**Minutes of the 26th ENAR Board Meeting**

**Lisbon, 21 June 2018**

**Present**: Marcell, Laurentia, Wouter, Vilana, Peter, Ghyslain

**Partaking in the delegation to the High Commissioner on integration**: Amel, Claudia, Enrique

**Apologies:** Karen T, Karen K

**Team**: Anne-Sophie, Ines, Ojeaku, Michael

Place: Hotel \*\*\*

|  |
| --- |
| Thursday, 21 June 2018 |
| No | Matter |
|  | **1. Adoption of the agenda****DECISION:*** **The agenda is adopted.**

**2. Adoption of the Minutes of the 25th Board meeting*** The Board confirms that the training on intersectionality and LGBTQI\* concerns was very interesting.

**DECISION:*** **The minutes of the 25th Board meeting are adopted.**
 |
|  | **3. Update on finances*** Presentation on finances by Inès (see annexed document);
* The European Commission requested an external audit for the year 2015. It will take place during August;
* Applications to funders: OSIFE (Black Caucus and co-funding for 2019-20 with increase of 60k$ and 35k$ for contingencies. OSIFE has already agreed to an increase of the grant and to some flexibility as to the allocation of the grant for unexpected expenses);
* The EC application for 2019 is due by 18 September, hoping that it will avoid cashflow gaps in January 2019;
* Reporting: DARE project (end of September); SRT (1st September);
* Internal audit: for the first time, we will organize an audit on the first part of the year to alleviate the final audit in February. It is scheduled in house on 8th of October. This will avoid us being rushed in February at the time of the reporting to the EC. The total cost should be the same. The accounts should be audited until the end of August;
* Wouter and Marcell reiterate that if there is a need for external extra support, the team should inform the Board. The Board is also a pool of resources;
* Michael informs of the subscription to a legal protection insurance and of the difficulties in ending the relation with our former accountant (PME Conseil: lack of communication, non-disclosure of information about costs whose payments we have suspended in the meantime).

**DECISIONS:*** **ASM and IB to send planning of workload and (potential) demands of support to the Board early July in preparation for the external audit;**
* **The Board agrees to the principle of external support to ASM and IB if necessary.**
 |
|  | **4. Review of the GA agenda*** Presentation of the logistic agenda by Anne-Sophie (see annexed documents);
* For the visits the following Board members will accompany the following groups: Hotel group: Laurentia and Peter ; Slave trade tour: Ghyslain; Lisbon Jewish community: Vilana, Wouter; APAV: Enrique, Claudia?
 |
|  | **5. Presentation of new options for the Shadow Report*** Presentation of the analysis and proposals by Ojeaku (see annexed documents);
* The analysis is based on the results of internal discussions, of the steering group meeting on research of last year and two surveys of staff and ENAR members.

Questions:* Changes would require more capacities in finances and HR => it might be interesting to think of one pool of money for the shadow report to be allocated on a yearly basis (small national reports, in-depths national reports, pan-European report) => it would amount to allocating the 58K€ not only for 29 national reports, but for reports that would be useful for our advocacy (smaller number of reports, but more in-depth, with research on the ground);
* What about a bi-annual shadow report?
* What about covering a larger or smaller set of issues?
* How to address the needs at national level? Are there any other needs at national level that the survey would not have identified?

Discussion:* Ojeaku points out that this conversation is not to sign off on an option, but an opportunity to comment on the proposals. A more detailed version will be presented to the Board in September;
* After consultation, it was clear that people like the coverage (geographical, areas of racism) of the current Shadow Report. It would not make sense to move entirely to another model;
* Bi-annual reports would cater for more time for analysis, which is missing currently, in particular if reports are meant to be designed for advocacy;
* Reports should avoid becoming too academic: they need to be readable for grassroots, non-expert audiences;
* It would be good to broaden the areas of research again – that has been missing in previous years (focus on employment, on hate crime => a new pan-European report on more topics would be interesting);
* It would be good to have an annual member survey on the themes covered by the shadow report, on what is missing (young people for example); How can we make sure that we identify where the gaps are?
* Maybe move to 3 years for the pan-European reports? It would offer more time for analysis. Good practices and implementation of legislation don’t change quickly. Legislation might change quickly, but not the rest. Maybe produce a report at the end of the legislative terms in the different countries;
* What is the rationale for producing the shadow report? To simply monitor (FRA does it already) or to change things through advocacy (probably our situation)?
* Most people use the overall summary of the Shadow Report rather than go into details => We need to report less on data, but reformulate data in such a way that we can set the agenda. People do not fully use the data that we are providing, whilst we can’t fulfill all data needs any way (housing, health, education). However we can formulate things in a way that sets strategic demands for data;
* We struggle to get data that people don’t already have;
* We can consider research as a capacity building element for the members (therefore it is sometimes good to look for data already collected by academics, but who don’t necessarily share it with civil society);
* We need to better build in the project how to use the report beyond the launch. We need to reflect how to embed networking (even virtual) among the researchers and the researchers and CSOs;
* We need to be careful about defining our targets and our needs when collecting data (e.g. on police violence, on the next year on health). We should also better anticipate our future data needs;
* We should maybe do less and translate our results into actionable discourses more so that a greater amount of people have access to our data;
* Does the Shadow Report data contribute to changes in behaviours? Emotions change behaviours, not data => we need to better articulate the link between behavioural change and data collection;
* Who uses the data?;
* Could we have more precise figures on financial and HR needs to implement the new proposal for the September Board meeting?
* Semi-final reports are also fine; it could cater for reporting on developments being processed;
* We could use the free slot of the GA on Friday morning to have the chance to further exchange with members;
* Maybe we don’t need data from NGOs, but just serious evidence to be able to discuss the problematic implementation of legislation at policy level => we do not need to talk about all issues, but about targeted, strategic evidence (that can be collected through focus groups, and not only reporting. Focus groups can help us to understand how to best ask for change);
* CSOs do use the Shadow Report, that’s very clear; probably more than academics; politicians are those who read them the least => not every report will be for everyone => maybe more specific reports will help us address more targeted audiences;
* Another way of looking at research is not just about knowing how many people have been discriminated, but what kind of discrimination happens and how it can be remedied;
* ON wishes to involve more members in designing reports and their use, including for the follow up (which is not the case now, as there is no time, or resources allocated for the follow up);
* The annual member survey could go beyond the Shadow Report, and include a larger set of questions including a few on the Shadow Report (maybe about case studies, their priorities…). For now, we only rely on the Shadow Report to call for specific information. That’s not the most adequate tool for this kind of research.

**DECISIONS:*** **ON to send a short update on the process to the Board during the Summer;**
* **ON to prepare a detailed proposal to be agreed upon for the Board meeting of September;**
* **ON to organise a conference call for whoever wishes to participate to give further feedback;**
* **Board to take into account the workload in designing the new process.**
 |
|  | **6. Update on staff*** MP announces the hiring of Esra Özkan as Network Development Officer as of 2nd of July;
* Wouter informs that to cater for the growing workload within the Team, the SFSC will look into making a proposal on management staff structure for the September Board;
* The SFSC will take place in September, before the Board meeting.

**DECISION:*** **MP to circulate Doodle for the next Board Meeting after the GA.**
 |
|  | **7. AOB****- Board turnover to be presented at the GA*** Michael presents information to be possibly presented at the GA regarding the next year’s elections (renewal of Chair, 2 Vice-Chairs and Treasurer) and proposing the prolongation of one year for 3 Board mandates (7 Board Members will step down next year), with the view to come back to the ideal scheme of 4-4-3 renewals.

**DECISIONS:*** **The Board agrees not to present the proposed election scheme to the GA as there are too many unknown factors (people might leave the Board in the meantime…);**
* **Amel to announce after the elections on Friday evening that next year the Chair, 2 Vice-Chairs and Treasurer will be elected;**

**Concluding words:*** The Board thanks Peter and Vilana for their great contributions to the Board;
* Peter thanks the Board for this excellent experience of sharing 3 years of work together;
* Vilana thanks the whole Board for having such a great time working together, for the safe space to share thoughts without fear of being misunderstood, and for always sharing constructive criticism. It was a great learning experience.
 |