
Amnesty International USA

Fall 2015 Resolutions Packet West Regional Conference

November 20-22, 2015
Los Angeles, California

Table of Contents	<u>Page</u>
Resolution 1: Board Size	3
Resolution 2: Amnesty International Position on Prostitution, Pimping, and Procuring	6
Resolution 3: Standing Rules of the Membership Resolution Process	10
Resolution 4: Human Rights of Agricultural Workers	14
About Decision-Making and Resolutions in AIUSA	19
Who's Who in Resolutions Voting Sessions	21
Definition of Terms	22
Acronym Guide	24
Standing Rules for the AIUSA Membership Resolutions Process	26
Let's Plenary	33

NOTE: Background, arguments in favor, arguments opposed, and resource implications are drafted by the National Resolutions Committee with input from resolutions sponsors, members, the Board, and staff.

Resolution 1: Board Size (Sponsor: AIUSA Board of Directors)

[A] RECOGNIZING the 2013 International Council Meeting (ICM) adopted the Core Standards;

[B] WHEREAS all AI sections are undergoing a governance review for compliance with the Core Standards;

[C] WHEREAS AIUSA is undergoing a governance review and considering governance changes in this process;

[D] WHEREAS AIUSA has the largest Board of Directors among AI sections;

[E] WHEREAS governance reform suggestions have included reducing the Board size;

[F] THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the size of the Board will decrease from eighteen (18) to fifteen (15) persons;

[G] THEREFORE BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that Article V, Section 3 of the Bylaws of AIUSA be amended to read as follows:

Section 3: Number of Directors:
The Board shall consist of fifteen (15) persons.

Background

Every two years Amnesty International (AI) holds an International Council Meeting (ICM). In August 2013 AI held its 31st ICM in Berlin, Germany. Each section sent representatives to the ICM to discuss a wide range of issues that impact AI leadership and country sections, including AIUSA. The 2013 ICM adopted AI's Core Standards and discussed AI section governance. The Core Standards are intended to advance AI's values, identity, policies, and strategy by creating consistency in the areas of governance, management, and human resources. As a result of this ICM decision, every AI section is undergoing a governance review to ensure their practices are compatible with the Core Standards. In doing so, AI aims to promote effectiveness, credibility, and an efficient use of resources.

In 2014, the AIUSA Governance Committee appointed the Governance Review Working Group (GoGov) as a subcommittee of both the Governance Committee and the Membership Committee of the AIUSA Board of Directors. The AIUSA Board of Directors hired the consulting firm Strategy for Humanity to conduct an initial assessment of AIUSA's governance processes in relation to best practices in both the international movement and other non-profit organizations of similar size and scope. Based on these initial findings, the Board has recommended a series of changes to AIUSA's governance, one of which is altering its size.

AIUSA's Board currently has eighteen (18) seats. Voting for its members occurs annually; Board members' terms are staggered so that six (6) members are elected each year. If the Board were reduced to fifteen (15) members, this annual election would be reduced to (5) members. In order to change the size of the Board, the membership must pass a bylaws change by a two-thirds vote during the Annual General Meeting (AGM).

This resolution was first introduced during the 2014-2015 resolutions cycle. At the AGM it received a majority of the votes cast, but not the two-thirds needed to change AIUSA's bylaws. During the voting plenary, a large group of members voted in a bloc to defeat the resolution.

Arguments in Favor

As previously stated, the AIUSA Board of Directors consists of eighteen (18) members, making it the largest Board of any AI section. For some time, AIUSA has been encouraged by the International Executive Committee (IEC) to reduce its Board size significantly. The GoGov recommendation of fifteen (15) Board members would give the Board an odd number of seats, eliminating the need for the chair to cast a deciding vote on deadlocked decisions. Currently, the Board has an even number of seats; if a vote is tied the chair has the responsibility to cast the deciding vote.

Reducing the number of Board members to fifteen (15) would not require further changes in the current Board terms of three years nor would this change alter the current structure of AIUSA's standing committees.

Finally, this change would save AIUSA money on travel reimbursements and other expenses. The Board is required to hold at least four meetings each

year, one of which takes place at the AGM. While Board members do not receive compensation for their services, AIUSA must cover their travel expenses to attend these mandatory meetings.

Arguments Opposed

AIUSA has struggled over the years to achieve the right balance of skills and experiences on its Board of Directors. By reducing the size of the Board to fifteen (15), there would be less opportunity to elect people with varying skill sets. This reduction in size also has the potential to reduce the diversity of Board members themselves.

Another argument against this resolution is that reducing the size of the Board may affect its productivity. The Board is responsible for hiring the section's Executive Director, evaluating his or her performance, overseeing program and budgetary matters, and defining overall strategy in accordance with AI's mission. If there were fewer members of the Board, then each member would be responsible for sitting on more committees, and the overall workload would be distributed among fewer people.

In addition, a smaller Board means less representation for members. Reducing the number will give fewer people a chance to serve and reduce the number of different perspectives at the highest level of decision-making.

Resource Implications

This resolution would reduce costs. There would be three fewer Board members, which would reduce the travel, lodging, and food expenses incurred by AIUSA on their behalf.

Resolution 2: Amnesty International Position on Prostitution, Pimping, and Procuring (Sponsor: James Zimmerman)

[A] WHEREAS the adoption of a new policy by Amnesty International is a serious matter, requiring the support of the members;

[B] WHEREAS The Resolution on “Sex Work” was passed without sufficient consultation of the members, and without sufficient research;

[C] THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that The Resolution be reconsidered at the 2017 ICM, or at the Global Assembly if that is substituted for the ICM.

[D] THEREFORE BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that votes for and against the resolution shall be recorded as the votes of individual delegates, not to be based on the one section one vote principle.

[E] THEREFORE BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that any final resolution incorporate the principles of non-prosecution and legal protection of prostitutes only; whereas pimps, procurers and traffickers shall continue to be subject to full penalties of the law.

Background

Amnesty International’s (AI) work and research on sexual and reproductive rights found that sex workers are among the most marginalized and vulnerable groups in society. The term “sex worker” here refers to “adults” (18 years of age and above) who receive money or goods in exchange for sexual services, either regularly or occasionally” (ICM Circular 18; ORG 50/1940/2015). Additionally, “sex work involves a contractual arrangement where sexual services are negotiated between consenting adults, with the terms of engagement agreed between the seller and the buyer of sexual services.”

At the 2015 International Council Meeting (ICM) in Dublin, Ireland, the International Council passed Decision 4, entitled “Policy on State Obligations to Respect, Protect and Fulfill the Human Rights of Sex Workers.” This decision “requests the International Board to adopt a policy that seeks attainment of the highest possible protection of the human rights of sex

workers, through measures that include the decriminalization of sex work,” including sex workers, third party and second party actors.

In the summer prior to the 2013 ICM, a draft policy on sex work was issued to the movement for initial consultation. It was discussed at the ICM and an international consultation of the general membership was conducted from fall 2013 through spring 2014. The AIUSA Priorities Subcommittee (PSC), a subset of the Planning and Priorities committee of the Board of Directors, conducted the consultation, with its final report issued in March 2014. The PSC also hosted a briefing and Q&A with members at the 2014 AGM.

AI’s consultation solicited feedback from fifteen organizations, from which eleven responded by the deadline: American Jewish World Service, Center for Reproductive Rights, Equality Now, Freedom Network, Helping Individual Prostitutes Survive (HIPS), National Center for Lesbian Rights, Open Society Foundations (OSF), Planned Parenthood Federation of America, and the Urban Justice Center Sex Workers Project (SWP). Of these organizations, five have adopted policies similar to the ICM Amnesty policy, while one organization, Equality Now, was strongly opposed. Four organizations could not be reached in time: Coalition Against Trafficking in Women, Girls Education and Mentoring Service, National Center for Transgender Equality, and the Polaris Project.

At the 2014 Chairs Assembly, held in June, the movement requested additional research on the policy. In December 2014 the International Board drafted the ICM resolution outlining the proposed policy, which was then circulated to the membership in March 2015. Summaries of the research commissioned at the 2014 Chairs Assembly were made available to the attendees of the 2015 Chairs Assembly and Directors Forums. The ICM resolution and draft policy were further reworked and edited at the June 2015 meeting of the International Board. On July 7, 2015, Circular 18, which included the draft policy and revised resolution, was distributed to the membership.

Arguments in Favor

Sex workers are arguably one of the most marginalized groups in the world. For this reason, AI’s sex work policy must be extremely well backed by sufficient evidence. We must be careful to ensure that our position does not

make it easier for second and third party actors, which include the buyers of sexual services, pimps, and brothel owners, to exploit sex workers. In the US, the majority of female sex workers have been forced into the trade by age 15, because of economic desperation, violence, and/or psychological manipulation. To believe that the women engaged in sex work have full agency over their situations is to ignore the reality of structural racism and violence against women in the world.

Like all other AI policies, we must recognize that this issue is not one that will apply only within the US and other developed nations. In many countries, human trafficking is the result of women's disadvantageous position in society, something that is often reflected in increased preference for sons and neglect of daughters. There is already a great deal of research showing that countries such as Germany and the Netherlands, where sex work has already been decriminalized, have experienced a surge in human trafficking, pimping and other related crimes. Quite often the reality is that the person in power, almost always a white male, has the effective right to buy another person's body, usually an immigrant woman of color. AI should not support the decriminalization of such transactions, because until women have sufficient economic opportunities they need to get out of these degrading situations, demand for commercial sex will only increase, leaving more women vulnerable to this often violent industry.

Arguments Opposed

The criminalization of sex work itself leaves sex workers with little recourse for justice and at serious risk of human rights abuse. In its research AI found that criminalization punishes sex workers in two ways: directly through prosecution and detention, and indirectly through laws governing the buying of sex. This violates the sex worker's right to security of person, health, and safety at work. The decriminalization of sex work recommended by ICM Decision 4 does not necessitate a complete absence of regulation on sex work; rather, it requires that any regulation respect, protect, and fulfill the human rights of sex workers, for example by setting safety standards for work conditions and access to health care.

Additionally, the policy has already been approved by the ICM in 2015 after intensive consultation and research efforts. In the US the Priorities Subcommittee engaged the membership and outside organizations to the

best of its ability given the time constraints of the consultation. To start the process over would undermine the consultation and research conducted by many Amnesty sections.

Full decriminalization of consensual sex is emerging as the human rights norm, accepted by international human rights groups and UN bodies (Final AIUSA Statement on Sex Work Policy). Last, Amnesty's proposed policy works to respect, protect, and fulfill the human rights of sex workers through acknowledging their own agency and their right to make decisions about their economic circumstances. There is no need to mention additional actors, because it is clear where Amnesty International stands on exploitative practices.

Resource Implications

If implemented, this resolution would require Amnesty sections to devote significant staff and board time to doing another section-wide consultation process, the financial implications of which are unclear.

If the global movement were to conduct additional research and consultation on the topic of the rights of sex workers, it would require resources at the International Secretariat (IS). If it proved necessary for the IS to hire another researcher to accommodate the increased workload, this could cost \$90,000 to \$100,000 per year in salary and benefits. These expenses could be avoided or reduced if the work is carried out by existing staff, but this would necessarily affect the amount and quality of research in other areas.

There would also be additional costs for research trips and report production, which is difficult to estimate not knowing where this research would focus and how many different research sites would need to be visited. Proposed research in the Global North, for example, is estimated at \$8,000 to \$10,000, but that amount could vary widely depending on the number of research sites, locations, and duration of research.

**Resolution 3: Standing Rules of the Membership Resolution Process
(Sponsor: Hilary Naylor)**

[A] WHEREAS resolutions presented to the AGM without previously being passed at a Regional Conference are called non-binding Decisions if they are passed at the AGM;

[B] WHEREAS important issues and concerns may arise in the six months between the Sept 1 deadline for submission to Regional Conferences and the AGM (late March/early April);

[C] WHEREAS in ICM years, the Resolutions submitted to the ICM are published in January or February of that year;

[D] WHEREAS the current wording of the Standing Rules of the MRP has allowed the Board to discount, dismiss and/or refuse to consider non-binding Decisions passed overwhelmingly (or by a large majority) at the AGM;

[E] WHEREAS prior to revision of the Standing Rules in 2007, non-binding AGM Decisions (also called "Special" or "Emergency") were treated equally to binding Decisions except that they could be overturned by a simple majority of the Board instead of 2/3;

[F] THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that Section 7E of the Standing Rules of the MRP be changed from:

7E. Non-binding decisions will be advisory, and implemented at the Board's discretion.

To

7E. Non-binding decisions will be placed on the Board agenda and either implemented, or overturned by a simple majority of the Board.

Background

Amnesty International USA (AIUSA) is a democratic grassroots organization. The resolutions process, in which resolutions are discussed and voted upon at Regional Conferences and the Annual General Meeting (AGM) is one way that

members can influence various aspects of our work. The process is governed by the Standing Rules of the Membership Resolution Process (MRP Rules).

The MRP Rules contain a deadline of September 1 for submission of resolutions, with a later September 15 deadline for those submitted by student groups. These are firm deadlines; resolutions submitted after those dates, called "late resolutions," are not included in the resolutions packet distributed at the Regional Conferences. (Such resolutions were formerly referred to as "emergency resolutions," and although that term is occasionally still used by members, it does not appear in the MPR Rules.)

It is sometimes possible, however, for late resolutions to be considered at Regional Conferences if they meet certain criteria. Such a resolution must be "timely, meaning that it either addresses a human rights issue arising after the resolution submission deadline," and "urgent, meaning that it addresses an issue that cannot wait until the next resolutions cycle." (MRP Rules 3(B)(c)(i and ii)

It is also possible to present a resolution during the period between the Regional Conferences and the AGM, as long as they meet the same criteria described above. Such resolutions, if they pass at an AGM resolutions voting plenary, are called "Non-Binding" resolutions.

All resolutions passed at the AGM are sent to the AIUSA Board of Directors for implementation. "Binding resolutions," meaning those that passed at one or more Regional Conferences and the AGM, must be implemented by the Board unless that body votes to overturn them by a two-thirds majority. Non-Binding resolutions, on the other hand, are "advisory, and implemented at the Board's discretion," according to MRP Rule 7(E).

The purpose of this resolution is to change the way the Board considers implementation of Non-Binding resolutions. It seeks to amend MRP Rule 7(E) to require the Board to either implement such resolutions or overturn them by a majority vote. If passed, it would no longer be possible for the Board to simply decline to decide whether to implement a Non-Binding resolution; it would have to either approve or deny implementation by a majority vote.

Arguments in Favor

Non-Binding resolutions still represent the desire of the AIUSA members despite the fact that they have not gone through the entire member resolutions process. Under the current MRP Rules Non-Binding resolutions are not given equal respect and concern as Binding resolutions. Since Non-Binding resolutions are considered advisory the Board can simply ignore them. This is not the appropriate way to treat a Non-Binding resolution that does still come from the membership.

An example from 2013 illustrates this. In that year AI members from the US and other sections were deeply concerned about the implement of the Global Transition Program that resulted in many layoffs at the International Secretariat. AIUSA members passed a Non-Binding resolution at the AGM asking the Board to instruct our 2013 International Council Meeting (ICM) delegation to convey the section's concerns to staff and the International Executive Committee at the ICM. The Board chose to decline action on the substance of that resolution without making a formal decision either way.

This resolution requires that the Board simply take the time to discuss Non-Binding resolutions and either approve or deny their implementation by a majority vote. Doing so would give AIUSA membership an idea of what the Board thinks about a particular issue, just as it currently does with all Binding resolutions. Creating a record of the Board's reasons for declining to implement a Non-Binding resolution would help AIUSA members determine whether and how to present the resolution again in the following year.

Arguments Opposed

Non-Binding resolutions do not have the force of all the membership's approval because they did not go through the entire approved member resolutions process. Only a limited number of members are able to attend the AGM and their voice is not the voice of the whole membership. One reason resolutions are considered at regional conferences is to make sure that AIUSA is representing members throughout the section, not just the small fraction that can attend AGMs. If resolutions passed only at the AGM take on the quality and respect of the Binding resolutions that pass at both Regional Conferences and the AGM, then there is a possibility that changes to

AIUSA policy will be dominated by one group that is able to go to the AGM and not by all AIUSA membership.

The change proposed by this resolution would essentially make Non-Binding resolutions almost as powerful as Binding resolutions. Sometimes ideas generated in the heat of the moment at an AGM can obtain a majority of votes at a resolutions session without much discussion or careful consideration. The Board should retain the discretion and flexibility to simply decline to consider such resolutions without having to take an up-or-down vote on the matter. If, on the other hand, a Non-Binding resolution passes with ample discussion and full consideration, the Board would likely decide to implement it despite its not having passed a Regional Conference. This resolution is therefore unnecessary.

Resource Implications:

There are no resource implications associated with this resolution.

Resolution 4: Human Rights of Agricultural Workers (Sponsor: Carly Calbreath)

[A] WHEREAS under Article 23 of the UDHR,

“(1) Everyone has the right to work, to free choice of employment, to just and favourable conditions of work and to protection against unemployment.

(2) Everyone, without any discrimination, has the right to equal pay for equal work.

(3) Everyone who works has the right to just and favourable remuneration ensuring for himself and his family an existence worthy of human dignity, and supplemented, if necessary, by other means of social protection.

(4) Everyone has the right to form and to join trade unions for the protection of his interests.”

[B] WHEREAS workers in the US agricultural industry often come from historically politically-disenfranchised communities, both in identity and geographic location;

[C] WHEREAS workers’ racial, or economic, or immigration status contribute to their vulnerability to exploitation by both economic and political powers;

[D] WHEREAS conditions often limit access to education for both workers and their family members;

[E] WHEREAS natural resources (such as food, water and land) have been denied of workers and their communities but granted to the industry that employs them

[F] WHEREAS workers consistently experience need for heat stress prevention, equipment safety, pesticide safety, and protection from gendered violence/discrimination

[G] WHEREAS current AI policies underserve these communities’ ability to pursue suitable standards of living

[H] THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED AIUSA must develop comprehensive policy to advocate for the recognition and protection of human rights of those individuals working in the agricultural industry and their communities;

Background

Amnesty International (AI) has a history of protecting and promoting the rights of immigrants around the world. According to the National Agricultural Worker Survey there are approximately 2.5 million farm workers in the United States. About 48% of all agricultural workers lack work authorization. The remaining farmworkers are about 33% citizens, 18% lawful permanent residents, and 1% having some other kind of work authorization. The Department of Labor has identified agricultural workers as one of the most vulnerable labor groups in the United States. This vulnerability often leads to exploitation, leaving workers with limited access to health care, fair wages, paid overtime, paid vacation, sick leave, or the opportunity to organize to improve working conditions. The denial of these rights is a violation of Article 23 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR).

AI has previously issued two reports on the rights of migrant workers in North Korea and Italy. The 2014 AI report "Bitter Harvest: the Exploitation and forced labour of migrant workers in South Korea" documented abuses of migrant workers in the Republic of South Korea under the Employment Permit System (EPS). Additionally, AI's 2012 report "Exploited Labor: Migrant Workers in Italy's Agricultural Sector" highlighted the exploitation of workers under Italy's immigration policy.

In 2012, Amnesty International USA (AIUSA) issued the report "In Hostile Terrain: Human Rights Violations in Immigration Enforcement in the US Southwest." This report examined human rights abuses associated with immigration enforcement at the border between the United States and Mexico and in the interior of the United States. While the primary focus of this report was immigration, it did document increased restrictions on day laborers in the U.S.

Some states have passed hostile laws that aimed at restricting day laborers' right to seek employment under article 23 of the UDHR by prohibiting laborers from congregating in public places. Certain laws have included provisions outlawing the solicitation of work by undocumented migrants in

public places. AIUSA's "In Hostile Terrain" report stated: "The enactment and enforcement of laws that target day laborers by criminalizing those who seek work in public places, restricts their right to find work and violates day laborers' right to work under international law."

AIUSA has taken on this issue by joining the Fair Food Alliance. AIUSA endorses the principles of that organization, but does not target individual companies regarding alleged abuses without further research on each case. This stance is in part due to AI's current boycott policy, which only permits the organization to initiate or support a boycott if AI research concludes that the company is involved in human rights abuses and if AI has made other efforts to change the company behavior in other ways. In addition, such steps are only permissible on the authority of AI's Secretary General.

This resolution asks AIUSA to conduct more in-depth research on the human rights abuses of agricultural workers and create comprehensive policies to ensure the rights of individuals in these communities.

Arguments In Favor

The lack of clear policy regarding agricultural workers sends the unfortunate signal that AI and AIUSA are not strongly supportive of labor rights, specifically, agricultural workers. Far too many abuses have resulted from the disenfranchisement and exploitation of agricultural workers in the United States.

AIUSA has acted as a coalition partner with other advocacy organizations, but has fallen short of endorsing targeted efforts against corporate abusers. Additionally, AIUSA has not held the U.S. government accountable to enforce the current laws that aim to protect workers from abuses. Therefore, it is imperative that AIUSA should independently examine these alleged abuses in order to formulate a clear policy regarding the protection and promotion of farmworkers' rights.

This issue is timely, topical, and aligned with AIUSA's mission, values, and efforts. Without this resolution, AIUSA will continue to sidestep the issue of labor rights, specifically, agricultural workers' rights. Without the passage of this resolution, AIUSA will continue to sidestep a large and developing human

rights crisis involving labor rights, and specifically the rights of agricultural workers.

Arguments Against

This resolution is unnecessary. AIUSA already acts as a coalition partner with other advocacy organizations to ensure the protection and promotion of the rights of all workers. As the background information explains, AIUSA has taken action to support the principles of farmworker advocacy organizations, such as the Fair Food Alliance.

This resolution calls for research and policy development, which will require considerable resources. AIUSA currently does not have expertise in labor rights, nor does the organization prioritize this issue. In order to engage in this movement, AIUSA would have to delegate considerable resources to research and development of policy. In today's unstable economic climate, in which AIUSA resources are limited, pursuing this issue would force the organization to reprioritize other campaigns.

Furthermore, this resolution asks AIUSA to create policy, which we cannot set. Before AIUSA can create and implement policy on a particular human rights issue, we must first seek approval from the International Secretariat. AIUSA must first submit a resolution to an International Council Meeting asking for AI's researchers to investigate alleged abuses of agricultural workers in the United States.

Resource Implications

The AIUSA research team is currently working on a report about human rights and gun violence in the United States in 2016. This is a priority domestic campaign. The IS/regional office is currently considering this project as part of a broader regional project on gun violence in the Americas with sections in Brazil, Venezuela and Mexico participating in the discussions.

In order for AIUSA to take on a project related to farm workers, it would require a change to the timeline associated with the current project on gun violence as well as substantial resources to provide the research, materials and mobilization tactics needed to advance a campaign on farm workers. If

these resources cannot be obtained by diverting staff from other projects, it could require hiring a full-time campaigner at an estimated cost of \$80,000 to \$100,000 per year in salary and benefits.

Another possibility would be to fit this subject into an existing area of research. The global movement has adopted “The Shrinking space for Human Rights” and “Protection of People on the Move” as the two priority campaigns for the international movement for 2016-2019. The international movement has also recommended that the “Stop exploitation of migrant worker” proposal be maximized and developed as a regional campaign. It is therefore possible that the IS researcher focusing on refugee and migrant rights issues, who will be placed in the United States in early 2016, could incorporate farm workers into that project.

About Decision-Making and Resolutions in AIUSA

Why Resolutions?

Amnesty International is a grassroots organization. Any member or group of members has an opportunity to impact the mission, method, policy, organization or allocation of resources. Resolutions are a means by which individual members or groups of members can influence policy on a regional, national, or international level. The purpose of a resolution is to make a statement to either direct a change in policy, a change in the method for instituting policy, or a change in AI's organizational structure. A resolution can be as simple as asking staff to clarify current procedures, or as complex as requesting a change in AI's mission.

Initial Considerations

A resolution should be written only after consideration of the following:

1. *Identify the issue:* The sponsor should identify the specific problem that he or she would like to be addressed.
2. *Identify the ideal outcome:* The sponsor should formulate a specific solution to this problem and be clear about what should change and how that change would work. The sponsor considers whether the idea can be handled only by a resolution (i.e., certain policy and/or mission issues), or if it can be handled through discussion with a Regional Office, a Board member, or a volunteer leader.
3. *Learn about the issue:* The sponsor should learn what AI/AIUSA has done on this issue in the past. The resolutions database should be consulted to ensure this issue has not been addressed in a previous AGM decision. If the idea concerns a mission or policy issue, discussion with staff, Board members, or an affected co-group member, at an early stage is advisable in order to guarantee the most effective resolution possible.
4. *Ask for change:* The sponsor should ask for the change from the Board, relevant staff, and/or relevant volunteer leadership structures.
5. After completing these steps and if the response to the request is unsatisfactory, only then should a sponsor submit a resolution.
6. *Focus on substance rather than implementation:* The focus of the resolution should be to put forth an idea for change in program priority, policy, or approach, but the

resolution should avoid mandating specific staffing or budget proposals (i.e. avoid mandating the creation of a new staff position or requiring the expenditures of specific sums of money). The Board and staff should be afforded flexibility in resolution implementation and be able to focus on intent and rather than the administrative details it may require.

Resolutions at Regional Conferences

Once a resolution is formulated, the author (sponsor) submits it using the Resolutions Submission form and following all guidelines. The resolutions submission deadline is September 1, with an extension until September 15 for members of a registered student groups. The National Resolutions Committee (NRC) will assign resolutions to Working Parties, organize and combine resolutions when necessary, and prepare arguments and background information. The NRC works with the sponsor to further develop the resolution for consideration at the regional conferences.

At the regional conference Working Party, the resolution is debated and voted upon. If passed, it is forwarded to the regional conference Voting Plenary for a final vote.

At the Voting Plenary, all resolutions are again discussed and voted upon, including late resolutions. A late resolution, subject to a ruling from the NRC, may be introduced directly to a Working Party or to the Voting Plenary of a regional conference after all other business has been attended. If it passes the Voting Plenary, it goes to the AGM, as do all the other resolutions that passed the regional conference Voting Plenary session.

Resolutions at the AGM

The NRC will automatically place all resolutions, which are adopted by the regional conference, on the agenda of the Annual General Meeting (AGM). At the AGM, the resolutions will follow in the same process as the regional conference, going first to the Working Parties and then to the Voting Plenary.

A Non-binding Resolution may also be introduced directly to the AGM either during a Working Party or at the Voting Plenary, if time permits. If such a resolution passes at the Voting Plenary, it is considered a Non-Binding

INTERNAL DOCUMENT—FOR AIUSA MEMBERS ONLY

AGM Decision, which is still forwarded to the Board for consideration but is in no way binding on the Board.

Resolutions Forwarded to AIUSA'S Board

Resolutions passed at the Voting Plenary of the AGM are considered AGM decisions and are passed to the AIUSA Board of Directors for implementation. The Board may overturn an AGM decision by a two-thirds vote. Each year the Board submits a report to the membership on the implementation of the previous year's AGM decisions.

The International Council Meeting (ICM)

The implementation of AGM decisions (resolutions) with implications for the international movement requires that the Board submit a resolution on this topic to the next ICM. The International Council meets biannually to consider resolutions submitted by

Amnesty International sections. The process of consideration is similar to that at the AGM: there are working parties, and voting plenary sessions. Resolutions that pass an ICM are considered ICM decisions and are submitted to the International Executive Committee (IEC), which is responsible for implementing them and reporting on their implementation.

Parliamentary Procedure

AIUSA uses *Robert's Rules of Order, Newly Revised* for decision-making in both Working Parties and the Voting Plenary. The purposes of these rules are (1) to establish a clear process understood by all; (2) to ensure that all views are fairly represented; and (3) to make decisions as efficiently as possible. A chart of commonly used motions and a guide for the session are attached to this packet.

Who's Who in Resolutions Voting Sessions

The People in the Room:

Members: Working parties and voting plenary sessions are internal meetings of AIUSA. Only voting members of AIUSA and authorized delegates of student and local groups may make motions and vote. Participants are asked to come prepared by reading the resolutions packet. They should be respectful of others, willing to voice their opinions, and even more willing to let others voice theirs. Participants should follow the order set by the Chair, asking for information, proposing amendments, or making arguments at the times they are requested. Everyone is asked to remember that it is the clarity of intent that is the goal; amendments should be offered on substance, not form (e.g. grammar).

Sponsors: The authors of the resolution at a regional conference. The sponsor usually introduces the resolution and speaks on its behalf at the Regional Conference Working Party. However, when the floor begins consideration of the resolution, the assembled body owns the resolution and not the sponsor. Resolutions at the AGM do not have individual sponsors.

Resource People: When there are questions about what AI is already doing on a specific issue, or about the financial or personnel implications of a resolution, there are usually a handful of volunteers, Board members or staff who are best able to provide the answers. When possible, an effort is made to foresee who will be needed in any particular discussion and to have them be present. The Chair should know who these resource people are and be able to call upon them if questions arise.

The People Up Front:

Chair: The Chair is an AIUSA member who is well versed in the resolutions process and parliamentary procedure. It is the job of the Chair to make sure that the people in the room know what is going on, keep track of where they are in the process, and ensure that all substantive points are heard while avoiding spending time on

Redundancy and minor grammatical points. A good Chair will make the process clear, keep the discussion moving, and get finished on time. It is not the job of the Chair to direct the outcome of debate on a resolution. The Chair only has authority to rule on points of order. A Working Party or Voting Plenary may have two Chairs, who usually alternate resolutions.

Rapporteurs: Rapporteurs are the secretaries of the plenary session. Resolutions are usually displayed on a screen. One Rapporteur works with the LCD display, inserting proposed amendments, so that everyone knows exactly what is being debated. All amendments that pass remain, as does a note as to the final vote. The other Rapporteur sits next to the Chair, keeping detailed notes on the session, including the stated purpose of the resolution, the basic substance of any amendments proposed, and arguments for or against an amendment or the resolution. Precise language of all amendments, as well as the vote tallies on each amendment and on the resolution as a whole, are also noted. After the Working Party or Voting Plenary is over, the Rapporteurs compare notes and make sure that they have an accurate record of the debate and votes. The Chair will approve the final notes and submit the notes and the final resolution language to the National Resolutions Committee.

Working Party Rapporteurs also prepare a brief report to read for the Voting Plenary as each resolution from that Working Party is presented, so the participants know what was considered. The report is a summary of the issues addressed and amendments made to each resolution that passed (including the important amendments that may have failed).

Runners: Runners are volunteers who do exactly what their name implies: they run to get whatever material or human resources the Working Party or Voting Plenary requires. This job could entail running to get markers, or tracking down a resource person who needed to answer a point of information. Runners also count votes and report the count to the Chair.

Definition of Terms in AIUSA Decision-Making Sessions

Abstention: A voter does not vote in favor or against a motion, but still wants that opinion to be recognized. An abstention is not a vote, and hence is not factored either way into the vote results. Abstaining may indicate confusion or disagreement with the procedure on the part of the abstainer.

AGM (Annual General Meeting): The principal decision-making body of AIUSA. Resolutions passed by majority vote of AIUSA members present for the voting process determine the general program and policy of AIUSA.

AIUSA: Amnesty International of the U.S.A., or the U.S. section of Amnesty International.

AIUSA Staff: At the Board's direction, the staff implements AGM and Board decisions, and coordinates the day-to-day work of AIUSA.

Amendment: A proposed change to a resolution. This proposed change must be debated and voted upon. If passed, this change will be incorporated into the resolution.

Note: Amendments to amendments may be proposed, but amendments to amendments are not allowed.

Note: Friendly amendments must be debated and voted upon, unless adopted by unanimous consent.

Board of Directors: Elected by AIUSA members, the Board develops policy and sets priorities for the work of AIUSA. It oversees the implementation of AGM decisions, and makes decision on issues arising between AGMs. If the Board judges a resolution to be contrary to AI's mission or policy, or prohibitive because of financial implications or impossible to implement for other substantial reasons, the resolution may be overturned by a two-thirds vote of the full Board.

Bylaws: The document that outlines the purposes and structure of AIUSA.

Chair / Co-Chairs: the person(s) who impartially direct the working party or plenary.

A Chair does not offer opinions or take part in debate on any questions. He or she recognizes speakers; rules them out of order (if, for example, someone else is recognized or speaker talks too long, etc.); makes procedural rulings, etc. making sure discussion runs smoothly and that the rules are followed.

Floor: The body of people assembled who are participating in the voting plenary or Working Party sessions.

ICM (International Council Meeting): The supreme decision-making and governing body of Amnesty International, comprised of representatives from all AI sections and meeting every two years. Resolutions passed by an Amnesty section, which would have international consequences, are considered at the ICM.

IEC (International Executive Committee): Elected by the International Council, the Committee supervises the work of Amnesty International. It makes major decisions on issues or international importance that need to be resolved between ICMs. The IEC also oversees implementation of ICM decisions.

IS (International Secretariat): The central office (located in London) of AI and staff who coordinate the day-to-day work of AI. They outline overall objectives and strategies for AI actions and develop specific actions. The IS implements the decisions and plans of the ICM and IEC.

Motion for the Previous Question: Colloquially referred to as "moving to call the question" or "calling the question." This is a motion for a vote on the last question under consideration (i.e. deciding whether or not it is time to end debate and to vote on an amendment or a resolution). This is not the actual vote on an amendment or resolution. This motion is not debatable.

Point of Information: A question asked by someone on the floor to the chair, or through the chair to the relevant person, for relevant information to the question under discussion.

Point of Order: A statement, usually made by someone on the floor, to remind the body of a

rule or procedure. Chair is called upon to make a ruling on this point and to enforce the rules of procedure.

Resolution: A formal motion put to the floor in order to be voted upon. A resolution may propose a change in policy, method or organization, directed either at Amnesty International or AIUSA.

Resolutions Plenary: See Voting Plenary.

Robert's Rules of Order, Newly Revised: Rules of parliamentary procedure used in the AIUSA Membership Resolutions Process, unless superseded by Standing Rules or the Bylaws.

Section: A recognized Amnesty International structure of a particular country, state or territory generally having three or more active groups who participate to some degree in coordinated human rights work.

Late Resolutions and Non-Binding Resolutions: A resolution not properly submitted by established resolutions submission deadlines/guidelines and brought to a regional conference or the AGM either during a Working Party or at the Voting Plenary session.

A Late Resolution, which passes a Voting Plenary at a regional conference, will proceed to the AGM with the same status as all properly submitted resolutions.

A Non-Binding resolution brought directly to the AGM and passed at the Voting Plenary session is forwarded to the Board. Such a resolution is advisory only, and is not binding on the Board. Late and Non-Binding resolutions are subject to a ruling as to whether or not they are in order and can be presented at the conference. A late resolution would be considered in order if it was intended to address an issue emerging after the resolution submission deadline, which cannot wait until the next resolutions cycle. Please see the Standing Rules of the Membership Resolutions Process for more details about the criteria for Late Resolutions.

Standing Rules of the AGM: A set of regulations guiding the process of decision-making at the AGM, which must adopt these rules at the opening plenary of the AGM in order for them to come into effect. A copy is attached as an appendix to this packet.

Standing Rules of the MRP (Membership Resolutions Process): A set of regulations guiding the process of decision-making within the Membership Resolutions Process of AIUSA. A copy of these rules is attached as an appendix to this packet.

Statute: The document outlining the goals, methods and structures of Amnesty International. It can only be amended by a two-thirds vote of the ICM.

Voting Member: An individual member of AIUSA (one who has paid dues or filed a valid dues waiver to the organization within the past calendar year), or an authorized delegate member of a local or student group who has filed a Group Voting Authorization Form. Voting members will be required to establish their voting eligibility, and will be given a special voting card to use at both working parties and the voting plenary session.

Voting Plenary: A meeting of all those attending a regional conference or AGM which reviews the recommendations of working parties (see below), considers further debate and votes to either defeat resolutions or pass them on to the Board of Directors.

Working Party: A body that debates resolutions, records its debate and actions taken and prepares a report for the Voting Plenary. A working party can either defeat a resolution or pass it for consideration at the voting plenary session. Because they are more intimate, working parties are traditionally the place for more in depth discussions of, and proposal of amendments to, particular policy issues and resolutions.

Acronym Guide

AC – Area Coordinator

ACSC –Area Coordinator Steering Committee

AMD – Activism and Membership Development. AIUSA Staff Department.

AGM – Annual General Meeting

AGMPC – Annual General Meeting Planning/Program Committee.

AI – Amnesty International

AIUSA – Amnesty International USA. The USA Section of Amnesty International.

BHR – Business and human rights; The focus of one of AIUSA’s coordination groups

BRICS – Brazil, Russia, India, China, South Africa; emerging powers, which along with the US and the EU [European Union], are prioritized for human rights advocacy and membership growth

CAN – Corporate Action Network

CAP – Country Action Program

Co-group – Country Coordination Group, either country or thematically based

CGSC – Coordination Group Steering Committee

GIG – Global Impact Goals

HRE – Human Rights Education.
ICM – International Council Meeting.

IEC – International Executive Committee, now called the International Board. The board elected by delegates at the ICM to supervise the IS and the implementations of ICM decisions.

IS – International Secretariat.

ISP – Integrated Strategic Plan

LC – Legislative Coordinator.

MAAC – Multi-Cultural Assessment and Advisory Committee

MARC – Mid-Atlantic Regional Conference

MARO – Mid-Atlantic Regional Office.

MCOD – Multi-Cultural Organizational Development Plan

MRP – Membership Resolutions Process

MSP – Military, Security, and Police Transfers; the focus of one of AIUSA’s coordination groups

MWRC – Mid-West Regional Conference

MWRO – Mid-West Regional Office.

NC – Nominating Committee. Also known as the **NomCom**

NERC – Northeast Regional Conference

NERO – Northeast Regional Office.

NRC – National Resolutions Committee. Also known as the **ResCom**.

NSYP – National Student and Youth Program

NTP – National Training Program

NWSA – National Week of Student Action

NYAC – National Youth Advisory Committee

POC – Prisoner of Conscience

PADP – Program to Abolish the Death Penalty

RAN – Regional Action Network

RC – Regional Conference

RO – Regional Office

RPG – Regional Planning Group

SAC – Student Area Coordinator

SDPAC – State Death Penalty Abolition Coordinator

SFC – Special Focus Case

SIF – Special Initiatives Fund

SRC – Southern Regional Conference

SRO – Southern Regional Office

UA – Urgent Action

UAN – Urgent Action Network

VP – Voting Plenary session. Part of the Membership Resolutions Process.

WARN – Worldwide Accelerated Response Network

WP – Working Party. A part of the Membership Resolutions Process.

WRC – Western Regional Conference

WRO – Western Regional Office

STANDING RULES FOR THE AIUSA MEMBERSHIP RESOLUTIONS PROCESS

(as amended July 30, 2014)

1. Controlling Principles

- A. It is the duty of all those individuals and bodies elected, appointed, established or recognized by these Standing Rules to make the procedures, processes and structure of AIUSA Resolutions Process as accessible, readily understood and friendly as possible.
- B. The Standing Rules of the Resolutions Process of Amnesty International of the USA, Inc. (“AIUSA”) must be in accord with the Certificate of Incorporation and the bylaws of AIUSA (“Bylaws”).

2. National Resolutions Committee (“NRC”)

- A. The AIUSA Board of Directors (“the Board”), at its summer meeting, shall appoint a National Resolutions Committee (“NRC”) to oversee and manage the Resolutions Process for the coming year:
 - 1) Establish reasonable rules for the resolutions process, to be set forth annually in the Resolutions Guidelines and Submission Form and conveyed to the membership at least 90 days prior to the September 1st resolutions submission deadline (September 15th for students);
 - 2) Assist and prepare the sponsors of all properly submitted Resolutions;
 - 3) Prepare the Resolutions Packets; reword and combine resolutions, provided that the intent of the original resolutions is not altered and the approval of the sponsors is secured for Resolutions at Regional Conferences;
 - 4) Provide the text of properly submitted and Binding Resolutions to members through print and online communications mechanisms, and provide online discussion of resolutions for members;
 - 5) Communicate with regional and AGM staff to coordinate process logistics; to this end, regional representatives shall serve on any regional conference planning committees and/or groups, and the Chair of the NRC on the AGM planning committee;
 - 6) Ensure the bylaws, standing rules, a summary of Robert’s Rules of parliamentary procedures are available to all members, and all properly submitted or Binding Resolutions are provided to all members at conferences;
 - 7) Promote participation in and understanding of the Resolutions Process; provide overview of the resolutions process at the Opening Plenary of each Regional Conference and AGM;
 - 8) Appoint, train and oversee the officers of the Working Parties and Resolutions Plenary;
 - 9) Assign Resolutions to the appropriate Working Parties;
 - 10) Assist the Working Party officers in preparing reports to the Voting Plenary, and ensure that copies of all resolutions passed by the Working Parties are available at the Voting Plenary; and
 - 11) Forward to the general secretary of the Board all resolutions passed by the Regional

Conferences and AGM, and reports of deliberations. AGM reports should include status of each resolution, whether binding or non-binding; and if non-binding, whether passed by a Working Party and the Resolutions Plenary, or presented solely to the Resolutions Plenary.

- B. All resolutions passed in the Regional Conference Resolutions Plenary will be forwarded to the NRC, which shall prepare said resolutions for presentation at the following AGM, unless they are purely regional in their scope.

3. Resolutions

- A. Any registered AIUSA member (individual member or member group) in good standing may sponsor a resolution, except that only individual members may sponsor resolutions to amend the Bylaws. Member groups sponsoring resolutions must designate on the Submission Form their authorized voting member or another individual member of AIUSA to serve as presenter at the Regional Conference.

- B. Regional Resolutions

- 1) There are two (2) categories of resolutions at the Regional Conference: “properly-submitted” resolutions (“Resolutions”) meeting all submission requirements set forth herein and in the Resolution Guidelines and Submission Form and submitted by the September 1st deadline (September 15th for members of student groups), and “late” resolutions not properly submitted (meeting all requirements) by the established submission deadlines.
 - a) Only properly-submitted Resolutions will have background prepared by the NRC, be placed in the Resolutions Packet for the Regional Conferences to which they are submitted, and be assigned to Working Parties by the NRC.
 - b) Late resolutions may be presented at the Regional Conference, subject to a determination by the NRC Regional Representative that they are in order, and the following requirements are met:
 - i. the sponsor or presenter is eligible to vote at the conference;
 - ii. the resolution does not propose an amendment to the Bylaws or these Standing Rules; and
 - iii. the resolution is submitted to the NRC Regional Representative on paper and electronically, and the sponsor/presenter bears responsibility for providing copies of the resolution text for members of the voting body.
 - c) The NRC Regional Representative will determine that a Late resolution is in order if
 - i. the resolution or other resolutions substantially the same have not already been assigned or defeated at the same Conference;
 - ii. the resolution is timely, meaning that it either addresses a human rights issue arising after the resolution submission deadline, or AI policy or procedural issues on which volunteer input is necessary and appropriate, arising from the floor of the Conference; and
 - iii. the resolution is urgent, meaning that it addresses an issue that cannot wait until

the next resolutions cycle.

- 2) Resolutions may be submitted to multiple regions.
- 3) All resolutions (whenever submitted) passed by the Resolutions Plenary of any Regional Conference shall be forwarded to the AGM, unless they are purely regional in scope.

c. AGM Resolutions

- 1) There are two categories of resolutions at the AGM: “Binding Resolutions” which are passed by and forwarded from one or more Regional Conference; and “Non-Binding Resolutions” which have not been passed by a Regional Conference.
 - a) Binding Resolutions will be assigned to Working Parties by the NRC prior to the AGM. If passed by the AGM, the resulting decisions shall be binding upon the board, unless overturned by a two-thirds vote of the Board, as provided in the Bylaws.
 - b) Non-Binding Resolutions may be presented by anyone eligible to vote at the AGM. If passed at the AGM, implementation of the resulting decisions will be at the discretion of the Board.
 - c) Non-Binding Resolutions may be presented at the AGM, subject to a determination by the NRC that they are in order, and the following requirements are met:
 - i. the sponsor or presenter is eligible to vote at the AGM;
 - ii. the resolution does not propose an amendment to the Bylaws or these Standing Rules; and
 - iii. the resolution is submitted to the NRC on paper and electronically, and the sponsor/presenter bears responsibility for providing copies of the resolution text for members of the voting body.
 - d) The NRC will determine that a Non-Binding resolution is out of order if the resolution or other resolutions substantially the same were considered at any Regional Conference(s) in the same resolutions cycle, and failed to pass at every such Conference.
 - e) If the resolution is not ruled out of order pursuant to paragraph (d), then the NRC will determine that a Non-Binding resolution is in order if
 - i. the resolution is timely, meaning that it either addresses a human rights issue arising after the Regional Conferences, or AI policy or procedural issues on which volunteer input is necessary and appropriate, arising from the floor of the AGM; and
 - ii. the resolution is urgent, meaning that it addresses an issue that cannot wait until the next resolutions cycle.
 - f) In ICM years, the Board submits ICM resolutions to the NRC for addition to the agenda of a strictly internationally focused Working Party. These resolutions are Non-Binding, but automatically meet the criteria for submission of Non-Binding Resolutions to the AGM articulated in these Standing Rules.

D. Late or Non-Binding Resolutions determined to be in order by the NRC may be presented at the Regional Conferences or AGM at three points:

- 1) If submitted in writing to the Working Party assigned by the NRC prior to the adoption

of the agenda, such resolutions can be presented as amendments and added to the Working Party agenda by majority vote of the Working Party.

- 2) Late and Non-Binding Resolutions may be presented to any Working Party assigned by the NRC for consideration after the Working Party has taken action on all the resolutions on its agenda, and taken up by majority vote of the Working Party.
 - 3) Late and Non-Binding Resolutions may be presented at the Resolutions Plenary after action has been taken on all the resolutions passed by the Working Parties, and may be taken up for consideration by majority vote of the Resolutions Plenary.
- E. Late and Non-Binding resolutions determined to be out of order by the NRC may nevertheless be considered by the Regional Conferences or AGM if the voting body votes to add the resolution to the agenda by a 2/3 majority.
- F. After action has been taken on all the resolutions passed by the Working Parties, resolutions which fail in a Working Party may be taken up for consideration by 2/3 majority vote of the resolutions plenary.

4. Voting

- A. Members are entitled to vote under the Bylaws of AIUSA. Eligible voting members include dues paying members, individuals who have submitted a valid “dues waiver” and those holding valid Group Voting Authorization Forms (one designated voter per member group), in accordance with such criteria and time constraints as the Board shall reasonably establish.
- B. In accordance with the Bylaws, only individual members may vote on Bylaws Amendments.
- C. Voting in Working Parties and Resolutions Plenary sessions at all conferences shall be taken by a show of voting cards clearly labeled “Member” or “Group”. However, only under extraordinary circumstances or to accommodate physical impairment, the chair or chairs may direct a vote to be taken by other means.

5. Quorum

- A. In accordance with the Bylaws of AIUSA, a quorum of individuals holding at least one valid voting card (40 at Regional Conferences; 100 at the AGM) must be present in order for business to be conducted at any Resolutions Plenary.
- B. It is the duty of the Chair to establish that a quorum is present before opening the Resolutions Plenary.
- C. If a quorum is not present, the Resolutions Plenary may be delayed until a quorum is obtained, or the Resolutions Plenary may be adjourned.
- D. If a Resolutions Plenary is adjourned without a quorum having been attained, no official business is conducted there (except a motion to adjourn or such other motions allowed

under Robert's Rules of Order); no resolutions are forwarded from such Regional Conference to the AGM, or from such an AGM to the Board. Business transacted prior to establishing the absence of a quorum shall be valid.

- E. Sponsors of resolutions not considered in a Regional Resolutions Plenary because of lack of quorum may attempt to have their resolutions considered as Late Resolutions at other regional conferences or as Non- Binding Resolutions at the next AGM.

6. Working Parties and Resolutions Plenary Sessions

- A. Staff shall provide ample accommodation for Working Parties (which shall be held the day before the Resolutions Plenary) and for the Resolutions Plenary at each conference.
- B. Except as otherwise provided, Robert's Rules of Order, Newly Revised, shall govern.
- C. Members shall be free to choose which Working Parties or Resolutions Plenary they will attend.
- D. While the Working Parties and Resolutions Plenary are not closed meetings, only eligible voters may propose amendments or propose/second motions.
- E. Members not in attendance at a given Working Party or Resolutions Plenary may participate in the discussion by:
 - 1) Submitting copies of a position paper to be circulated in the Working Party or Resolutions Plenary by another voting member in good standing;
 - 2) Providing a statement no more than 300 words in length to be read aloud during the discussion by a voting member in good standing.
- F. The NRC, in advance of each Regional Conferences and AGM, and in consultation with regional volunteer leaders and staff, shall appoint:
 - 1) A Parliamentarian who shall be provided with copies of the AI Statutes, the Bylaws and Standing Rules of AIUSA, and Robert's Rules of Order, Newly Revised;
 - 2) The Chairs, Rapporteurs, and Runners of such Working Parties as are necessary, and of the Resolutions Plenary; and
 - 3) Tellers and such assistants as are necessary to secure rapid and accurate counts of votes in the Working Parties and Resolutions Plenary; Runners and Chairs may serve as Tellers.
- G. The voting members present in each Working Party or Resolutions Plenary shall approve the officers appointed to them or elect other officers, which election shall be the first order of business.
- H. The Working Party shall approve or alter the order of the agenda established for the Working

Party, which action shall immediately follow the election of officers. The Working Party may not remove from the agenda properly submitted or Binding Resolutions assigned to it by the Resolutions Committee, but may add Late or Non-Binding Resolutions submitted for their consideration.

- I. The Resolutions Plenary shall approve or alter the order of the agenda established for the Resolutions Plenary, which action shall immediately follow the election of officers. The Resolutions Plenary may not remove from the agenda resolutions forwarded to it from the Working Parties or add new Late or Non-Binding Resolutions until after all other business has been conducted.
- J. Drafting Committees may be formed by decision of the Working Party Chair (or by majority vote of the Working Party) at regional conferences and the AGM on contentious resolutions. The Working Party Chair appoints a Secretary of the Drafting Committee from attendees of the said Working Party, who is to bring proposed compromise language to the Voting Plenary of the same conference. Resolutions for which Drafting Committees are formed at conferences are not voted upon at the Working Party, but forwarded directly to the Voting Plenary of the same conference at which point compromise language from the Drafting Committee is considered. Drafting Committees can be formed by the NRC between regional conferences and the AGM to bring compromise language to the AGM on contentious resolutions and resolutions which passed more than one regional conference with textual differences. The NRC appoints a Secretary of the Drafting Committee and members of the Drafting Committee from among interested members. The Secretary of the Drafting Committee is responsible for bringing proposed compromise language to the assigned Working Party of the AGM.

7. Board of Directors

- A. All AGM decisions (resolutions passed by the AGM Resolutions Plenary) will be forwarded to the Board and placed on its agenda.
- B. Binding decisions will be implemented in full and in a timely fashion, unless overridden or amended by two-thirds vote of the Board within one year of passage, as provided by the bylaws; AGM decisions not overturned or amended by the Board within one year of passage may only be overturned/amended through the Resolutions Process as provided by the By-laws.
- C. AIUSA resolutions that call for the submission of an ICM resolution are placed on the agenda of the Board within one month of passing at least two regional conferences.
- D. Binding AGM decisions requiring an ICM resolution submission for implementation shall be submitted to the international movement by the Board on behalf of AIUSA.
- E. Non-binding decisions will be advisory, and implemented at the Board's discretion.
- F. Resolutions submitted to the ICM, which originate with the Board, are submitted as

resolutions in the AIUSA Membership Resolutions Process.

- G. The general secretary of the Board or his or her designated representative(s) will:
 - 1) Prepare a summary, updated as necessary, and include it in membership publications and communications, outlining the board's disposition of all AGM decisions including Board amendments and the reasons for them, as well as the Board's progress on implementation; and
 - 2) Serve as the officer to whom members may write for a more extensive written report of the Board's action on any given decision, which designation shall be included in the summary distributed to the membership.
- H. By each AGM, the Board shall report to the membership on the implementation of the previous year's decisions, and the Board shall report to the membership at the AGM.

8. Amendments to these Standing Rules

- A. Amendments to these Standing Rules may be submitted by any AIUSA member in good standing, in accordance with the rules for submission of resolutions established herein.
- B. Amendments to these Standing Rules may not be submitted as Late or Non-Binding Resolutions.

Let's Plenary!

Your guide to the Working Party and Voting Plenary.

Chair or Co-chairs will preside over the meeting.
Rapporteurs will take notes and display the resolutions.
Runners will count votes.

Resolution to be discussed is displayed on a projection screen, read, and introduced.

Are there any questions on the resolution?
If so, questions will be answered.

Are there any amendments?

If you think the resolution should be changed, you can propose an amendment. Please write the amendment on a piece of paper first, before presenting it.

YES!

NO!

The Resolution will be displayed and reread with the Amendment included.

Questions on the Amendment will be taken and answered.

Debate on the Amendment: People will speak for or against the Amendment. Speak if you have something to say, but try not to repeat another speaker's statement.

Can we stop talking and vote? There are two ways to end debate:

1. If debate has slowed or if time is running short, the Chair may ask the body to move to a vote on the amendment.
2. A member may **move the previous question** (call for the question), ending debate and bringing the body to a vote on the amendment. If the motion for the previous question passes, the next step is to vote on the amendment. If it fails, the body moves back to debate.

Vote on the Amendment: Votes will be counted by a show of cards. Your vote can be in favor, in opposition, or you can abstain from voting. Leave your card up until all votes are counted. The Chair will announce the results.

If the Amendment passes, it becomes a part of the Resolution. If it fails, the resolution is unchanged.

Are There Any Other Amendments?

YES!

NO!

Debate on the Resolution: People will speak for or against the resolution. Speak if you have something to say, but try not to repeat another speaker's statement.

Can we stop talking and vote? There are two ways to end debate:

1. If debate has slowed or if time is running short, the Chair may ask the body to move to a vote on the resolution.
2. A member may **move the previous question** (call for the question), ending debate and bringing the body to a vote on the resolution. If the motion for the previous question passes, the next step is to vote on the resolution. If it fails, the body moves back to debate.

Vote on the Resolution: Votes will be counted by a show of cards. Your vote can be in favor, in opposition, or you can abstain from voting. Leave your card up until all votes are counted. The Chair will announce the results.

If there are no more resolutions, the Chair will call the session to a close.

If there is another Resolution, go back to the beginning.