# Minutes

**6th Steering Committee meeting**

**27-28 September 2014**

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

**Apologies**: Jallow, Julia, Rokhaya

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

**Venue:** ENAR Office

**Accommodation:** Park Inn Hotel

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **No** | Matter |
|  | Adoption of the agenda  **DECISION:**   * **Confirmation of Laurentia as ENAR representative in the SIRIUS network on migrant education instead of Karim who has stepped down from ENAR’s Board** * **Participation of new BMs in specific committees** * **Light ON project (Andreas)** * **Debrief of the Migration SG (Nicoletta)** * **Equality summit – inspirational speakers (Sarah)** |
|  | Follow up of minutes of 5th Steering Group Meeting:   * Finances will be put on the next SC meeting’s agenda – Myriam and Andreas would like to have at least half a day * Former members that pay their membership fee again can become a member at any time (facilitated process) * Changes to the Operating Manual are postponed to the next SCM in November * Board Members are asked to propose a list of points to be reviewed in the OM     DECISIONS:   * Agenda adopted with the suggestions for AOB * Minutes of the 5th SCM are adopted * A half day maximum will be devoted to finances at the 7th SCM * Board members to suggest revisions to the OM if needed * **A list of points to be reviewed will be established.** |
|  | Evaluation of the convention:  See annex below for more detailed minutes of the conversation.  DECISIONS:   * Catering and logistics need to be improved, in particular for the inclusion of diversities – however trying to employ local businesses should not be dropped altogether. Revert to organisation such as for the GA 2013. * Propose elements that allow people to learn about ENAR, both for newcomers and old timers. Expose the consultation processes so that people understand the background of decisions. * Stronger consultation of the Board ahead of the GA; stronger involvement of the Board during the GA to frame the conversations, highlight the success stories. * Define from the outset the objectives of the GA to ensure that they are delivered upon. * Understand that we will never get a 100% satisfaction rate from members as they all come with different perspectives and expertise. Understand that most of the members come once a year to meet with ENAR and get a great networking experience. * Some ice-breakers were not effective: need to ensure they deliver their objectives and do not hamper deeper conversations on content. * Involve members in designing the programme – as early as January through an online registration form (Google doc for example) asking for their expectations. Offer spaces for members to network freely + offer spaces for sessions proposed and owned by the members. Some sessions should be organised by ENAR “central” such as a session on finances in which members will be engaged creatively. * Be input oriented. * Write shorter papers – people don’t have time to read long papers. * Choose the facilitators of the workshops carefully to keep participants focused. * Q&A sessions involving external partners should be better prepared to get the best out of them (e.g. the session with Secretaries General from the EP political groups). * Develop the capacities of the network with more trainings (such as the training on EU advocacy for BMs that took place years ago). * Communicate better internally on all the work we do, before the GA and at the GA in particular |
|  | Strategic development of ENAR  See annex below for detailed minutes of the conversation.  DECISIONS:   * Early 2015: one strategic committee meeting on the impact of austerity measures on racism (Jamie expresses interest to participate) * Reinforce the internal communication (in particular about ENAR’s successes/impact, including EU/national campaigns) so that members not connected to any specific steering group are aware of what ENAR does and succeeds. Make information more available to members via the extranet. * Reaffirm clearly that our objectives are part of our mandate, that we can change tactics but not the strategic objectives themselves, given the time frame for their realisation. * Better highlight towards the members our specific advocacy demands at national/European levels. * Rebrand our “communities” strategies to make clear what they actually are: we want European strategies against Afrophobia, Islamophobia, anti-Semitism, anti-Gypsyism and anti-migrant racism/nativism. Every member should engage with these forms of discrimination, it is not reserved to a specific community. Sound-bites such as “European strategy for the social inclusion of PAD/BE” should be kept for advocacy purposes.   SUGGESTIONS:   * Offer regular “time/space” for members to engage on specific strategies (via Skype, FB, video/phone conference). * We need to strengthen the membership in terms of capacities, not necessarily in terms of numbers. It is our added-value. |
|  | **Varia & AOBs**  A) ENAR support to ISD seminar in November   * Divergence of terminology between ISD (which supports anti-Black racism) and ENAR which has adopted “Afrophobia”. * Andreas: We need to encourage the membership to take leadership on certain initiatives, but we need to have clear guidelines on how to engage the support of ENAR Europe. If not, we risk discouraging members to engage. We also need to adapt to the national context when making our decisions. * Eyachew: we don’t want to change our decision on Afrophobia, it’s part of our plans and clearly highlighted in our logframes of activities. * Jamie: we agree to go for a pragmatic approach. It’s fine for ISD if ENAR does not want to change its terminology and not partner with us because of that if it risks generating confusion. * Nicoletta: beyond terminology, the strategies are the same. We should keep providing space for exchanging and building synergies. * Claire: we need to balance opportunities and risks when having to decide on partnering with a member or not. * Sarah: As a board, we cannot make decisions on such terminology issues; the debate needs to be steered by the relevant steering group. At the same time, we need to remain capable of adjusting and renegotiating if requested from the context. But we need to make clear that we cannot change a network decision every time a member asks for change. * Laurentia: we need consistency and professionalism when making our decisions and sticking to them. * Claire: while applying the principles of consistency and professionalism in our advocacy strategy, we need to leave space for national members to own the strategies in their own national context. The Secretariat is always striving to apply these principles. However, if there is an issue which requires some sort of arbitration, we delegate the case to the Board which has the mandate to make such decisions. The Board can also call on the relevant steering group to give an expert based input.   **DECISIONS:**   * **ENAR sticks to the decision made previously by the Board and the membership, through the GPP, to use “Afrophobia”.** * **ENAR will not be a partner of ISD for their seminar in November, but will be there as a participant and support up to 8 members of the PAD/BE steering group to participate in the seminar (pay for travel and accommodation).**   **SUGGESTION:**   * **Draft a clear procedure for partnering with members for their activities at the national level.**   B) Steering Groups/Community lists  **DECISION:**   * **The Steering Groups will be composed of a small number of persons (max. 10-15), most engaged in and willing to contribute to one of our strategic objectives, at a given point in time. The Secretariat is tasked to manage the mailing lists of each respective steering group. These Steering groups will be consulted regularly and asked for input by the Secretariat and/or the Board.** * **A larger mailing list (online community) will comprise of all individuals expert in/interested in one of our strategic objectives. They will be consulted on a less frequent basis than the Steering Groups. The Secretariat is tasked to manage the mailing list of each respective online community.**   C) Communication cell in times of crisis   * Our press statement on anti-Semitic attacks in Europe during the Gaza crisis has stirred some reactions: some Jewish individuals considered that some of the wording was not appropriate, some Muslims condemned the fact that we did not say a word about the growing Islamophobia generated on social networks in particular. CEJI in particular has expressed a number of concerns that have been dealt with by the Secretariat. * CEJI expressed the feeling that they were alone without interlocutors when all the cross-community work they had been doing for years was falling apart. * As a follow-up, CEJI and the Secretariat would like to consider setting up some sort of “crisis cell” within the Network, composed of a few individuals from all communities to ensure that in case such a crisis happens again there are some channels of communication between communities, but also a space to bounce ideas before issuing press releases or developing other communications. ENAR, as a meeting point of all communities, is best placed to offer this space. * We need to build trust between communities. * It seems that this is particularly needed for the Jewish and Muslim communities at this point in time. * Jamie expresses interest to be part of such a cell if this is to be set up. * CEJI also expressed interest in training anti-racism activists in ensuring a proper personal communication on social media, which would not indulge in discriminatory/racist statements.   **DECISION:**   * **This project of crisis cell, as well as the training on social media, will be discussed in more details with the Steering Group on anti-Semitism.**   D) Lawsuit of C. Konkwo against ENAR – for information   * Michael informs the Board that C. Konkwo, from Austria, has launched a new court case against ENAR and is asking more than 57K€ from ENAR in the civil court for unjust dismissal and damage to his reputation. * The background of the case is reminded: dismissal of C. Konkwo in June 2011 in the framework of the Field Officers project; out of court settlement after a claim in front of the labour court for an amount of 15K€. The case was supposed to be closed definitively at that time. * First hearing on 17 October. * The law firm that had supported us in 2011 did not wish to give us pro bono support again and we haven’t managed to find another law firm which would accept to work pro bono => we have selected lawyers who have agreed to charge us the minimal rate. * If we win we are entitled to reclaim the spent amounts from the plaintiff, but we might still have a loss as he seems not to be solvent. * Lawyers are optimistic with regard to the content of the case.   E) Next Steering Group meeting  **DECISION**   * **1 day on Friday 21st November.** * **Skype meeting beforehand to deal with all non-important issues.**   **SUGGESTION:**   * **February meeting: in Luxemburg to prepare the country’s Presidency of the EU?**   F) SIRIUS network  **DECISION:**   * **Laurentia will represent ENAR in the Sirius network to bring the anti-racist perspective to the issue of migrant education.**   G) Light ON   * The project is coming to an end. * Question about the follow-up of the project, in particular maintaining the website. * 3 options: let it die, maintain it minimally, maintain with input * Cyprus, Slovenia and Romania might be interested; * It is not a hate crime reporting tool, but information, database about hate speech, cyber hate; * More academic than practical; * ENAR staff has no resources to maintain the website – we can link to it for a while, but once the project is finished, we can’t take it on board * Could it be broadened to give information to victims on how to report incidents?   **DECISION:**   * **Andreas will report our feedback to the LIGHT ON committee. In the meantime, if members find extra support to ensure the continuation of the website, its pursuit might be envisaged.**   H) Migration Steering Group   * Nicoletta reports that during the Convention many people expressed interest in forming a SG on migration/asylum. * ENAR’s approach should focus on anti-racism and anti-discrimination, which is still very broad. * JP Gauci sent notes to NC. She will review them and share with BM and the secretariat. We will then send them to the network to seek members interested in joining the SG. * Nicoletta will take the lead on this effort. * From the Secretariat’s side, we have to check who would be interested in getting involved in the issue to provide ongoing support. Claire prefers to take the lead during 2015 while members are exploring ENAR’s take in this area. * We have to link the SG with Eyachew and the EIF. Eyachew is member of the SG on migration in any case. Eyachew will send documents/information to Nicoletta. * EPAM (European Platform on Asylum and Migration): during 2015, the Secretariat will also be exploring which angle could be interesting for ENAR within this platform. For the moment, it is very much focused on migration and asylum policies, without real space for anti-racism.   **DECISIONS:**   * **Nicoletta to review Jean-Pierre’s notes about the meeting on migration that took place during the Convention. Notes will be circulated to the Board and Secretariat before being sent out to the membership to seek interest in joining the SG on migration.** * **Nicoletta to take the lead on the SG on migration.** * **Claire to take the lead on this issue in the Secretariat in 2015, until the pitch of the SG has been defined.** * **Eyachew to send to Nicoletta all relevant documents/information about the EIF and its conversion into a European Forum on migration.**   I) Eyachew and the EIF Board – for information   * Eyachew reports about the EIF Bureau meetings (2 first meetings were about good practices in integration); * It has been decided on 24th September that EIF will include migration and asylum; * Before Eyachew goes to the EIF Board Meeting, he will meet with EU NGOs to agree on points to be discussed at the EIF; * EIF Board role is mainly about agenda setting; * EIF Board will be extended from 2 to 8 representatives from civil society; * Next meeting will be in November.   J) Laurentia is planning to have an initial ENAR NPC meeting in Romania in November.  **DECISIONS:**   * **SI/MP/other BM to be invited** * **ENAR will pay for their travel and accommodation**   **5. ENAR Fundraising strategy**   * Detailed presentation of the different initiatives undertaken by ENAR over the last couple of years, by Pascal * Question: do we have a list of projects and their income? * PH: not really, small amounts of money with most of the projects except for e@w (equal@work) * Question from Laurentia about the involvement of members in fundraising activities? * PH: does not really work – communication with the members is difficult in the first place. We have tried to set up a project pipeline, but it did not really work. There was definitely a capacity issue, a communication issue… We decided to drop this track after a few months of efforts. There is some potential in it, but the efforts in capacity building of the members as a prerequisite are beyond our reach. * Question about ethics in our relationship with businesses? * We have developed guidelines in that area since 2009. We are fine with a good cop/bad cop relation as long as companies show a willingness to change.   We could find 10-15 companies that had court cases and ask them to join e@w. Obviously, those which have felt the pinch are more motivated to work on diversity than others.   * The anti-racism narrative is hard to sell in general: can we try something else? But what? * How could we sell our “products” at a higher price to businesses? * Where are we visible? Brussels, Member States? Who is our audience? * We could focus on developing visibility at the national level. It is possible, but there is a resources issue. Could we organise some activities jointly with members to get visibility as a way to seek funding? * Visibility is about networks and contacts with decision makers => we are operating under time constraints and such relationships take a lot of time to develop. * What is the mission of ENAR? If it is about advocacy, we do not necessarily need to get 20 K supporters on our Facebook page. * We need to be more specific in terms of audience development. * We are not experts in business / communication with businesses / fundraising with businesses => it is a chicken and egg situation: we need resources to invest to increase our expertise in this area. * We need to better define what kind of product we can sell. * The Bodyshop project needs to be pursued. * Shall we compare our model to the AFMD model (flat fee + charge on specific products)? Should we review our fee system? * What is the product that we sell? The link to our members? But do we have strong standards of work at national level? This is often where we end up having issues. * We would be glad to receive secret funding from foundations, but we miss the contacts. * We haven’t yet found the persons who would like to invest in us to make us grow. * We are also exploring venture philanthropy capital: we have serious business discussions on our needs for growth. It’s a difficult area to look into, but we meet people that take our project seriously and see its added value. * We are better at selling our e@w / HDM products, but we need our first real customer. * HR: working with interns provides some support but it is difficult in terms of time investment * Do we need to change our strategy? * Could we dovetail with the work of members and try to sell it to other potential funders and foundations? Maybe through a regional approach (agreement with 5 NGOs, get the money and have a % out of it for ENAR)? * E@w is starting to yield some results after 5 years. We need to persevere. * We need to be very clear with the funders about what we are going to do with their money. * We need to be personal in our communication with the members (Dear \*\*\* rather than Dear All). * Sarah suggests working with Rating Agencies to develop their rating criteria in matters of diversity management (specifically ethnic diversity) to impact on hedge funds (in particular Nordic funds sensitive to diversity) so that it has an impact ultimately on the fundraising capacities of the companies. It would be a clear way to use money to incentivise them to do diversity management, while furthering our own objectives.   **DECISIONS:**   * **NEH will look for companies with court cases on diversity issues => ENAR will try to approach them to ask them to join e@w** * **SI will contribute to the work with rating agencies.** * **Marcell will share with Georgina his contact at Metro international** * **Div’Apero – maybe drop the October one / lower priority** * **Pascal to focus in the coming months on the most promising avenues: businesses through the equal@work platform** * **Sarah, Laurentia, Marcell are interested in being involved in the working group on fundraising** * **Ask NPCs to scope organisations in their country. What are the resources available in terms of access to communities, expertise in diversity management,…** * **Be personal in our communication with members/donors (“Dear \*\*name\*\*” and not “Dear All”)** |

**Annexes**

**2. Evaluation of the GA**

* Andreas: Nice venue but the size of the room must be appropriate, technical issues are really important, the atmosphere needs to be improved, catering took too long (basic needs). The idea of giving the organisation of the event to local businesses is good, and should not be dropped altogether.
* Nicoletta: The ice-breaking exercise was unnecessary or should have been designed in a different manner, because it didn’t work as it was supposed to. We already have individuals committed to the job, we don’t need to motivate them. We need to discuss the real issues in their work and need more time for real discussion.
* Sarah: do we need ice-breakers?
* Marcell: The GA 2013 was much better (in terms of logistics). Very good participants, strong experts but we were not using these strengths effectively. Trainings on issues such as community mobilization or the NPC in Greece do not concern everyone. If we redefine the aim, we could have a great event.
* Sarah: We need to be clear about what we do.
* Michael: How do we decide what is important?
* Andreas: We need to learn about the needs of members, as it is the second GA under the new regime, both for newcomers and members who have been there for a long time. There must be an opportunity to learn the basics about ENAR and then a content discussion, planning issues. Work in groups? We need a session on finances, to explain and make it interesting. We need to answer the needs of new members and others.
* Niels-Erik: Scope on whether the event matches your needs is very high. So people come with an open mind to these events. How do we assist people in getting what they really need? Can be empowered to go home with something else.
* Michael: Last year we had an open space for members, purely for networking, which was not the case this year.
* Nicoletta: The board didn’t take any decision on the content of the convention, which was both a strategic congress and the GA. When it comes to strategy, it is important because it comes every three years. It is not something that came out clearly for members; they didn’t understand. They thought they were presented with something that was really already decided beforehand.
* Myriam: Very few members knew what we do during the year. There was no annual report on the content and when they see the organisation’s budget, they don’t understand.
* Jamie: There was a lot of motivation in the room to be part of a movement. No halal food in the beginning. The flower session was long, but it was a nice idea. Papers are accessible, but they are too long to read => prepare one pagers because people don’t have time. In 2013, there was slogan building, ownership session, open space. This year was really input oriented.
* Sarah: What did you think of the thematic session on objectives?
* Jamie: not enough time. We could have assigned tasks to members. Groups at several levels.
* Sarah: The working group on racist violence was really useful. Maybe this is just the format that we need to take in all expertise.
* Andreas: We need to make the best use of our time; the facilitator is essential to understand where the strategies are at.
* Sarah: Members have different levels of expertise and we need to manage different expectations. GA to provide information? Get input from members? Make objectives clearer.
* Jamie: Google doc: ask input for the GA in advance. In January. Just ticking the box.
* Sarah: There is usually very little response from members and the board.
* Niels-Erik: Group on anti-Semitism. We hope there would be more members joining afterwards. We should learn from the PAD group. Situation in Denmark. White paper from the Danish Institute of Human Rights saying that the ban on circumcision would not violate any law.
* Eyachew: wasn’t there in June. Some are new members, some are from the Board. The chair could make that point clear. Have success stories about what ENAR has achieved. Is the board responsible for connecting with current developments? We should also inform other members about EU developments.
* Marcell: As new board members, we have a fresh approach. Old board members have a different perspective. The other 100 members are just coming once a year to see ENAR. They don’t follow the newsletters, or other docs. We have to consider that. Need to set deadlines on decisions is good but there are decisions that should be made without all these members. What was interesting as a new member was the networking dimension. We underestimate that. Need to discuss projects and campaigns and combine the experience of activists and experts. Do we need to have GA in Brussels or should we find cheaper places? What about National Platform Coordination meetings?
* Sarah: There are many implications of changing place for GAs, and other considerations (safety, flights, etc). We do that for Board meetings.
* Sarah: The session with the Secretary Generals of the EP political groups was important but that wasn’t necessarily understood by all members, because they don’t understand the structure of the EP. Perhaps we needed to make it clearer in the morning. This session was really good in fulfilling our advocacy objectives. We should think about how we link up all our objectives together.
* Michael: The secretary generals of the parties found it really good. Members also liked it. People were venting their frustrations before asking their questions. We may need to prepare this more.
* Niels-Erik: It was a lot of work and they were shocked of the results. We should follow up on this, having something similar on other topics.
* Nicoletta: We should train members on using this opportunity, on understanding how the EU system works and how it has an impact on their work. Foresee training budget for Board members and for the membership.
* Andreas: We should have entered immediately in the topic rather than spend time discussing how wonderful the socialist party was. Prepare the members on what questions should be asked. GA: with the new model, there will be a constant election campaign, with new members discovering the network and others seeking to be elected to the Board.
* Michael: ENAR’s constituency has changed, for instance Muslims. ENAR’s work is not visible, not well communicated. Develop communication (5 minute clip). The documents are still too long. There was an aim behind the convention: get more into action and mobilization; build the movement, with ENAR as the driver, as this was one of the first meetings of the open GA. We didn’t want another person from the US and we chose the ELOS institute. But it didn’t work out. They couldn’t even get to the point. We didn’t expect this. We applied another methodology in Slovakia and it worked very well. The timing of the session with the Secretary Generals was not ideal. We thought the discussion on strategies was good, using the energy of members. We tried to kill too many birds with one stone, and we lost readability. Board members were not involved in the design of the GA and of the Strategic Plan and I should have consulted you rather than just inform you about what we were planning to achieve.
* Sarah: logistics, ownership before the GA. Doesn’t agree on the “anti-racist fiesta” and focus on the content. Clear objectives. Look at this as from January during the Board meeting after the next.

**3. Strategic development of ENAR**

* Michael: In 2008 we restructured membership because we didn’t know the members and because of their lack of ownership. Smaller basis of members. From the staff perspective we have succeeded in reinvigorating the membership. We get good feedback on strategies. That was the expected issue of the process.
* The process started in 2009 with regional seminars – to propose a new narrative on diversity and equality. We came to the conclusion that it was around full equality of outcomes, solidarity, well-being. What does it mean policy-wise for an anti-racist network? Full employment is a golden gate to get there in the current context, while also dealing with immediate violence (hate crime). As ENAR, we take this as our angle of attack, but the situation is much broader than that. But ENAR is also a vehicle for members to work on other issues. The far-right narrative makes it impossible to have a progressive debate on equality. The far-right is a symptom of the situation, but it’s a good hook to articulate strategies, discourses, action and rebuild an anger => tackling the far-right is not an aim per se. Structural discrimination is still a hurdle – data collection, equal work, PAD, Muslims, Roma, Jews.
* Community mobilization/organisation supports all strategies.
* Some issues are about inside reform – we are already operating from within the system
* Some issues require a radical approach: what is the alternative to the Commission? They don’t question what they do.
* But who should articulate the different layers? Some questions are crucial and the Secretariat should not be left alone articulating them.
* The adoption of the Strategic Objectives was the result of an ongoing process for 5 years. The strategic planning itself is how we formally agree on this on paper, but the process goes on.
* This approach has paid off so far as we have gathered huge support in the Network (SOs were adopted by 98% of those present).
* Jamie: How do the steering groups work? Sarah: not all the same setting. It depends on the level of engagement of the communities and the level of development of the work.
* Niels-Erik: We don’t have similarly strong constituencies on some issues.
* Laurentia: This should be discussed at the NPC meeting. The issue of feedback is also a problem because of lack of time.
* Sarah: We know that there will be different levels of engagement.
* Nicoletta: What are the results of these groups? Michael: Afrophobia has seen very good progress, similarly to equality data collection and Islamophobia. We are obviously having an impact. Nicoletta: members don’t know what is happening and whether it is useful. What is resulr of this work? Michael acknowledges that if one member is not connected to any of the steering groups, s/he might feel nothing much is happening => we don’t communicate about our successes.
* Jamie: it depends on the structure of the grassroots organisation. Sometimes it’s not accessible.
* Andreas: You need to raise awareness, stimulate the discussion.
* Claire: We have two-level strategies: what we do at EU level and what we do with at national level - they must be interconnected.
* Sarah: Communicating with members about our results is important. We give the information but how the information is used is the question.
* Claire: We should run an impact assessment also for our members.
* Eyachew: How to design a strategy to take it at national level, this is up to us members. If you don’t have data, we don’t have ideas, we can’t influence the process. We have to be creative/ambitious.
* Jamie: Reading about input and information is different than being present.
* Nicoletta: We need to consider how to link the various areas of our work - How to have data collection when it comes to migrants, when it comes to all other groups. Applied to other strategies, how to link this work.
* Sarah: That would help address the silo approach. There are cross overs, we just need to highlight them.
* Niels-Erik: Maybe we should bring all issues together in the shadow report. This may be a goal in itself. People take issues back home.
* Claire: We also need to look at the bigger frame and keep track of other issues: fundamental rights, MEPs (not only the commission). EP: we have to see if hearings on some issues are useful or not. We need to make links with MEPs at EU level, and not isolate them. The example of the intergroups is useful in that regard.
* Sarah: What is negotiable or not? How do we go about it? How do we react when objectives are being challenged?
* Jamie: There are certain things that are not negotiable. Communities need to be part of it but the advocacy work happens in a wider context. Communities based requires involvement, standing in solidarity.
* Laurentia: All these issues are in our work plan. It should be acceptable as an answer.
* Andreas: You have to make decisions and follow up. You position yourself. We can’t change our strategy but we could change the tactics. It takes 5 years to steer it around. We need to explain this better to our membership.
* Michael: Deficit of writing voices - we don’t write enough to explain what we do. If you are not connected to any strategy, you feel as if you don’t contribute, and for some it is frustrating. Bringing the manpower. We already have the narrative for our strategies, but it’s a matter of communicating them internally and externally. We need more resources to do so.
* Nicoletta: Members are dynamic organisations, they have their own understanding, you need to engage them in the discussion. Shift working on communities while keeping the horizontal approach. Highlight our specific advocacy demands.
* Sarah: We are not putting into question that those affected by the issue should not be at the front of the question.
* Marcell: ENAR is a network, not just a think tank, advocacy organisation in Brussels. We have to make it clearer to members. The Secretariat is doing a lot of work and it is not always possible for members to follow. Online meetings could be a good idea; FB group is good. Skype meeting with members on one of the topics. There is no bad move, you just have to stick to it. We have to be flexible – add or remove some strategies. Times are changing. Universal approach might be less visible.
* Laurentia: Need for pragmatism and being active within ENAR. We should develop cooperation among members, otherwise they don’t know how to develop their organization. Allocate a person for fundraising. Sending calls to members, applying for funding if you want to be a network.
* Do we want to attract new members? Is it a goal per se?
* Laurentia: How can we generate funds for campaigns?
* Sarah: How do you get to that? We can discuss this tomorrow with regard to ENAR’s fundraising strategy. Being funded by the EC brings some constraints.
* Laurentia: Other networks work around projects.
* Andreas: Are we really about cultural representation? Internally, we should talk about forms of racism: about Islamophobia and not Muslims, anti-Semitism and not Jews. There is a role for communities in shaping that agenda. That is what we developed within ENAR (universal/specific) – it makes it difficult when it becomes a community thing. If it’s about Afrophobia and racism rather than PAD, that opens the door to everybody. Everybody should engage against Afrophobia, Islamophobia…
* Michael: We are fighting forms of racism but some forms are not recognized and we have started joint press releases with different communities to avoid silo approaches. Our strategies are not about cultural representation but forms of racism. “Strategy for the social inclusion of PAD/BE” is what we use towards EU institutions to make our message clear to them => we should clarify that.
* Niels-Erik: The Gaza tragedy during the summer generated lots of “them and us” discourses. It is critical to collaborate. There is a confrontation going on.
* Sarah: This summer was difficult, trauma from Durban. How we don’t fragment along community lines, at all cost. This must be a priority for us. How do you tailor your response to that?
* Sarah: Addressing the far-right is there in all our work. There was space to discuss this at the Convention.
* Andreas: Should we make an analysis of the UNITED project?
* Sarah: We are not per se a campaigning organisation. We don’t have the skills to that extent. It would require massive changes to become a campaigning organisation.
* Nicoletta: Yes but we could support our members in campaigning. Campaigning is just a tool.
* Jamie: We need to be goal oriented, while managing expectations of our stakeholders – it should be in the OM.
* Eyachew: It is not exclusive. It’s about tactics and timing. The ILGA/ENAR campaign was really useful, one of the most successful. Such collaborations between EU and national level should be better highlighted.
* Michael: ENAR is an advocacy organisation. But there is a part of think tank, network, monitoring, campaigning. Lobby groups are successful because they know can weigh on votes (i.e. closing a company in a specific constituency will have an impact on who gets elected). As ENAR, we don’t have that power, therefore we need to build up our anti-racist constituency to be able to push from the backyard of MEPs. In order to mobilize, we are trying different methods. We represent communities. We have to create that power relationship. Use the civil right movement strategy. It is a non-partisan political work.
* Niels-Erik: Need for mobilization and strategic litigation. We should engage in implementation of the directives. Example of a project conducted in 2007 on training for small NGOs. We should look at projects within the family of ENAR members.
* Andreas: OSF advocacy model. Inside/outside + evidence based/value based advocacy. You can’t do it all. You need to map your organisation, to know where we move our organisation.
* Sarah: If we are shaped by members, there is a risk we always change. Need to find a pitch to ensure some stability (difference between tactics/strategy?).
* Nicoletta: Our aims according to our statutes are many. That could cover everything. But we have to think what is our added value. We are a membership organisation, we bring the perspective of grassroots NGOs – which is part of our added-value. We invested more in policy and advocacy, research, etc., but we have not invested to such an extent in the membership, which is our strength. We should not invest in being a think tank, advocacy is needed, but the most important thing is to strengthen members. Not in terms of number of members, but of having active members. The Secretariat has developed but the link with national level has not functioned so effectively. We should invest more resources in developing the network.
* Sarah: The impetus comes from our members. And impact should take place at national level. Maybe it is not happening as much as we would like it to.
* Marcell: We were elected to develop the network. ENAR should take the initiative. Each member has a common point with ENAR. We should encourage members to achieve our objectives. Members have to be guided to work on something and that requires some methodology.
* Jamie: In Germany, a number of organisations part of the network are not grassroots. They are more about lobbying. When you strive to influence the EU level, you can’t be active at the grassroots.
* Claire: We need to and are striving to use different tools to achieve our objectives, and these tools differ according to our various strategies.
* Eyachew: We fail to translate the findings of the shadow report at national level. We need to take responsibility for that, so that it is discussed at national level. Suggestions: financial investment is good. We also need to mobilise MEPs from the national level instead of being stuck at the national level with national parliaments. ENAR could help in that.
* Andreas: We have to activate membership depending on our objectives. We should consolidate the membership to that effect.
* Myriam: The new structure has increased our relationship with members, Juliana has much more work in relation to members and liaising with them.
* Nicoletta: Different organisations have different strengths. You may be grassroots because you work close to the situation on the ground. The networking officer needs to be reinforced. We also need to generate resources to support members’ work on joint activities such as 21/03.
* Michael: The community development programme that we had set up in 2008, with a training for activists, is still valuable. When it comes to mobilization activities, the network is not ready to mobilise yet. Members are not really connected to the media. It is too early to do something together, we are not strong enough. See the example of the fight racism campaign done in partnership with some of our Swedish members. We have to build the will because members don’t see the added value of mobilising together for transnational campaigns. There are also many campaigns running and a small number of activists are asked to do a lot. We can provide some training to our members, but civil society is characterised by a high turnover, which means that we have to train constantly on the same issues. It’s extremely hard to build a strong grassroots basis. We even have a “Civil society training academy” in our pipeline.
* Sarah: We have to highlight the value of working with ENAR. How do we engage members and rally them on issues we are all interested in. Methodology will be tailored around the issue.
* Nicoletta: As members, we didn’t see what we can do to work on these objectives more effectively during the Convention. I knew about them because I’m a Board member. The next convention should be designed to engage the members in working together on realising our objectives.
* Michael: How do we tackle the macro-level which has an impact on our reality: austerity, euro crisis, democratic deficit, neo-colonialism, etc. What should we do about this? Who should speak on those issues? The Board, the Secretariat? At the micro level: we need to keep unfolding the consequences of our policy positions (e.g. could we say something about dignified income => we don’t need to go into the details, but at least say if we think this could contribute to reduce racism or not). For the big issues, we have the strategic committee. We should have a principle agreement on fleshing out the strategic objectives and connecting the dots. And all of that is our narrative.
* Sarah: Are we going to be able to have a position, an opinion on the whole landscape?
* Niels-Erik: Indeed, our work is not about cultural representation, but about who is discriminated against. When it comes to discrimination, there is no legal problem as to the level of social assistance. We stick to what we know: combating racial discrimination.
* Claire: We have to leave macro-level issues to other networks which have this in their field of expertise. We do not need a definite position to interact.
* Sarah: Who should develop those positions? Do we have the resources to cover it all?
* Nicoletta: Austerity is going to last. We make the link to capitalism, but austerity directly affects our communities. It has an impact on discrimination, therefore it’s not outside of our remit.
* Eyachew: Racism is also fully economic.
* Sarah: We should leave these questions to the strategic committee and report back to the board. Let those interested by these issues among us get involved in that committee and these discussions.