

1. Yes Emergency Enactment To allow all R.I. Board members to be non-voting members of COL – this corrects a prior COL adoption that was primarily intended to restrict involvement of Past R.I. Presidents and not the Board.
2. No 20-R-02 Related to promoting “ideal of service” - vague and confusing.
3. Yes 20-R-03 It would be desirable to reintroduce “professional development” of members as a Value of Rotary with the same priority as ethics and service.
4. No 20-R-04 I would not favor amending the 4 Way Test.
5. No 20-R-05 I would not favor amending the 4 Way Test.
6. No 20-R-06 We should not dictate Club meeting programming (would not be enforceable anyway).
7. No 20-R-07 Starting a new chartered Club with only 10 members (rather than 20) is too low – it could go to 6 or 7 quickly.
8. No 20-R-08 It is too complicated to worldwide come up with a universal single structured program for children ages 6-12. The current regional programs seem to be working
9. No 20-R-09 It is too complicated to worldwide come up with a universal single structured program for children ages 6-12. The current regional programs seem to be working
10. Yes 20-R-10 It would be good stewardship that separate Youth Exchange entities provide financial statements to the applicable District (FYI – no such separate organization exists in 5930).
11. No 20-R-11 Rotary is still working on Rotaract revisions and this Resolution simply states what Rotary is already doing.
12. No 20-R-12 Limiting authority of R.I., Board – vague and unnecessary.
13. Yes 20-R-13 If Rotary’s communication systems can be revised to assist the visually impaired to the extent reasonable possible that would be desirable.
14. Yes 20-R-14 A Vocational Committee, either mandatory or option, should be recommended at the District level.
15. No 20-R-15 As to creating Regional Nomination Committees, this appears to be a local communication and Rotary politics issue in Africa that does not need a worldwide solution.
16. No 20-R-16 The term of office of the General Secretary does not need to be term limited (he is a hired contractual employee).

- | | | | |
|-----|---------|----------------|---|
| 17. | No | <u>20-R-17</u> | Requiring a “Sustainability Report” – has vague value and Rotary does not need another labor intensive report like this. |
| 18. | No | <u>20-R-18</u> | Trying to define “peace” as a consensus worldwide would be difficult and the long winded result would not add anything. |
| 19. | No | <u>20-R-19</u> | Trying to devise a more flexible definition of the word “political” - same problem as item 20-R-18 |
| 20. | Pending | <u>20-R-20</u> | (Need to hear more about what current role of Rotary’s representative at the United Nations to understand this proposal). |
| 21. | No | <u>20-R-21</u> | Lobbying for a treaty would be “political”. |
| 22. | No | <u>20-R-22</u> | This is unneeded – Rotary is already very involved in providing services related to the pandemic. |
| 23. | No | <u>20-R-23</u> | We should definitely not pick a specific geographic area of the world for Rotary’s pandemic efforts. |
| 24. | No | <u>20-R-24</u> | This is not needed – the ARRFCs already provides support for promoting the Disaster Response Fund. |
| 25. | No | <u>20-R-25</u> | This is no long necessary because the 7 th Area of Focus was adopted. |
| 26. | Yes | <u>20-R-26</u> | The 4 th Area of Focus should be modified to include “senior health” or a similar term. |
| 27. | No | <u>20-R-27</u> | 20-R-26 (see above) is better worded and more specific and should be adopted instead. |
| 28. | No | <u>20-R-28</u> | To remove limitation on Peace Fellows eligibility- I believe Rotaractors are eligible for Peace Fellowships – there are income tax non-profit organization issues that would be violated if Rotarians were allowed to benefit from and receive a Rotary Fellowship. |
| 29. | No | <u>20-R-29</u> | It does not need to be mandatory to spend 3% of a grant on publicity – much publicity can be free (social media, etc.). |
| 30. | No | <u>20-R-30</u> | There is already a DDF shortage in many Districts – allocation of more than 50% to District Grants would be a mistake. |