****

**BOARD MEETING**

**Minutes**

**Brussels, 9 May 2015**

**Participants :** Sarah, Andreas, Niels-Erik (by phone), Eyachew, Marcell

Sarah received a proxy from Nicoletta

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

**Participants ENAR Secretariat:** Michael, Claire, Myriam (by phone), Officers as relevant

**Venue:** ENAR Office

**Accommodation:** Park Inn Hotel

|  |
| --- |
| **Saturday 9 May 2015**  9:00-17:00 |
| **Opening words**   1. **Adoption of the agenda**   **AOB**  **-** ARDI  - Board attendance / board requirement  - European Reparation Network  **DECISION:**  **- The agenda is adopted upon inclusion of the AOBs.**   1. **Adoption of the minutes of 8th Board Meeting**   - Eyachew suggests the following change p. 5: “pleaded for an increase of funding for southern NGOs as well as for an increase of the participation of southern NGOs on the Board of the Forum”.  - Andreas suggests to add in brackets p.2 that the “launch of the Shadow Report took place on 6 May”)  **DECISIONS:**  **- The minutes are adopted upon inclusion of the changes proposed above.**  **Follow up on the decisions of the previous Board meeting:**  **-** Andreas and Myriam have been reflecting on the communication on finances for the GA. This will be discussed later on during the point on the GA.  - Nicoletta sent the initial document on migration to be circulated to interested members. |
| 1. **Update on financial challenges**  * Presentation by Myriam (see attached documents) * We will need to reallocate 155.000€ during the summer and ask for amendments to ensure that we spend the whole amount of the grant. * The impact on the cash-flow will be felt as soon as October => we need to find 70.000€ co-funding for the autumn + an amount corresponding to the 20% of the last installment to be paid later on by the EC. * ***Political strategy to address this issue***: Michael steers a coalition of anti-discrimination and equality NGOs facing similar concerns: we have contacted the Director General of DG JUST for a meeting (hopefully May or June). If we do not receive a positive answer, Michael has already contacted Claude Moraes MEP (LIBE Chair) who already agreed to write to the DG. The Board of ENAR and of other anti-discrimination networks will be called in at that point in time to increase political pressure. For now, our collective approach is to keep at the highest level of operations. * If this does not work, we will contact Commissioners Jourova and Timmermans. We will also explore the track of the Ombudsman. * Claire suggests asking for letters of support from Ministers (2 or 3, such as Sweden). * Eyachew: members could support from the national level, by asking a number of their MEPs to support or sign up to our demands. * Niels-Erik proposes to highlight and beef up our added value, for example by organising activities in the UK as a way to support the EC (bring something in the basket for negotiations). * Andreas suggests that staff members of all EU supported networks join unions so that the unions could pick up the fight. * Marcell: we should look for all the organisations/companies to which the European Commission owes money and create a platform for joint advocacy on this common concern. * Issues to be raised: (1) networks/issues are pitched against one another. This is not appropriate. (2) The language used in the communication, which implies that we are dishonest (over-budgeting; making money lost for the EU budget). (3) The EC administration is clearly under pressure, and it ends up putting pressure on our people. * Claire suggests to define the demands (short and long term) and share them with Board Members if we have to go political, beyond the Director General (the Secretariat can organise an info point on Skype and joins who wants to join) * Sarah asks Michael to update the Board on the process with other anti-discrimination networks and the DG JUST Director General.   **DECISIONS:**   * **Michael: share the ENAR fundraising presentation with Board Members.** * **Myriam will pay the second installment to NPCs for 2014 only in September 2015, after the EC assessment, in case there would be ineligible costs, so that it can be deducted directly instead of reclaiming money.** * **Michael: update the board on the process with other anti-discrimination networks and the Director General of DG JUST.** * **Michael: in case of failure of plan A advocacy, follow political recommendations above.**   **SUGGESTIONS:**   * **Staff members: join a union so that they pick up our issue too.** * **Michael: stress our added value to the EC (e.g. by organising activities in the UK to reinforce pro-EU sentiments.** * **Michael: look for other organisations/companies to which the EC owes money to join in common advocacy.** |
| 1. **GA Agenda & programme**  * Andreas: we should organise a conversation on what we achieved over the last year, maybe start with a conversation with the team (personal reporting, world café format?), and then move into the budget => the aim would be to explain what the staff costs go into, that these are not stand-alone expenditures without any relation to outputs. * Why not produce a movie? What are our achievements (outputs, but also impact) featuring interviews of staff, achievements of members => connecting the work of secretariat with members’ actions (Sarah not really in favour, see timeline and cost). * Use posters? Prezi presentation? For example: “Runnymede in numbers” => the staff will need about one day of meeting to look for data, highlight the achievements and support the narrative report with numbers, including finances. * The presentation should also include an explanation of the context (financial difficulties, difficult context and still we manage to achieve something) => this could be highlighted in Sarah’s opening speech. * Sarah: how to ensure that members avoid the feeling of being presented information “top-down”? A presentation with regular slots for questions? World café? Market place? * Marcell: we should not only focus on what happened in 2014, but what we can achieve together in the coming year(s). * Sarah: we should go for a Prezi presentation of the reports, which will be followed by a market place with 1 staff, 1 key member in the development of the area => the tables should focus on achievements, rather than the strands of the programme (e.g. Black facing, Forgotten women; EP elections; ARDI). We should not focus on more than 5-6 achievements (including the visibility of ENAR). Every 10’ people move to another table. After we come back into plenary, leave a slot for formal questions on the activity report and the financial report and then vote on their adoption. * Eyachew: at every table, we should ask for members’ feedback/ideas on advocacy, networking… * Marcell: we need to stress how to maintain the connection with members, how we can connect with the efforts at national level. * Juliana: we should not only focus on linking achievements to expenditure, but also what can be done, or what has been done without funding (1st step in community building: getting together to create a common sense of belonging: it does not require a lot of money). * Niels-Erik insists on the tough context (we need to spend more); on projects carried out by members and ask them if they’d be happy to do activities, provide us with invoices and deliver and only get the money later (or half of the money now and the rest later). The staff could prepare some ideas for national activities. * Juliana updated the Board on the list of topics for the open session: the programme will be circulated with the lead taken by a specific person/organisation   + circulate 3 weeks ahead if there are slots available (so that they cannot say they were not informed)   * Eyachew: the Board should develop an annual work programme as a Board, a collective body, so as not to personalise too much its work in some areas. Work should be developed and supported collectively. * Andreas: we need to insist on the specific role of Board members before the elections (participation in the organisation, governance, know about the finances). * Candidate Board members should be made aware of their commitment, what it takes to fulfil their role, of the situation of the organisation to ensure they are fully aware at the time of their commitment. Candidates will be asked to sign up a commitment letter saying that they will attend Board Meetings on a regular basis and be available to contribute advice/governance when needed.   **DECISIONS:**   * **Adopted concept for the activity and financial reporting: Introduction to the context by Sarah; Prezi presentation with figures in connection with activities; market places with 5-6 achievements to be selected; then move to formal part: adoption of the activity & financial reports + discharge of the Board and Treasurer.** * **Michael: circulate a concept of this session to Board Members asap and circulate the revised agenda of the Convention as soon as possible.** * **Michael: ask if Commissioner Vice-President Timmermans could also open the GA (in line with the EC Colloquium).** * **Michael: explore the possibility of organising a “come and meet us session”.** * **Juliana: circulate to the Board the list of workshops that will be driven by members and who is in charge.** * **Juliana: inform Board candidates about what is expected from them + prepare commitment letter to be signed before the elections.** * **Staff: disseminate bits of information until the GA (graphs: did you know that?) ahead of Prezi so that people receive information ahead of the GA.** * **Staff: reporting of workshops of day one will be done via Twitter/Storify**   **SUGGESTIONS:**   * **The Board should develop its own work programme as Board of ENAR, in line with the priorities of the organisation, so as not personalise too much its work in some areas.** * **Juliana: 3 weeks ahead of the Convention, circulate to members the list of workshops and encourage members to apply for action if there are slots available.** |
| 1. **The future of UNITED**   - The UNITED Director is leaving the organisation.  - UNITED has increasingly difficulties to find funding. It wishes to stick to an organisational model that has proven to be effective, but no longer in line with the priorities of funders.  - The UNITED Director is exploring solutions to not lose the assets of UNITED by seeking organisations that would be interested in taking up parts of the work.  - Sarah: we need more information on UNITED (finances, activities)  - We need to have a strategic discussion between UNITED and ENAR on what direction to take if there is a mutual interest.  **DECISIONS**   * **Michael: ask for more information from UNITED and arrange meeting with Geert at the September Board meeting.** |
| 1. **Update on the community mobilization strategy**  * Debrief by Juliana (see annexed documents) * So far, Juliana has only received 15 national project proposals from 13 countries. The evaluation has been completed. We are waiting for the final go ahead from the Commission regarding our contract.   **DECISION**   * **Juliana: circulate the projects for national activities to the Board members (next week) so that the Board can consolidate the decision on the final list of projects.** |
| 1. **Initial reflection on a possible CR/CT strategy (reported from last board meeting)**  * Presentation of the strategy by Michael (see annexed document). * Andreas: in Germany, many Islamic scholars are hired to work on CR/CT policies. * Eyachew: some academics have access to data in the Schengen Information System. How could we collaborate with them to ensure we better understand the system and better tailor our advocacy. * Claire: the EC has developed “common risk indicators” on who can be considered radical. There is a great risk of ethnic profiling. * Andreas: there is a whole discussion about prisons (with an over-representation of Muslims? Minorities?) being hotbeds of radicalism => we should have a conversation about their re-integration in society => we could produce recommendations on the principles of such policies for the national level so that members can have some elements to engage in a meaningful conversation on this issue with policy makers. * Eyachew: there is a huge difference between East and West on chaplaincy in prisons/the army (for example: in Slovenia, one would first expect that people don’t just disappear). The level of expectations towards services and accessibility is really different between Eastern and Western Europe. * Niels-Erik: youngsters in prison should be protected from radicalisation. * Claire: what’s the reality on the ground? How to foster meaningful policies in this area? * Sarah: with regard to Jewish-Muslim joint projects, there is the MuJew Crew in the UK (as a good practice for engaging dialogue). How many of those Jewish-Muslim initiatives are still surviving? What kind of innovative good practices have we been able to spot? * What would be the aim of fostering cross-community work? => Working together on questions such as circumcision, slaughter which are currently being legislated against in different EU countries => there are some common areas of interest, but we still need to build the bridges (through local actions on common issues). Community building will not happen out of nowhere. * Andreas: we need to rephrase our anti-racism narrative to tackle the challenges of the day, crossing bridges between communities. We need a clear orientation on alliance building (friends, neutral people, adversaries and how we recognise them). * Sarah: we need to get people like Eddie Friedman on board for our community mobilisation efforts in this area. * We need to have space for cross-community action at the GA. * Andreas: we need to look for organisations such as “Impulse” in Hamburg for the mapping (beyond Jewish, Muslim…) and to bring our members in the picture.   **DECISIONS:**   * **Michael: develop lists of recommendations for local communities about dealing with radicalisation in prisons for the national level with an anti-racism perspective (freedom of religion in prison, religious profiling…).** * **Michael: engage with Eddie Friedman to take part in our Jewish-Muslim cross-community mobilisation project.** * **Claire: present our mapping at the GA and the upcoming community mobilization Steering Group.** * **Juliana: organise a workshop on community mobilisation at the GA.** |
| 1. **Update on the last experts groups (islamophobia, PAD/BE and anti-Semitism)**   **A. PAD/BE**   * Update by Eyachew and Claire * Eyachew: there were not that many concrete recommendations from the Steering Group on Afrophobia. We should draft a more robust working plan, developing more concrete actions. * Eyachew: there should be better coordination between Board members supporting a specific strategy when they speak and act on behalf of ENAR, to ensure better consistency of the message. There should also be more structured feedback to the Board, the organisation => we should prepare speeches together more, be more coherent. * Claire: Afrophobia is not at all on the map of the EU => there is a big gap to overcome. We expect that ARDi will be taking a lead in raising awareness on this issue. We’re setting the agenda, but there’s a long way to go. * We have to see when the FRA’s EU-MIDIS report will be presented => we will advocate to get a “data in focus” on PAD/BE. * Eyachew: we should send a follow up mail to the SG, with expected actions until 2017, so that they can think about developing projects. There are many activities, but they should not only happen by chance, they should be more coordinated. * We need to maximise the benefits of the Decade => we need to ask the EU to have a working group on PAD/BE.   **DECISIONS:**   * **Afrophobia Steerign Group: develop a more robust working plan with more concrete actions/** * **Board Members on Afrophobia: better coordinate their work, better feedback to the Board and network.** * **Julie/Claire: advocate to get a data in focus on PAD/BE from the upcoming FRA EU-MIDIS survey.** * **Julie/Claire: develop a timeline for activities until 2017.**   **B. Islamophobia**   * While we all agree on the demand for a specific strategy, it’s less clear what are the exact demands, what we would want to concretely see happen. * There is still work to do in this area. Challenge: find key experts to help us frame the objectives area by area (education, employment… For now it’s still very broad). * Hope to have some lines in the Council recommendations of the Luxemburgish EU Presidency, from the conference on CR/CT and the EC’s fundamental rights Colloquium.   **C. Anti-Semitism**   * Interesting point: everybody agrees on the need for a specific strategy to fight anti-Semitism. * What is striking is the number of issues that still need to be addressed, despite the level of awareness and engagement of governments. * We need to raise awareness about EU legislation among a number of Jewish community organisations. * We need to develop the legitimacy of ENAR on this issue. We stayed away from this field for too long.   **D. Common points**   * We need to find more connections between the different strategies. * Data collection, hate crime and community mobilisation are convergence points. |
| 1. **AOB and closing words**   **A. Board attendance**   * We need to be clearer on what is expected: how many meetings + mails + responsibilities (check list – self-assessment: requested commitments, 6 meetings a year / consult mails and respond / travel on weekends…). * If a Board member has not been attending meetings for a while, the Chair should ask if the person wants to maintain his/her membership (step down or recommit) (see PICUM). * There is nothing in the Operating Manual on this issue – but it is important to remind people of their commitment. * Proposal: if a Board member misses two meetings in a row, he/she receives an email from the Chair asking what’s happening. Presence at meetings is necessary but not sufficient. There is also a need for participation at external meetings/events on behalf of ENAR. * Board membership is not formal, but active. * Niels-Erik suggests that there should stronger regulation on attendance in the Operating Manual: if a Board member misses half of the meetings, the person would not be allowed to seek re-election.   **DECISIONS:**   * **Staff: prepare table of meetings of the last 2 years and check who attended or not.** * **Staff: draft self-assessment + sign commitment.** * **Michael: monitor attendance of Board Members.** * **Chair: contact Board Members that would miss more than two meetings in a row.** * **Sarah to contact individuals.**   **B. ARDI**   * Update by Claire. * ARDI re-established by December 14. * We spent a lot of energy to have a number of co-chairs accepting to devote financial resources to hire an assistant that would coordinate the whole work. * The recruitment process of the assistant is nearly completed (they still need to agree on the final list of candidates, and who will interview). * Once hired, the person will be trained by Bruno Selun from Qumkat consulting and ENAR (on the content). This should hopefully happen soon.   **C. European Reparation Network**  **DECISION:**   * **The Board agrees to join the European Reparation Network.**   **D. Next Board meeting**   * Thursday 25 June. * Andreas apologises, he will only attend the 2nd day of the GA. |