes to have a two day meeting as opposed to a one-day meeting. I know everyone wasn't comfortable with the subcommittee meeting process, but we can see the incredible amount of work yielded by subcommittees as opposed to the committee as a whole. The frequency and the amount of time people can actually take makes a huge difference; we grow in collaboration. We do need action on this.

* Jamie: I'm in favor of monthly meetings; I think it provides us an opportunity to schedule the presentation and voting on decision making on various other subcommittees so we can do one per meeting, don't have to stack a whole lot into one phone meeting.

* dkg: it sounds reasonable to me; do the internationalization folks ready to support that kind of work? it's a larger time commitment to try to have that happen.

* Roberto: I don't know if internationalization can answer that right now; we'll need to sketch that out and figure it out.

* Penny: we definitely need more volunteers--people who are JUST doing interpreting.

* Roberto: we'd need at least a couple of volunteers per meeting.

* Alfredo: in theory it's a short meeting compared to this.

* Jamie: pointing out that without a change in technology we'll need consecutive interpretation, which will take more time.

* Mallory: I'm not in favor. I picture myself for two hours on a night once a month; that's untenable for me. I would like to state for the record that I think it's a bad idea; I don't really have/follow what's considerate and offering an alternative; I know we have a lot of work but that's because we're giving ourselves a lot of work.

* Joseph: would bimonthly be too much?

* Mallory: if we did a quartelry meeting and all committees met in between quarterly meetings, then in effect we'd have more meetings with less participation per

* Jack: i think that whichever frequency or model we choose there are things we can do to help this along. I did a training with the Aorta collective that does facilitation and healthy communications. they talked about structuring information about what is going ot happen before it happens and what happened afterward to make it healthier for folks who have to miss meetings for whatever reason to stay involved.

* Rasha: I appreciate jack's comments. I am not sure that I would be able to make every meeting every month. I see some values in regular phone meetings which could relieve some pressure from email conversation. i have a concern for a clear agenda, prep documents, and a commitment to beginning and ending on time. would cmtes also be meeting in between?

* Joseph: Yes, I think committees would also be meeting in between.

* Alfredo: this proposal is not tagged to an amount of work alone; there is more work, so we need to be about more work, but that's not the only reason we're calling for this It's part of an overall proposal for a much more intense relationship between leadership and membership; goes hand in hand with the LC giving staff more guidance on what to do; perhaps most important it's about developing the relationships between LC members. One problem is that we can't express our differences as easily as we'd like to; we don't have a culture or method for exchanging/expressing differences. It comes with time, it comes with meetings. Those are some of the reasons we thought about as we talked. It's not about the amount of work we need to get done; it's about making a better LC.

* Alfredo: calling for an in favor/abstain/against. All those in favor of instituting monthly meetings: 11. Opposed: 1. Abstain: 1. That carries.

* Jamie: please note that I will soon have a child! (put on the agenda!)

* Juan Gerardo: do we want a quick eval of the LC meeting before we go?

* Jamie: I'm eternally grateful for Mallory to blaze a trail bringing Daria (a baby!) into the organization. As Alfredo alluded yesterday and Mallory can attest to, having a kid totally changes your life and committment. I'd first request support from everyone in helping bring

the child into the organization and the rest of my life; I'll be sending a link to a website that Meredith and I have set up about this! Other point: I do expect it to have an impact on my ability to complete my duties as organization co-director. Suggestions and ask for help getting through this process:

** For 7-8 month period last year I was the sole co-director; at an LC meeting Alfredo insisted that we form an emergency response team with 3-5 people who could be consulted for emergency situation that directors need to deal with. I'd like Enrique to have that kind of support, both for Enrique and for the NYC staff. Thank you to the people who did this last year; it's a serious commitment and also very important. We need people who can help make collaborative decisions.

** Mallory: my experience in that group was important; it's also important to keep it small and efficient. What we were able to do in short amounts of time was great.

** Enrique: one level this is good for emergencies. but at another level, it's for continuing day-to-day activity and how that's carried out. i would like to ask how are you seeing the need and the demands for your family for the coming months, how is this going to impact the day-to-day work of the staff?

** Jamie: without realizing it, i've been planning for this over the last several months, and that has been building starting from hiring Hilary, then Ross, and now Dana, so we have people taken on the primary day-to-day activities that are essential for MF/PL activities. However, thursday is my MF/PL day. I talk to everyone all day. that piece is going to suffer the most because the coordination is going to be a challenge. the other thing is: my plans are: meredith takes 6 months leave from her job. the PTP is more generous that the DoH: i will take 2 weeks off my paid job, then do 3 days/week instead of 4 days/week for the next six months. honestly, i don't know what i'll do with my MF/PL thursdays. whether i stay home on thursdays, i don't know. i will need help figuring that out.

* Mallory: do you work from the Sunset Park office every day of the week?

* Jamie: generally yes; I work from the Sunset Park office on Monday-Wednesday for my paid job (PTP); Thursdays I do MF/PL work from the office.

* Joseph: are there redundant people who can access all of the different collocation locations in case Jamie's unavailable?

* Jamie: we have two collocation centers in which the vast majority of our production servers are located, Telehouse and XO. Everyone on the support team can access Telehouse. XO is access via keycard, of which we have 2. One is in my wallet, one is within dkg's access. I may want to turn my key card over to another person in NYC so we have easier access to that; the support team might need to figure that out

* dkg: that needs to be done if you want a keycard tied to a mobile phone [since dkg does not have one so can't be reached via mobile phone.]

* enrique: is there anyone in the LC -- we have 3 support-team in addition to jamie. I would like to bring forward joseph and dkg and jamie to figure out what tasks are taken and can be shared among the three. can we plan for a scenario in which jamie cannot respond on a daily basis, we have a process that can move forward for daily operations?

* Joseph and dkg agree to work on that proposal.

* Jamie: last year's emergency response team was not technical, it was legal/political.

* Juan Gerardo: how can we work with legal/political concerns that could add? can we continue with the original emergency response team?

* Jamie: original legal/political response team is Jack, Alfredo, Mallory, Daniel Strum. Jack, mallory, and Alfredo will continue.

* Juan Gerardo: do we need more? should we make the team larger?

* Jamie: three is probably enough, and larger makes it harder to respond promptly.

* Josue: point of clarification--the last time, Jamie was the director, there was a team to support the director when issues came up that need a rapid response. If Jamie is out of commission, we'll have Enrique as a director. This is a rapid response system to support the

director in this time when there's only one.
* Jamie: yes; what was added is that there's also staff in NYC that might need rapid response and can't reach Enrique; international calls can be more difficult to establish.
* Jack: having four of us worked. if someone else wants to come on, i'd be happy to have them. i also would like to have someone new come on if they have a chance and an interest to do so.
* Jamie: i think it would be useful to have a member in mexico on this team.
* Enrique: we need to think about what media are we going to use, how will that person be involved? we need to have clarity abou thow to establisht the communication. but i'm in agreement that maybe we could bring you (Juan Gerardo) and Lourdes and be able to call them up as needed.
* Juan Gerardo: can we leave it at that?
* Jack: translation is going to be difficult on the emergency, but we can try.
* Mallory heads out. Take care, Mallory! (Who can't read this...)

= EVALUATION =

* Juan Gerardo: let's evaluate the meeting space/logistics, the meeting co-chairs, the procedures we followed, and the results?
* Rasha: as someone participating remotely I have a different experience of space and logistics; wanted to offer appreciation for the commitment that MF/PL has always shown to make it possible for people to robustly participate remotely. I want to especially appreciate Joseph and Enrique for being my skype buddies and liaison, especially since I've been sick. Also want to offer appreciation for Jack and dkg who've been doing a tremendous job on the notes; there is no way I could have followed through the gaps in conversation and being sick if I hadn't had the notes to look at. It's also great for democracy and participation as documentation. As for procedures, I'd like to offer a reflection: there a few different roles for facilitation, some that have been in the space and osme that might show up in the future: facilitation of the agenda, timekeeping, notetaker, other pieces like temperature/vibe check, logistics, when do we take breaks/lunch, etc. Want to offer formalizing those roles from other facilitation spaces, might help us manage our time. Appreciate everyone's time, travel, patience with the process, remote difficulties.
* Enrique: also want to thank everyone's efforts, especially the people who filled out their tasks of the i18n as the leaders of the committee, technical skills, taking notes,. the i18n team thas to come with all this equipment, ahve everything ready for the moments when all of this is needed, without disrupting everyone. they're changing micropohones all the time. it's a great acheivement of that team here and in mexico. In my own personal evolution, i'd just say that i think that we have to develop a process for engagement that permits us to preserve unity while accepting our differences within the committee and to move forward. my fear last night was that we wouldn't. i think that my fear was of returning to Mexico City without returning to DF without a report that was clear to bring to our membership. but i think that there is an initial plan that is sustainable that reflects the interest of our members that are capable of ensuring that there is an interchange among us, and that people can get to know the politics of this organization. i'm grateful for the force of unity here. That you all have established in this time the political effort as put forward that offers us the opportunity to learn. we're not all in agreement about these decisions, so we need to offer the opportunity to be honest with each other, to disagree and to admit when we make mistakes, and to correct our course.
* Joseph: big ups to the interpetation team. (applause!)
* Jack: two days made a huge difference. i know it's harder to do in general, but it was very valuable. i hope we can use it in the future.
* Joseph: I thought the space was good; more centrally located than the Brecht Forum

* Jamie: whenever we come together i am practically moved to tears. in particular, this process of integration with our mexican members is one of the most moving for me. to experience this LC, to be able to bring two members locally, and to have aaron remotely, -- even with all the fumbling -- to have active interpretation, we can act on a radically broader spectrum of the world's communities than we did before. it means a lot. However, it wasn't easy. we had some serious difficulties yesterday. i'm celebrating the successes that we brought to the meeting today but i don't want to gloss over the disagreements fromy yesterday. and: it's going to get harder. but i think we can work through the challenges. i want to thank everyone for working through and all the productivity today, and the success that we can see from that.
* Josue: I'm very grateful for that everyone has been contributing in the past two days. one of the benefits of having two days is that we can struggle enough yesterday to make the conditions so that today can be extremely productive. i believe that this is going to serve us very much as tihs group speaks more regularly to move forward to develop our ongoing relationships. this organization does so much -- too much! but i'm very proud that in these two days i've seen that we can also take on things that are even more difficult because we are a little more close -- closer to a unified vision. if we can follow through in that direction, then we are going to be able to achieve more. [switches to english] There are some things that are so much nicer to be able to express in spanish, i appreciate being able to do it!
* Alfredo: the thing to keep in mind is that we just made history this weekend, because we've never had this kind of functional translation, interpretation, and cross-cultural sharing and collaboraiton as we've had this weekend. That's the presence of Juan Gerardo and Enrique, who went through hell to get here, enormous sacrifice. The connection with Aaron in Mexico whose contributions have been extremely fruitful. Our whole interpretation team should get a standing ovation. This is the work of Roberto Tijerina; he has established the standard for our movement for interpretation. Those of us who worked for the USSF were there when we did it. We're in the presence of a giant and it is an honor to have him on the LC with us. All of you folks who work in interpretation, Josue is another one who early on dedicated himself to this thing. You're laying the groundwork for the struggle of the human race and its success; this is one of its necessary components and it's happening here in MF/PL and for that we should be very, very proud and I certianly am.
* Hilary: I feel honored to be part of this process and humbled by all the people in the room.
* dkg: I am very pleased with what we've come to today; I'm also happy to struggle with all of you in the future.
* Aaron: it's been a great effort on the part of all of you the individual and collective participation gives me great satisfaction to work with everyone. i look forward to seeing everyone in the future in new york, or if conditions permit, in mexico. i'm proud to work with each of you.
* Roberto: what jamie mentioned is quite important. yesterday's struggle contributed to what we came to today. with remote locations, we're working on that still. my feelings keep getting more and more elevated. but yesterday, it gave me the power and setup like the chance to do our productive work today. when i got to know MF/PL at the social forum, i didn't know that i would be here today. i was on the outside becaus ei'm not a technical person. but there were waqys to enter these spaces. all the information, i've been able to engage with it, including in the autumn meeting. but this was the first time, where the whole day, the technospeak was not so high that we could all contribute. it's very important to make sure that there are ways for the rest of the world to have ways of understanding and engaging in our politics and in our organization.
* Jack: both of these things would require some expense. we might want to consider bringing in facilitators. this might free up LC members to participate instead of having to facilitate. no disrespect intended to the currrent facilitators. another thing to consider is the possibility of a retreat -- going someplace. it can be more fun, though it is more difficult to organize.

* Juan Gerardo: I share what everyone has said; I was really surprised and moved when I was invited to run for the LC, but then I was even shocked when I was proposed to co-chair the organization without having experience with the work you do, with the members of LC, with staff, interpretation, etc. I didn't know if I could respond to such a responsibility. When they said you have to be there on Feb 8 and all these storm warnings came up, if it had been any other trip I wouldn't have come. But when I said, all this is happening, there's trust and interest in my participation, especially as part of the Mexican team; I'm sure Enrique had a lot to do with many of these proposals and I'm sure I can "blame" him for many of these things; I hope I didn't make too many mistakes, this is the first time I interact with you. My idea of chairing the meeting was not only giving the floor to people but trying to make a summary of where I felt was the predominant opinion in the meeting; in that case I perhaps gave too much weight for one position and not enough for another, but that's a way we've worked with cooperatives, didn't know any other way to do it; maybe this needs to be improved, but I sometimes get the impression that in meetings like this it's important to try to summarize what everyone has said even though there's a majority that goes one way and a minority in the other. One chairs for the group and not for oneself or for certain results to be obtained. They are important but just as important is how one manages to work with the group and how one manages to be part of it at the same thing. One more thing: one has to come here better preared for the things that must be analyzed and decided on, so that after all these efforts (financial efforts included), you also expect certain results as Alfredo has said for Monday morning so that the staff has some sort of orientation for how to continue or how to change their operation. I think we'll improve. I want to thank everyone for their contributions and I think we will continue to build ... which is strategic for movements in US, Mexico, and many other places in the world.

MEETING ENDING!

* Alfredo: in solidarity with our comrades, let's make sure we clean this place up, let's make sure we get everything back to ALP.