**Minutes**

**8th Steering Committee meeting**

**7th March 2015**

**Participants Board meeting:** Sarah, Andreas, Niels-Erik, Laurentia, Jamie, Marcell, Eyachew, Nicoletta, Julia

**Apologies**: Jamie, Rokhaya

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

**Venue:** ENAR Office

**Accommodation:** Park Inn Hotel

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **No** | **Matter** |
|  | **Adoption of the agenda** |
|  | **Adoption of the minutes of the previous Steering Committee meeting**  - P.2 : change « le gars de marche » into « Toumi Djadja »  **DECISIONS:**   * **The minutes are adopted.** * **MP: circulate the minutes (even draft) as soon as possible after the Board.** * **JW: update the Board on the community mobilisation strategy at the next Board meeting.** |
|  | **Finances : Update on the financial situation:**   * Presentation by MDF * Momodou raises concerns about the difficulty for members to reimburse money for activities considered as ineligible 2 or 3 years after the accounts are closed. The way the EC proceeds is really difficult to manage. * Members should be aware that even if they deliver all the documents on time, they have to expect that something might happen a few years down the line (the EC requests that all documents be kept available for 10 years). * In this context, finding unrestricted funds is a key priority to reduce ENAR’s operating loss and compensate partly for the cash flow gap. * The idea to organise fundraising concerts is proposed. Unless we have contacts with high profile singers, the cost-benefit analysis is not really interesting, unless it is a joint effort with national members (members contacting and connecting with artists, organising the activity in their country; ENAR organising the promotion and communication; profits being shared between the members and ENAR). * Proposal to organise small actions everywhere – to generate smaller amounts of money, which might make a difference in total (Jamaar is developing a concept for the EF). * Marcell proposes to pay contractors and ask them for a loan until we get paid.   **DECISIONS:**   * **Myriam/Andreas: communication towards the members should be clearer: be clear that expenses are not accepted until the EC gives final clearance 2 or 3 years later. Sending documents and invoices to ENAR does not amount to a discharge.** * **Andreas/Myriam: have more regular communication (letters/mails from the Treasurer) with members who have signed a contract with ENAR to inform them about the EC’s demands.** * **All: priorities for fundraising: ensure (1) co-funding; (2) unrestricted funds** * **MP: prepare a list of fundraising priorities for this year and come back to Board members to break them down into concrete actions (European, national or local level).** * **MP: explore with other networks in the same situation as us if we could file a collective complaint to the European Ombudsman to ensure that applications are dealt with in a timely manner to avoid cash flow gaps and putting ENAR in breach of the Belgian labour law.** |
|  | **Shadow Report 2014 and 2015**   * Presentation by Ojeaku * Andreas will send out a press release on the shadow report in Germany including elements from the national report, as long as it is not launched at European level, but at least prepare some communication for 21st March. * NEH can translate the executive summary of the European shadow report in Danish and organise a launch on 5-6 May, just before the CERD review of Denmark. * Not all countries are equally represented in the final report. There are gaps in the information and it has therefore been very difficult to produce statistics. * Eyachew suggests contacting Tanja Fanjon (S&D MEP). They usually organise actions on March 21, June 20 and December 10 in Slovenia. They could also do a national launch on May 8. * ML: how can we link the report and the data to victim stories? Ojeaku will prepare a package with key elements. * ON: for the next round, we will need to be smarter in the questions we ask to avoid having lots of answers with many gaps. * MJ: research on prosecution of racist motives also needs to be included.   **DECISIONS:**   * **The launch is postponed to 21 April.** * **The information collected by members can be used at national level as it will not be published as such at the European level.** * **Ojeaku: for the next round, link the questions more closely to ENAR’s advocacy priorities; develop smarter questions to avoid answers with lots of gaps; use the PAD group to test ideas and formulations; identify gaps in the shadow report on PAD/BE of 2011 as a starting point.** * **Ojeaku: prepare a package for the launch, including elements to link the data to victims’ stories.** |
|  | **Operating Manual**  **A. Electoral procedure**   * See annexed document with proposals for revision of the statutes. * The limit of 2 board members per region might be too restrictive for countries with many strong organisations. * If the question is only about regional balance, we need to redraft the wording (maybe introducing a ceiling: max 3 Board members per region and if a region does not provide candidates, we could have gaps on the board). * Some agree on proposal B) but with a threshold for big states so that they could go up to more than 1 person. * The key issue is about reducing the perceived injustice in the current thresholds imposed for regional balance: why do we feel the need to set clear limits for regional balance, while we are able to reach balance on gender and ethnicity in a very mature way? Do we need a rule on regional balance? * Should there be quotas for some regions? * Everybody agrees that there should not be more than 1 representative for any country. * Proposed compromise:   Every region should have at least 1 representative on the Board. No more than one Board member shall come from any specific country.   * Vote:  1. Rule on regional balance: 3 Yes 2. No rule on regional balance: 5 Yes + mention of the regions (recheck with NC)   **DECISION:**   * **MP: redraft the proposal to be circulated to the membership: remove the rule on regional balance, while clearly defining the regions in the Operating Manual. Regional balance will be a target, similarly to gender and ethnic balance.**   **B. Consultancy of BM and conflict of interests**   * d) should be under Board and not staff. * It should be an asset to have been on the Board of ENAR => in principle, a Board member can apply for jobs in the organisation, but the person cannot be part of the decision making process related to this issue. * Two options for discussion: suspension of membership of the Board during the process, or resign from the Board AND apply, with the consequence that, if the application is unsuccessful, the person will no longer be a Board member.   **DECISIONS**   * **MP/MDF: move Section d) of 3.5.4.5 under Board not staff.** * **Dissociate employment from the consultancy in terms of contractual obligations and processes in the wording.** * **As soon as Board members are informed of a staff recruitment process and are interested in applying, they should suspend all Board activities until the process has been completed. They step down if recruited; stop suspension if not recruited.** * **MP/NC: draft a new provision on employment.** * **MP/NC: rephrase last § / sentence about consultancy to include the necessary checks and balances in view of the expected flexibility.** * **MP: circulate the draft to NC before circulating to the members.** * **MP: use “person” / “they” instead of “s/he” to avoid excluding persons without assigned gender.** |
|  | **After the terror/anti-Semitic attacks of Paris and Copenhagen : ENAR’s approach/upcoming action**  **DECISION:**   * **Postponed until next meeting – lack of time** |
|  | **Presentation of the Islamophobia and anti-Semitism strategies**   * Anti-Semitism strategy: presentation by Claire. * We need to increase our recruitment of Jewish organisations in eastern Europe. * Marcell proposes a typology of 3 types of anti-Semitism: anti-israelism; anti-Zionism; anti-Semitism proper => there is a need to differentiate, or at least discuss this typology and what it entails with stakeholders; but we need to make clear that criticism of Israel per se is acceptable as long as it is about Israel as a State, not lumping all Jews with Israel as a State; and reminding that it is not ENAR’s role to comment on Middle East policies. * ENAR needs to be a safe space for communities to come together. * The steering group, like the one on PAD and Islamophobia, will be diversified. * CF: we are pushing for the anti-Semitism and Islamophobia strategies together: we are looking at them equally; using the same instruments at European level => so far we’re winning the argument, but some Jewish organisations have an issue with that. * We have to be sensitive about how we communicate about anti-Semitism. * Trust building is needed first to be able to be critical friends at a later stage. * We are pushed to speed up our involvement on anti-Semitism due to the current context => we need to show leadership. * Eyachew: contact Paul Lappaleinen, he might be a good resource and connector. * Momodou: there can be a distinction between the position of ENAR as an organisation and members / Board members as activists as long as we uphold the same ethical standards. * Islamophobia strategy: presentation by Claire. * During the GA, we need to think about a connection between anti-Semitism and Islamophobia – we need to allocate time for each strategy while creating a space for cross-grounds discussions. * There should also be time allocated to discuss the post-Paris attacks during the GA.   **DECISIONS:**   * **Staff: communicate to the Board the results of Steering Groups.** * **During the GA: allocate time for sessions on post-Paris attacks; anti-Semitism, Islamophobia and cross-grounds discussions.** |
|  | **Anti-migrant racism, first elements; EPAM**   * Presentation by NC (see attached note). * ENAR to work as per its mandate: discrimination and racism in the area of migration. * Access to the labour market is linked to nationality/legal status (e.g. some sectors only for migrants from specific countries => there is an ethno-stratification of the labour market). * How do migration and race interrelate? * ENAR should be more engaged on the nationality issue (key for integration; nationality rule & citizenship), including capacity-building for the organisations working in the field. * Eyachew debriefed about the new European Migration Forum and EPAM: discussions are mostly technical about the organisation of the Forum, about the move from the European Integration Forum to the new forum. He recommended an increase of funding for southern NGOs. * Definition of “migrant”: NC wants to leave it to the SG beyond the basics (involuntary: refugees, victims of trafficking; voluntary: all others – 2nd generation is covered). * Others say that fighting for rights is more effective than access to nationality => ***2 strategic options for ENAR: focusing on civic participation OR access to nationality***. * NC: there are new developments at EU level on citizenship: there are questions from the EC on the Maltese and Cypriot schemes for buying nationality as they have an impact on accession to EU nationality. * MJ: access to right to influence policy could be one entry point (rather than nationality or EU citizenship). * ML: it would be interesting to look at projects on political participation of migrants at local level. * ML: ask for more rights for long-term residents? * CF: we should first map what exists already (e.g. on the right to vote), this would help us select who to invite. * CF: what is the EU’s competence in the field (harmonization, erase discriminating differences between the member states)? * CF: do we monitor all rights (which we don’t for other minorities); or only one specific right that can make a difference? Where is our added value? Same for collaboration with other networks. * Eyachew: there should be more coordination between ENAR members with regard to the EIF (in case of elections to ensure proper campaigning; the last elections were not well organised). * NEH: it would be great to have a common argumentation on why to work on this issue (even if it is project related). * NC: one entry point could be to take out the nationality exemption from the RED and EED. * NC: we don’t need to work on all issues of migration, but look into all issues of migration to find the AR/AD spin.   **DECISIONS:**   * **Nicoletta: rework the paper based on the discussion.** * **CF: dissemination of the paper to the members working on migration; ask for feedback and interest to work on the issue.** |
|  | **AOB and closing words**  **A. Application to ECOSOC consultative status**   * See annexed explanation note. * NC: beyond application, you need to show that you contribute, that you are an active member => it requires resources (see ECOSOC status expectations). * MJ: strategically it is important to have it as an extra advocacy tool (e.g. Mireille Fanon asked ENAR to contribute to the work of UN Decade; having the status would smoothen our way into that). * Sarah: the question is “is this a good use of our resources?”. Is it compatible with EU funding? * CF: we need a whole set of different expertise to really be efficient (and what about OSCE and CoE which are also extremely relevant to us). It could be detrimental to ENAR, if we have the status and do not show up ; even if members go on behalf of ENAR, we would still have to be involved, review documents, etc. to ensure we are up to the level expected from ENAR.   **DECISIONS:**   * **All: the Board agrees on principle that we can work to influence the UN, but our advocacy does not necessarily need to be linked to ECOSOC status.** * **CF: check if ECOSOC status is a prerequisite to engage with UN institutions.**   **B. PAD strategy**   * Debrief by MJ (Strasbourg Zwarte Piet EP event, Launch of the PAD book and related advocacy meetings). * UN PAD Decade upcoming continental conference; target OHCHR. We should see if ENAR could be closely involved in the preparation of the conference => what to do at national level? * Mention of 26 March – end of slavery (with US Ambassador). * 10 April: Steering Group on PAD. * Support letter to Cécile Kyenge in her struggle against racist speech in the Italian parliament. * Meeting Swedish minister next week with Julie on Afrophobia, anti-Semitism and Islamophobia. Things are moving fast in Sweden thanks to the work of ENAR members in Sweden. The fight against these forms of racism is in the roadmap of the current government.   **C. NPCs**   * ML: what to expect for this year? * Michael: The process is completely delayed because of the lack of answer from the EC: we cannot commit to funding and contracts if we’re not sure that the EC will finally validate everything.   **DECISIONS:**   * **Juliana: communicate to members why the process has been delayed and when members could expect clearer information.** * **All: the new process for national level activities will have to be assessed properly in 2016.**   **D. Projects**   * Laurentia: we need to explore the possibility of building projects together, good to show added value of being a member of ENAR, be it only to motivate them to do something together.   **DECISION:**   * **Juliana: clarify what to expect from ENAR on the website (no drafting of application, but constructive feedback, connection with/between members…)** |

**Minutes**

**Call meeting – Extraordinary Board Meeting**

**10th April 2015**

**Participants:** Jallow**,** Sarah, Andreas, Niels-Erik, Marcell, Eyachew,

**Apologies**: Jamie, Rokhaya, Jamie, Laurentia, Nicoletta, Julia

**Participants ENAR Secretariat:** Michael, Myriam, Claire

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **No** | **Matter** |
|  | **Finances 2015: EC grant**  - Update by Michael on the answer of the EC to our application.  - Informed MEPs about the situation. They are sympathetic but couldn’t do anything about it. (off line)  - Andreas, as a Treasurer: The situation is irresponsible. It puts every one under personal risk because running an organisation without money is pushing us to illegal action. If the EC ask us to cut on the core activities, he will step down.  - Jallow: it’s a political issue, we need a plan. Should we meet with other networks to create an outside pressure: it’s not acceptable from the outside => make some noise.  => Andreas: different steps  - budget  - other options: going in the budget committee (involve it => Jean Lambert, with MEP?)  - Board of other networks to take action (what’s the best person to have a discussion with and make a chance)  - Refuse to sign the agreement?  - Cash flow: We have to discuss the issue with the EC as soon as we get the budget  Eyachew: We need to protect the core activities of the network by for example rotating the activities around the staff.  => Board should discuss with the EC because they are in the better position than the staff to discuss on those cuts.  - flight cost: 200€? Concord: 400€ => should not leave such conditions for ENAR  => **Option 1 proposed**: Cut 300.000 € but it might be a problem for the Shadow Report.  Andreas, Eyachew agreed  Jallow: We need to take a decision, about cutting the right things, and about the last things we would want to cut, but also what we don’t want to cut at all.  => We should cut the board meetings and use this money to allocate to members activities. It’s a good approach to show that we care for members, and that cut on ourselves (e.g. Board meetings => online BM).  **DECISIONS:**   * **The board agreed on option 1 as proposed by Myriam (300000€ decrease).** * **Myriam will decrease the number of physical Board Meetings and will reallocate the money to Shadow reports and other costs (travels…)** * **if the EC disagrees on this budget and ask for more cuts, another online board meeting will be called up.** |