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**BOARD MEETING**

**Minutes**

**Brussels, 25 June 2015**

**Participants :** Sarah, Nicoletta, Jallow, Laurentia, Jamie, Eyachew, Marcell

**Apologies:** Rokhaya, Julia, Niels-Erik, Andreas

**Participants** ENAR Secretariat: Michael, Claire, Myriam, Officers as relevant

**Venue**: ENAR Office

**Accommodations:**

**-** 24 June 2015: Nekotel Concept Art Hotel (Esplanade de L'Europe 27-29, 1060 Brussels)

- 25 June 2015: Thon EU (Rue de la Loi, 75 - 1040 Brussels)

|  |
| --- |
| **25 June 2015**9:00-17:00  |
| **09:00-09:30** | **Opening words**1. **Adoption of the agenda**
2. **Adoption of the minutes of 9th Board Meeting**

 **Follow up of the decisions of 9th BM**  **(3) AOBs**- SR evaluation process- UNITED**DECISIONS:****- Agenda is adopted upon inclusion of the AOBs****- Minutes are adopted** **(4) Board Members attendance – OM provisions**- Nicoletta informs that she will not be able to attend Board meetings for the upcoming 6 to 8 months, neither through online participation.- Sarah points out that stepping down is a process. It should take place before the GA. Otherwise, is there a possibility to open the place of Vice-Chair? Co-opting is not an option in that case.- There is only one year left for Nicoletta, two for others. We need to reinvigorate the presence of members on the Board.- What will be the follow up of the work on migration? Who might represent ENAR in external events? - It is not primarily an issue of representation but of presence in decision making meetings. That is the basic requirement from Board Members.**DECISIONS:****- There will be a workshop on migration at the GA, to discuss possible follow up****- Nicoletta will not step down from the Board at this stage** |
| **09:30-12:30** |  **(5) GA Agenda & Programme:** **A) Visit to the EP with members**- All members we’re going to meet are members of ARDI- Laurentia: there should be a space for members to present/discuss their projects and explore how to work with the Secretariat.- Jallow mentions that the GA is a space for criticism; it should not be done outside.- Laurentia suggests that there should be some sanctions foreseen for members spreading “nonsense” about the organisation.- Nicoletta: ENAR has been raising its profile with the institutions, but it is still lacking impact with its members.- The meetings with MEPs are also useful to help members understand that the work at European level has a direct impact on their work on the ground.- The Prezi presentation of the sketch of the work plan 2016 will integrate suggestions from the workshops on day one.- Eyachew suggests that the Secretariat should have invited Chibo to take part in the GA.- When it comes to the elections, Regions are not any more the key defining factor. It’s a parameter among others to be taken into account.- Jallow: Peter Pompa’s organisation has not paid the membership fee – it will be paid before the start of the session.- Sarah: we should stress that the South-West region is under-represented.- Laurentia: do we know if some candidates are already involved in ENAR (as NPCs for example)?- Sarah: the commitment dimension should be reiterated – it’s at least for 3-4 years. We should also start thinking about the future chair of ENAR.- What do we do if we have 2 candidates from the same country elected? => we should run a specific vote between the 2 of them.- In case the person is not present at the GA, they cannot run as candidate.- Outgoing Board Members will have a 5 minutes closing speech.**DECISIONS:****- As of next year, all former chairs of ENAR will be invited to the GA. ENAR will support their travel and accommodation.****- In case two candidates from the same country are elected, there will be a separate vote between the two of them. This will be announced to the members. Staff will prepare a second ballot. This point has to be added to the electoral rules in the OM.** |
| **13:15-14:30** |  **(6) Update on Staff**- Update on the situation of Julie by Myriam: Julie is coming back on Monday 29.- Jallow: who will take over PAD if there will be a reshuffling of responsibilities?- Claire: ON interested in the PAD/BE strategy but she is already overbooked with the SR => we have doubts she will be able to take over the full PAD strategy. We have planned to address this issue during the summer and come back to the Board with clear answer as soon as possible. We were in the process of reshuffling the staff attributions, but we stopped with Julie away.**DECISIONS:**- **Staff: take a decision as soon as possible on who is responsible for each strategy****- Sarah: on behalf of the Board, she will convey all its sympathy to Julie****- Management Team is given all the necessary leeway to support Julie in resuming work and shield her from pressure****- All: at September Board meeting: discuss the priorities and responsibilities for each strategy to facilitate communication****SUGGESTIONS:**- **In times of overstretch, Staff can contact the Board: some Board Members could have the time to chip in and do some work depending their availability** **(7) Update on Finances / report on EC meeting**- Presentation of the results of the discussions with DG Justice on core funding until 2017 by Michael: the AD networks met with the director general of DG JUST (Michou Paraskevi) and the Director of Equality (Salla Saastamoinen) and the Director of Finances (Renatas Mazeika). They assured that they had made substantial changes to the application process: the restricted call will be launched during the Summer. The money for 2016 has been budgeted on the budget of 2015 so that there is no need to wait for the EP approval of the DG JUST 2016 budget to sign our contracts. They plan that the assessment of the projects will be done by the end of 2015 and the transfer of the first instalment could take place in January 2016. They take our remarks as a benchmark. If they don’t bring an answer to these by the end of the year, we should write a formal letter of complaint. - Most worrying were the information regarding the fact that there is huge questioning, within the EC, about the added value of civil society networks representing a particular constituency. A number of civil servants severely question our work and our funding in times of decreasing budget => all equality networks have to use the next 3 years to advocate extensively within the EC about the good we bring. A number of persons would just like to replace our core funding with one year project funding, away from the advocacy.- Update on the Konkwo case by Michael: after having brought ENAR to the labour court in Austria in 2011 (and won the case), M. Konkwo, former Field Officer in Austria, is suing Michael in front of the civil court as director of ENAR on a double ground: accusing ENAR not to be his employer, so having no legitimate ground to dismiss him and therefore accusing Michael of having built a false case against him and having spread false information about M Konkwo to ruin his reputation. The case has been dismissed entirely in first instance, but M Konkwo lodged an appeal on a formal question: the fact that he was not offered a chance to improve his claim as allowed by the Austrian law. Michael to witness in front of the court on 30 June.- Update on the finances by Myriam (see attached documents).**DECISION:**- **Board Members: convey to Myriam and Michael innovative ideas to cope with the loss. Ideas will be discussed in September.** |
| **14:30-16:00** |  **(8) Network development** **A) Network Development**- Presentation by Juliana on the current situation of the network (see annexed documents). How should we broaden the network: focusing on advocacy organisation that now make up to 50% of the membership (+11% over the last year), or keep welcoming any organisation, including those who don’t advocate, with the risk that they are not fully satisfied by what the network can offer them?- Jamie: she would advise to not actively seek to extend the network and be further overstretched.- Sarah: we should not focus on one category of members; but we should show the link between advocacy and grass-roots work and communicate it better to members which are not involved in advocacy. Finally, we should not expect that all members be active all the time. Their involvement may vary from year to year, depending the topics at stake, their own resources.- Jallow: all the advocacy work, at the end, has an impact on organisations not working in that field, but we’ve to keep being pedagogical in our approaches and connecting the dots.- Sarah: we should not be too worried about the fact people engage, then disengage, because engagement can also vary in shapes (e.g. on PAD: lots of advocacy in 2015, but more on islamophobia next year).- Claire: it’s a perception issue, that needs to be addressed through communication from the Board: responsibility in conveying this message to the membership.- Eyachew: we should also encourage members to look for partners.- Nicoletta: to improve the communication with members, the Secretariat should try to come at national level within members projects. Maybe do as PICUM: ask members their priorities, and check if we can do something together. This really creates an added value.- Present the extranet at the GA: it was developed according to the needs expressed by the members when Chibo and Michael did their “European tour”, but nobody is using it.- For the national contracts 2015: the Board is given the list of cases: Board to give an opinion by next week. - We cannot give money to a project rated at 1/5. The staff is entitled to take a decision: the threshold for success is 3: below, the projects are dropped. We should listen to members during the GA and check if some might have interesting projects to be developed this year.**DECISIONS:**- **Board: give feedback to Juliana about the national projects by next week****- Juliana: threshold for successful applications: below 3/5 projects are not selected for support****- Staff: team members should participate more in national level activities to communicate with members concretely****- All: improve the communication on the link between EU level advocacy and grass-roots impact/realities****B) ENPAD**- Jallow: debriefed the Board about the Afromadrid conference and the conversation he had with Mireille Franz-Fanon and Doudou Diene about the criticism of Michael McEchrane about ENAR (lack of legitimacy, perpetuation of racism, PAD organisations would be quitting us).- Members having criticism against ENAR should address it at the GA and not shoot down ENAR in other fora: if a member is discontent from ENAR, s/he should raise the issue internally, but not go around and criticize the organistion. If not, s/he should quit it.- Jallow demands if it is an official position of ENPAD to criticize ENAR? The issue is in particular addressed to Jamie who is also a steering member of ENPAD.- Sarah: how do we manage sometimes conflicting stances between member organisations?- Claire: this issue affects the work of the Secretariat – we do not know what stance to take. ENPAD EU advocacy group contacted us for information => this puts us in a difficult position, because most of ENPAD members are ENAR members, and we won’t be able to work and advance without at least some cooperation at technical level. There is also an issue of trust from our side: how can we trust that we are going engage in a healthy relation?- Jamie: we need to have a mutual space where we can work together – but these conflicts have all a history (personal), but it’s definitely not ENPAD position to say that ENAR would be an organisation maintaining white supremacy.- Jamie: we should agree on a MoU in written form and a clear agenda on what we’re going to discuss together. That would help clarify the situation.- Jallow: how can we have a guarantee that a member of the board of ENPAD, in his capacities, will not indulge in a similar behaviour again?- Laurentia: do not we have a code of conduct for members? It is not normal that members go around spreading defamatory information about ENAR.- Sarah: not sure we can regulate members in all situations.- Jallow: we have a provision about racist statements from members; saying that ENAR is racist is as bad. Could we add this to the OM?- Nicoletta: I agree on a mediation and map out the problems.- Jamie: there is definitely a difference of structures (black led); and a difference in terms of advocacy between the 2 organisations.- Sarah: why work together if we’re so different? – but there seems to have willingness on both side to keep working together.- Jallow: the most important issue is that non 100% black led work on PAD/BE is less legitimate for ENPAD. This should be clarified.**DECISIONS:**- **Jamie: draft a MoU between ENAR and ENPAD on how to work together to advance our common goals, in particular in the field of advocacy (use of terminology, cooperation and attendance of staff in common projects…)****- Claire, Jallow, Jamie: a meeting between selected members of the ENAR SG on PAD/BE and ENPAD to be organise before the end of the year to clarify the questions raised above****C) UN Decade**- Jallow will raise awareness about decade in the WS tomorrow and look for possibilities of activities with the members |
| **16:00-17:00** |  **(9) Reflections on a WP for the upcoming Board****DECISION:*** **Topic left to the upcoming Board Meeting**
 |
| 17:00-17:15 |  **(10) AOB and closing words** 1. UNITED: next conference soon organised by Marcell in Budapest. If Geert comes to the board, that will be fine.
2. Chibo was not invited to the GA because he had refused to be member of the council of eminent persons. As per the new Board decision: all former chairs to be invited in the future at the GA.
3. Commissioner Thyssen on 14 September: 1 free slot: ask for interest when new Board members are elected.
4. **SR evaluation**

- Ojeaku highlights that the process changed quite significantly. The table she presented (see annex) is a first internal evaluation of the process, with some successes and a number of difficulties. She plans to write a more detailed report, with more context and also recommendations for 2016/2017. She would like to get thoughts on improvements.- We also have a budget for external evaluation. Any input on the approach we might want to take are also welcome.- Laurentia: will the evaluation be over several years?- Ojeaku: there will not be much time for an evaluator to look over many years. The focus should be on the impact and also include recommendations for the future.- Jamie: how to improve the timeframe? Is it okay to pay members to tell us there is no data?- Ojeaku: for some, there was input but no data. For the timeframe, there are options: we chose a different date for the launch or we keep 21/03. If this is the case, she will need more support from the team to meet the deadline.- Jallow: the report is really good and the outcome is great. The questionnaire is a lot easier that it used to be. This is an improvement from before the questionnaire. Having one big report is smart so that we don’t have to edit all the national reports. - In Sweden, they will launch both the SR and the PAD book. We should encourage the other members to the same.- Nicoletta: having no national report is not positive. We don’t have a tool to launch the SR in our national context. We should re-think this aspect.- A person in the Secretariat will be fed information on an ongoing basis. She will help members to assemble their material. For the launch, members can use their national data on top of the European Shadow report.- Ojeaku: we had the idea to draft country briefing. This year, we identify 5 to 10 briefings. But for next year, we could do them to be launched alongside the shadow report. The questionnaire will include a demand for summaries to help the secretariat drafting briefings. - The database is in the final stages of its development. It is about to be launched. It will provide storage for ongoing feed. How the information will be used, this is still to be decided.- Nicoletta: the SR fee will be given to a NGO that will be working on reporting all year through.- Claire: we will still need expertise on specific topics, so that the 2000€ of the fee will not be offered to only feed in the database.- Jallow reiterates that it is important that thematic issues are raised as it helps our advocacy. Otherwise, the SRs will remain too general. - Eyachew: providing data is different from media clipping from the years before. For the external evaluation – it is not so important. The SR officer and the secretariat have the expertise. Explaining everything to an external person will be too much. Also, we need to know what day there will be a launch.- Marcell: what about next year? Will there be a delay? What are the plans for 2017?- Michael: in a previous Board meeting, it was already accepted that the research in 2016 would be on Roma, for a publication in 2017 as it’s a long time we’ve not been researching on this community specifically.- Sarah: it is important to stick to the date of 21/03.- Myriam: it would be interesting to have an external evaluation for donors and other stakeholders. We anyhow have money in the budget for that for this year. - Sarah: if this is the case, then go ahead. The evaluation has to useful.- Nicoletta: we should be careful not to be detached from the reality in Europe if we don’t make any research on the reality of migrants. We can’t stay as if nothing was happening: anti-migration speech, xenophobic discourses…- Claire: we already have some information from our hate speech monitoring. We could use this data to dedicate a report to this issue.**DECISIONS:**- **Ojeaku: organise an external evaluation of the SR process: what impact on external stakeholders****- Ojeaku: 21/3 remains our launch date. The timeline will have to be adapted to ensure that this objective is met****- All: discuss at next Board meeting the research topic of 2016 (Roma, migrants, other?)****SUGGESTIONS:****- Ojeaku: encourage members to launch the PAD Book and the SR together** |