

Date: March 11th

Meeting Time: 11pm Eastern, 10am Central, 8am Pacific

Call-in: (712) 432-0075, code 388105# (host 564471#)

Facilitator: David

Notetaker: Shamako

People/NPC orgs on the call : David Cobb (MTA), Shamako Noble (HHC), Walda Katz-Fishmon (LRNA), Jerome Scott (LRNA), Alfredo Lopez (MF/PL), Monica Beemer (ATEP), Rob Robinson (USACAI), Cheri Honkala (PPEHRC), Rose Brewer (GJWG), Evelyn (DAWG), Daniele Kohn (AFGJ), Keith Harvey (AFSC), Rahmen Jamaal (RFA), Pam Brown (OT), Ellen Somekawa (AAU), George Friday (IPPN), Mary B-J (PWG), Jackie Smith (INoSA)

Rise Up Pad

[https://pad.riseup.net/p/ACT\\_Call\\_03-06-14](https://pad.riseup.net/p/ACT_Call_03-06-14)

- \* Draft Working Groups Report Document
- \* Affinity Groups Budget Template
- \* Affinity Groups Plan
- \* DRAFT-NPC Member Financial Support Agreement
- \* DRAFT-United States Social Forum (USSF) Orientation

## 1. NPC Face to Face Meeting

Jerome: Presents rationale/need for a face-to-face NPC meeting soon, and stresses that this proposal is coming from unanimous ACT recommendation.

David: Frames out dates: May 5 and 6 (Mon, Tues following New Economies Conference in Jackson, MS) OR May 10 and 11 (Sat, Sun) OR May 24 and 25 (Sat, Sun)

Daniele: Is there a proposal for Jackson being the site regardless of date? Also, notes that May 11 is Mother's Day.

David responds: Jackson only location for May 5,6. Locations not identified for other dates.

Pam: Are their funds for this? Concerned about costs.

David: small amount in the budget that has already been passed. Already nailed it down that ACT is responsible for a process and specific mechanism for how travel stipends are distributed.

Rob: Complicated for folks on the West Coast, May is a full calendar. Depending on

the dates that everybody agrees on. Try to work something out.

David: Concern or observations around Mothers Day (Daniele), Pam, Rob complicated for New Yorkers.

Rose: Travel costs where, that's a given. Sounds like the 5th and 6th might be the best one for whatever, interlaced with Jackson Rising

DAvid: Not a weekend, it's a Monday. That's the only non-weekend

Pam: Like's Roses suggestion because of things that people have mention. Wanted to do it in March, never happened.

Jackie: Not all NPC members are on this. Try to get as many members as possible on this, important to get as many people as possible. Pick two dates, and let's

Shamako: Let's pick the primary dates, pick a pair of secondary and make call directly to the NPC.

David: Reiterates proposal.

Evelyn: Are there alternative dates because May is really packed.

Jackie: Keep dates May 10th, 11th dates in there. Recommended May 10th and 11th as the two options. Think we need to give an option other than Mother's day on a weekend.

Pam: If we're going to add dates. Let people choose from three. Present at least two options that are real for people and let them choose from that. Trying to get us to consensus.

David: Going to put out three dates. Proposal that ACT be empowered to choose those dates.

Evelyn: Simple little poll and send out to the NPC list.

David: Put it out to the NPC. Do follow up calls to folks we don't hear from.

Pam: Think that we should set a deadline so that we can also move forward. Would love to see a dead line so that we can actually deadline. Proposal Friday of this week for completion of the deadline.

Dione: What is the policy or rule if people do not respond.

David: Proposal-sending out these three dates, asking people to respond by

Friday. Who would be willing to join Shamako to make those calls?

Decision: Unanimous consensus to have Shamako send a message to full NPC list that there will be a face-to-face meeting of the NPC either May 5,6 or May 10,11 or May 24,25. Responses do by Fri. Follow-up calls will be made to those who do not respond. ACT is empowered to make a final decision on where/when.

Keith Harvey and Rob Robinson volunteers to make calls.

## 2. Three Year Plan

Walda: Describes the 3 year plan that comes out of Road Working Group and is a proposal from the ACT. This is the final one that we'd like to take on and discuss collectively. Discuss in the framework of the overall process. Doing an overview, then open up a discussion, formal approval or affirmation. Then will move to the specifics of additional polycentric.

The three year was first conceived of at the 2013 NPC meeting convened at Project South office..

2014-- the year of using PMA's and very intentional process of PMAs, hubs, and Movement Schools as principal outreach tools. We anticipated finalizing what polycentric means and consolidating polycentric sites by early 2014.. This gives sufficient time to do all of the ground work that needs to be done. If you look at the plan in particular, do have quite a few PMA's have listed them out. (please see the document)

Another important element is launching what we call movement schools. Really helping to thing analytically and strategically in terms of what we're trying to do in building a national movement.

The year of 2015 is the year of polycentric social forums, building on movement school and all the other work. We have Philidelphia as a site and we have Jackson as a site. (Rose will bring out the proposal for another site). The PMA process is still foundational for the polycentric social forum.

This takes us to 2016—year of a National PMA, bringing together the prior PMA's and all Social Forum work, analysis for action and education in an effort to have impact on a Presidential election year.

NOTE--we've never had a multi year prcess in the Social Forum. We are drawing this out, we wanted a common framework, common langauge, common understanding. There are some benchmarks that lift up some common pieces. Critical consolidation of leadership Coms/Tech, piece. What are the communication

and technology pieces that will facilitate this process.

Decision: Unanimous consensus to adopt the 3 Year Plan as presented.

Rose: Leads the discussion on the site proposal.

It's been circulated. Jackson and Philadelphia are already set. Given the site call on Monday, underscores that we have a deep obligation to those sites that must be acknowledged and met. Philly already has their site up and running. Already have an idea of how the funding situation will get off the ground. In respect of Chokwe Lumuma (RIP) we have not pushed for next steps in Jackson.

The NPC decision was to pursue a social forum of a different type. The site application references that with an eye on a third site. The road team has decided that given our capacity and budget, that the three site model is probably optimal. We'd like to bring in the west. There have been nibbles. Arizona, all the way up to the NW, in a very intentional political way. Get recommendation for a third site and then reach out. Under the current circumstances that's the current recommendations for the three site model.

Alfredo: Can you explain the the logic of three sites as opposed to four.

Rose: The struggle, around getting 1 site up and moving. Trying to get site number 1 up and going. Secondly, the recent situation in Jackson, very technologically driven process. The on the ground question of capacity—it is a daunting proposition. We already have folks in the western region, in the NW, perhaps interested. With some nibbles from Native American/Ind. folks. Would probably meet our needs as a political and social formation. 4 was kind of a regional, NSEW, thing. No real need for 4. Closing it out by the end of April. Getting all of the technology and Com/Tech piece in place and moving forward. We've got to move this process.

Alfredo: I was pushing four, not so much regional because of the political affinity's, West coast, NW and California. That is one set of political relationships and concentrations, a large portion of which is known as being Indian country. The SW down has a relationship with Mexico. The whole idea was to rest on the political affinity of these localities. It was not merely a divy up of the regions. Some real political thinking went into it. That political thinking remains. Understands practical matters, but we are not merely making an administrative decision when we discuss 3 or 4 sites. What we are doing is ensuring that the West Coast social Forum is going to be a smaller version of what we'd do in the past. It's going to sacrifice some grass roots involvement because of the situation. Having said that—he is willing to follow leadership. We're not just taking about things that are a matter of logistical convenience. There are political implications.

Rose: Certainly appreciates Alfredo's observations. Very complex, a fourth forum is not going to solve those. Want to put some energy into solving that. Considerations went into thoughts.

Rob: Stresses importance of face to face conversations. Those kind of political conversations are important. Important for us to reach out to Native American communities and make every opportunity to create situation. Make all of our jobs

Dione: Has lived in the NW for 20 years. Organized there. Have to be communal. Some people get to go, some don't. Ensures that all people who want to be a part of the process at different layers can. Also gives people at different layers a chance to participate at their level of operation. Also gives us an opportunity to lean in and say, "How do we support you and get to the larger forum." It's been my experience working on the west coast. We can use some, come to the middle. I've felt that we've been not as connected and isolated. Would be really positive for building relationships to be out West.

Jerome: Just want to add some information on Native American involvement. On outreach, we are in the process of having meetings with 7th generation foundation. At least have something in the west, and have something that has significant Native American leadership on the third site. Working hard to make sure that's the case.

Daniele: Speaking on behalf on the Alliance for Global Justice, reached out as being an anchor group in Tucson. Have a question and then a few comments. Are all of these forums going to happen at same times or all they happening at different times.

David: Pushing towards same time.

Daniele: Very, very hot at that time of year. People love to be in San Francisco at that time of year.

Rahman: Talk some more about that. Highly recommend us doing it out there. Doing some very, very advanced applications. On top of immigration population. People who need the most organizing help to fight their battles. Have some particular ones that would be mutually beneficial to this process. Become familiar. A lot of the work that we are working towards, is actually. Example and model. Very strong recommendation for Toussant.

David: For the last year, several of us, have been out looking for potential anchors as we've been doing other movement work. It is not easy. At all. That said, really hear Alfredo's point. It's powerful. To that end, we are right on the verge on deciding. What if we keep the deadline as May. If it's possible to get the four, we can. But we have to get to three before we get to four. And right now, there's no guarantee that we get a third site.

Alfredo: What's gonna happen is that we're going to end up with 3-4 PMA's that are going to be relatively large. Political thrusts in a particular direction. Large political formation process, the polycentric itself, will end up being itself some sort of...not that freaked out. May First, is in the United States and Mexico. One thing we don't do is recognize that border. What we would like to have is some sort of Social Form convergence. Have some sort of Mexican convergence. But as participants in folks with stuff that is going on. We have to begin to look at a consensus that includes the entire America's. Many of the discussions that are going on in Mexican movement, there would be plenty of movement. Just wanted to add that because it's not clear on everyone's mind.

Rose: David's wording is fair way of wording. Tweaking as a friendly way of tweaking. ACT, supported the proposal.

Daniele: Don't understand why we need to decide 3-4 at this time. Echo previous comments about getting to 3 before we get to four.

Rose: Think we need to move forward in a...trying to set an outer limit for the end of April for confirming that. Maybe we can get some consensus. If we get to four. Get a sense from the NPC about proposal.

Dione: Rose, end of April...if a fourth site popped up after April, would they be welcome to start the process.

Rose: Do think, in order to work, have to be in conversation with one and another. Have to an end date, it's not linear. It's that the multiple sites build together. That's the reason for the end date. Following the plan.

Dione: That answers the second part of the question.

Evelyn: Was just wondering, who has outreach already talked to. Not doing work that's already done.

Jerome: We've had tweet from Bay Area, Toussant, Native American community that we've followed up on and still following up on.

David: Concerns about going on process and the level of conversation. Several of us have had these conversations in all the movement spaces we have been in for over a year. None of these folks (or organizations) have the level of commitment or connection to the USSF process that folks in Philly and Jackson have had.

Decision: Unanimous consensus to adopt the site proposal process as presented.

### 3. Funding Proposal Document

Monica: Writes up what has always been a part of our agreement. Need to help with the fundraising, and it's not going to happen without the fundraising. In July, we will not have operating cash in July unless we all pitch in. So we'll help out with patching in with funds. If we are not able to do that, there are other ways to directly help with fundraising. If we sent an E-ask out, would that be counted towards a thousand dollars in our group. It would be.

David: Started with the NPC, came through Res/Dev, ACT and is collective.

Evelyn: 2 things. Who is going to keep track of who has donated, and how are we going to hold people accountable who haven't donated. Also, for organizations that are smaller. Our budget is \$60,000 a year. Is there going to be sliding scale. \$1000 is going to run us for a month.

Monica acknowledges that the wrong document went out. The proposal actually takes into account NPC orgs with a smaller budget and has slots at \$500 and \$250.

Evelyn: Agreement about making a financial agreement. Have agreed to financial commitment. Some of us who have a board of directors, have to have time to have something to put to our board. Put to our budget, did not have a budget of \$1000. Will take more than a work.

Walda: Have the budget doc, has internal inconsistency. They have internal inconsistency, what was annual budget is. And what the recommended budget is.

Daniel: Is not able to make a financial commitment on behalf of AFGJ on this call.

David: Process concerns that folks made are very powerful, recommend that we hold this, until the next call with a sense of urgency around it. With at least one month, we can all check in with our respective organizations of what this might mean. Does that work for Res-Dev?

Monica answers Yes.

Evelyn: If someone wants to donate to something specific, is there a system for that.

Monica: We can restrict funds.

David: Wants to lift up that we did not get to the orientation document that was created collectively, the Working Group Reports, or the Maestro system Daniele wanted to talk about.

As facilitator wants to point out that it a very big deal that we are moving towards a face-to-face meeting, that we passed a 3 year plan, passed a site proposal.

On our next call we need to agendize:

- 1) Organizational Funding Proposal
- 2) Maestro communications system
- 3) Orientation Process Document
- 4) Working Group Reports Document.