**27th BOARD MEETING**

**Minutes**

**Brussels, 21-22 September 2018**

**Participants:** Amel, Marcell, Enrique, Wouter, Claudia, Laurentia, Maria, Vilana

**Apologies**: Karen Taylor, Karen Kaneza, Ghislain

**Participants ENAR Secretariat:** Michael, Claire, Anne-Sophie, Ines, Ojeaku, Sarah, Juliana

**Venue: ENAR office, Brussels**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Friday, 21 September 2018** | | | | |
| **Timing** | **Matter** | **For info** | **For Input** | **For Decision** |
| 10:30 – 10:45 | **1. Opening and adoption of the Agenda**   * Amel welcomes Maria on the Board; * Amel confirms that Claudia is staying on the Board; * Esra has started in July as Network Development Officer; * Myriam is back until December to support the Team from an administrative perspective.   **DECISION:**   * **The agenda is adopted.**   **2. Adoption of the Minutes**   * Point 5 of the minutes should be shortened where possible.   **DECISION:**   * **The minutes are adopted.** | | | |
| 10:45 – 12:00 | **3. Revisiting the Board’s commitments**   * Board members renewed their commitment for their mandate.   To ourselves as Board:   * Challenge and reflect on our identities and roles in safe spaces; * Support the development needs of the Board (governance) * Perspectives we should focus on (intersectionality in our social policies) * Better understand how media work; * Learn from the team how to better work on advocacy.   To our members:   * Continue to improve our communication with the members, how we connect and support; * Focus on our mutual learning as members and sharing that learning; * Make time to reflect on how we build coherence, including governance and values.   To the team:   * Ensure we work towards providing a work environment that is serene and respectful; * Be a proactive Board Member, support the team and be alert; * Work with the team to start challenging our organisational culture and open it to potential new approaches. | | | |
| 12:00 – 13:00 | **4. Evaluation of the GA**  The overall assessment is that it was a very good GA.   * **What worked?**  1. Being outside of Brussels was very interesting; 2. Visits to local NGOs were very interesting in terms of shared learning. The different groups enjoyed their visits; 3. Gender specific workshops were incredibly interesting and intense; 4. Re-boosting our network in Portugal was really extraordinary, generating enthusiasm among Portuguese NGOs; 5. The positive relationship and collaboration between Board and Team contributed to the success and was visible to the outside; 6. Members took upon themselves to stand up to other members to manage power dynamics, and protect staff; 7. Accommodation was very good and proximity to the airport was appreciated; 8. Kudos to the secretariat for the logistics; 9. It drew light on the priceless value of the network; 10. The presence of the author of a key book was great. To be repeated on other topics; 11. The situational game run by Tara was extremely powerful in visualising power games.  * **What did not work?**  1. Time management was problematic throughout, we were always behindschedule; Workshops were too packed and too short. There was a clear demand to go deeper in discussions; 2. The election process was a little bit of a disaster; there was not enough time for the presentation of candidates; there was not an equal distribution of time among candidates – we tried to accommodate specific demands of communities in changing the timing, but we should plan this better and streamline the process within the programme; 3. Things did not flow well in the statutory session: there were lots of tensions; 4. The 20-years party was not that enthusiastic, people were tired; 5. The white supremacy workshop was too short, too crowded, too superficial and without solutions; 6. The slavery tour was a lot about “whitewashing”.  * **What could we have done differently?**  1. Maybe have more time to enjoy the seaside, or go out of the hotel for conversational outdoor sessions; 2. Better personal preparation of Board and Staff before trying new methodologies, exploring new topics, with the view to better to manage the feedback/pushback that can stem from difficult conversations; 3. Better structure the workshops (less packed agenda, more time for discussion); 4. Organise more gender specific workshops; 5. Organise the market place for Board candidates; 6. Make more time/space for networking (not free time, but flexible time).   **RECOMMENDATIONS**   * **Start the statutory session with the market place to defuse potential tensions (the GA is the one time in the year to ask questions about the organisation); the current unfolding process: activity report, financial report followed by market place is not the best process for the management of emotions;** * **Ensure that there is a Board meeting with the staff in March/April to better prepare the GA.**   **DECISIONS:**   * **Review the election process (1) to cater for the specific needs of our constituencies/candidates and (2) to make it truly inclusive and streamlined in the GA process.**   **5. Exploring our next concrete steps as a feminist anti-racist movement**   * The initial plan was to bring the two groups together for a conversation after the gender specific sessions, but after feedback from the facilitators of the two workshops, the decision was taken to cancel this joint session on the spot because the two dynamics were too different; * In the women workshop: people were speaking, crying about past abuses, difficult stories… It was great to have the space for such a reflection, but it was confusing how to handle it. Some persons were resistant to that conversation at the beginning (not necessarily seeing the gendered angle of the discrimination they are facing); * We are not used to being in gender specific spaces, but it was really helpful. It is part of a process. It is crucial to question patriarchy in general and within the anti-racism sector; * It was not a space for therapy, there was safety and a caring atmosphere, lots of empathy. Participants knew what their boundaries were; * On the men’s side, there was a fear that participants would not show up, but they did. It was a productive conversation, but some people were angry. It was very necessary, we’re not even at step 0; * The men’s group broke into smaller groups at the very end of their session, but they had no time to explore next steps; * Some expressed concern about the endorsement of the declaration. It was a big mistake in terms of process => it generated frustration for some, while it was a great moment for others. We did not realise the level of anger of some individuals in the room and it backlashed against a number of women in the evening (also due to alcohol consumption). The declaration was also not discussed with the Board beforehand; * Men have to take responsibility for managing other men. It’s not the responsibility of women to manage them; * It would have been great, in the men’s plenary session, to share stories of harassment happening within the network. It happened in a couple of sub-workshops and had a strong impact on participants; * We need women to speak up when confronted to harassment and bullying so that we can exclude members as it is against our values => we need to work on empowerment of members for this to happen; * There is a whole conversation about manhood, about men in patriarchy, men who are racialised in patriarchy, toxic masculinity that needs to happen within the network. | | | |
| 13:45 – 15:00 | **6. Review Shadow Report process**   * Presentation of the Shadow Report review proposal by Ojeaku (see annexed note); * Thematic reports might get better coverage in the media; * We need to pay attention to the fact that thematic reports end up focusing on the issues of larger West European countries, leaving on the side smaller Eastern countries and their specific issues => involving different regions in the design of the process would be key to avoid the trap of always selecting the bigger countries; * Decision on the yearly themes of research: we will know what the members are expecting (be it only through the membership survey), but there might be arbitrations to do as to what will be the selected themes among the proposed themes by members; * For the dissemination of thematic reports, translation of national fact sheets will be foreseen as the reports will be more closely linked to a national context,; * National researchers should be involved in the dissemination process (some refuse to be available for dissemination activities, for example participating in the national launch by ENAR members => this could become a contractual obligation for researchers). Appropriate planning would also enable Ojeaku to attend national launches where possible; * Explore the possibility of drafting specific reports on very narrow issues that no one is dealing with, but it would need to be linked to ENAR’s advocacy priorities to avoid publishing reports “out of the blue”. There are already “left-overs” from the current reports that would provide a solid basis (gathered information that is not included in the final report => we do not have the capacity to handle this information in the current setting, it would require more capacities); * We should strive to target more academic audiences for the report, that would contribute largely to our impact; * We should also make the format of the Shadow Report more appealing and adapt it to new ways of consuming information, but not as a “book format”; * With regard to extra support on research: during the thematic report years, there might be some flexibility in the budget for hiring a consultant. It is not possible to confirm the sustainability of this model at this stage.   **DECISIONS:**   * **The Board endorses the recommendations of the Secretariat. The Secretariat has the space to implement the changes at its own pace;** * **The Board leaves it up to the Secretariat to decide about the periodicity of the European reports (2 years, 2,5 years or 3 years).** | | | |
| 15:00 - 16:00 | **7. Next concrete steps on PAD & intersectionality**   * Sarah presents the latest developments of the symposium on intersectionality (3/10/18) – see annexed agenda; * Emilia Roig (CIJ) will draft in 2019 a publication exploring advocacy venues to advance intersectionality; * There will be a Steering Group on intersectionality early in 2019 to contribute to the publication; * The Board is very appreciative of the development of the symposium. * On the PAD European Parliament resolution, the LIBE coordinator from GUE, Malin Bjork, has agreed to lead the process for the resolution. The resolution will finally be tabled to the LIBE committee after many advocacy meetings. It should be passed before the end of the EP mandate in 2019 – support will be needed to get as many MEP as possible to endorse the resolution; * FRA will launch the report “Black in the EU” at the end of November. It is also the result of ENAR’s long time advocacy on this issue; ENAR is part of the launch with a speaking role on the main panel. It’s the first substantial report by an EU agency on this issue. It’s a milestone; * What would be the Board’s view on our plans for next year? Should we go for another PAD week? Could we create an opportunity to inform new MEPs about all the work done, notably through a series of meetings with anti-racist activists? How can we also ensure the EP acts as an anti-racist space as of the beginning of the new parliamentary term after the EU elections => maybe propose an “anti-racism week”, in collaboration with anti-racism organisations, shedding light on all the challenges at stake; * Explore how to get the learning and advice of MEPs on what was key in their learning process when they joined the EP so that we could tailor our activities in the best way. Board Members could help reach out to the MEPs that they know; * With regard to an anti-racism week, it is really important to make it a space where all struggles can meet, exchange, hammer out the commonalities and get out of “silo” thinking – it would also contribute to reassuring potential funders who are often afraid to step in to support anti-racism because they feel that the field is extremely fragmented and that activists are not talking to each other. * The key challenge is to put anti-racism on the radar of MEPs when they have so many other issues to consider => there is a balance to findas we cannot be too specific at the beginning, when the level of awareness is likely to be basic. The most important is to ensure an anti-racist presence in the EP (including through ensuring the re-establishment and sustainability of the Anti-Racism and Diversity Intergroup (ARDI)); * Ideally, the anti-racism week should happen in September 2019; * In 2019, we will also advocate to ensure that our demands are taken up in the “hand over note” from the current EC to the next EC; * By the end of 2018, we plan to consult members through webinars to check their demands for the EP, but also for the new College of European Commissioners (who will be nominated after the EP elections).   **DECISIONS:**   * **The Board commends the work of the Team on the organisation of the symposium on intersectionality (Julie, Sarah, Juliana, Esra, Anne-Sophie);** * **Team: get advice from outgoing MEPs about their learning process on race equality issues when they joined the EP with the view to design a specific package for the upcoming MEPs.** * **Board agrees to the organisation of a transversal “multi-struggle” week in September 2019 to set the stage rather than a focused PAD week. The organisation of a dedicated PAD week is postponed to 2020 (unless more funding becomes available).** | | | |
| 16:00 – 16:30 | **8. Vera’s project; membership applications**  Membership:   * Team to find another way of consulting Board members than Excel sheets about membership applications – it’s not very readable;   Vera’s project on strategic litigation process:   * Presentation of the project by Michael on the basis of Vera’s note (see annexed document); * Beyond the content, her key demand is that ENAR would be the lead applicant of the project on behalf of the consortium of members; so far it has been refused on the grounds that ENAR did not have the financial capacity to take the risk as it would be legally responsible for the project and/or that applying members would not be reliable. All such demands have been turned down so far on this basis: the point here is that this demand might be different on one or the two aspects: ENAR’s situation is better and the consortium of organisations is solid and can be trusted. * It would set a precedent if ENAR just accepts a proposal because of the persons initiating it; * The topic is interesting but we don’t have the resources at this time to engage in the project, even in a supervision capacity; * ENAR does not have the capacity to work through the application as a full applicant.   **DECISIONS:**   * **MP: for next Board meeting, draft a clear policy on not being the lead applicant in project applications on behalf of members;** * **MP: inform Vera that ENAR cannot take the lead on the application;** * **EO/JW: explore another way of presenting information about membership applications than excel sheets;** * **Board: come back to Esra with feedback on membership applications by 28/09.** | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Saturday, 22 September 2018** | | | | |
| **Timing** | **Matter** | **For info** | **For Input** | **For Decision** |
| 9:30 – 11:15 | **9. Update on finances and applications**   * Financial report presented by Inès (see annexed document); * ENAR applied to Google for a 20K€ contribution to support us before the end of the year – in cash or in kind. * Staff and Board travel costs have been significantly reduced; * The December Board meeting might become a webinar, as well as the NPC; * The attention of the Board is drawn to the fact that we have increased our core costs with costs that cannot be compressed (more staff, more equipment); * For the 2019 application to the European Commission, we will have to plan as soon as possible which activities could be dropped in case of co-funding shortage, as well as have a more strategic approach to spending on staff and board travel. * The team met with the representative of Sigrid Rausing Trust: she was very encouraging for our 3-year application in 2019, asking us to apply for more than the current grant. * The results of the external audit by E&Y were not bad at all: they found a couple of no-shows at our GA2015, and a number of depreciation costs that had not been properly allocated. They will be deducted from 2015, but we have the opportunity to reallocate them in 2018. The final result is that we have a few hundred € to refund. We have only received the first draft report that we have approved. * We don’t have a mechanism in ENAR to support the organisation in assessing the risks of projects, of funding opportunities, of internal processes and to support the development of appropriate processes (probably the SFSC does not have the skills or time to do this). This could be the task of a committee composed of 2 Board Members and 2 external persons (one meeting a year): an “internal governance support committee”; * Small scale fundraising proposals involving members will be developed after such guidelines are approved; same for the larger fundraising projects. * Suggestion: have a meeting of people responsible for finances and budget within ENAR member organisations. We only hear the activists, and never those persons who might have a very useful good practice exchange and learning cycle for ENAR Europe as well as for the larger community of under-resourced organisations.   **DECISIONS:**   * **The Board approves the most careful budget proposal until the end of 2018;** * **The Board agrees to the drafting of guidelines for strategic spending on staff and board travel costs and other spending (December Board meeting);** * **IB, Wouter and Marcel: make a proposal for an “internal governance support committee” (1st Board meeting of 2019);** * **The Board commends the work of the finance and administration team for the management of the external audit, for the current budget adjustments, for the budget forecasts for 2019 (EC, OSIFE) and for the clear presentation to the Board.**   **10. Follow-up of the strategic fundraising workshop**  See above the decision about the setting up of an “internal governance committee”.  **11. Update on Staff (from SFSC)**   * Amel updates the Board on the results of the SFSC meeting and the changes in the Team.   **SFSC RECOMMENDATIONS following the resignation of BA**  *a) Short term:*   * Training of staff and board on line management once needs are identified; * Management to inform staff regularly about the current work regulations; * Management to inform the staff on 1&1 about what happened in the process, what are their needs in such situations, and have a collective session on lessons learned; * Amel and Wouter to listen to ASM; * Review recruiting processes in line with the longer reflection work on the type of employer that we want to be.   *b) Middle term:*   * Finalise the new working regulations (in process since February) - priority; * Review the governance processes so that the Board can make the right decisions for the Team to do their job; * Build the capacity of the Board to ensure quality governance (on finances, staffing, liabilities, risk management); * Develop a safe space within the team to address power relations within the team, perceptions and impact to further improve the well-being of the staff (including through the support of external consultants); * Clarify the type of employer that we want to be and the consequences in terms of management (what do we need to put in place, what can we put in place, what types of processes; what does it mean to be a value driven organisation and drawing the consequences in terms of internal regulations).   **SFSC RECOMMENDATIONS on the need for a review of the management structure**   * On the request for a management structure review by the management team: the co-directorship structure is not perceived as the best option in the current situation of the organisation’s status and resources, while not ruling out completely such an option in the future. A review of the management structure will be conducted by an external consultant who will make proposals to the SFSC, with the view to cater for quality HR management.   **DECISIONS:**   * **The Board agrees to the recommendations of the SFSC and to follow up their implementation by the SFSC and the Team during the upcoming Board meetings;** * **The Board decides not to create any new job within the Secretariat before the review of the recruitment process is carried out, except for the recruitment of the Advocacy Officer for the DARE project who will be recruited through a restricted call for applications before the end of the year;** * **The Board commends Claire for the quality of her work and input in outgrowing the role of the DD to cater for the needs of the organisation facing staff growth and changes.** | | | |
| 11:15 - 12:00 | **12. Update on workplan 2019 and prospects for 2020**   * Presentation of the outline of the REC application by Claire (see annexed documents); * Presentation of the work plan in 2019: paying attention to the workload with a staff in reduced capacity; * Workload for 2019: it seems that there are more actions added than what was presented at the GA. The Board inquires what is the plan for workload management/reduction; * We need to communicate more and better (including towards the members) about the vast number of our accomplishments. We need to explore the development of videos, blog posts, other formats by present Board members, outgoing Board members, Team members, Members… with the view to document and share what we do. For example our journey towards becoming a feminist anti-racist organisation.   **DECISIONS:**   * **Board: at the GA 2019, the decision on the work plan should be that the Board is given the mandate to work with the members and team to prepare the EC application;** * **The Board insists on the urgency of reducing the workload and making space in the planning of the work for “soft actions” that draw on staff resources (external meetings, action planning, coordination with third parties, advocacy preparation, responding to demands for application);** * **Board: inform the members about what ENAR is developing in terms of staff well-being, the employer we want to be => leading by example.** | | | |
| 12:00 – 13:00 | **13. EP 2019 plans**  ***ENAR Europe:***   * Most of the resources will be used after the elections (building our agenda in the new EP); * 3 working groups: narratives and communication; developing our specific demands (top one: keep ARDI going); supporting members (check list for political programme assessment; our policy demands; toolkit for campaigning; regular check-in with members…).   ***Members:***   * Invite all the members to take part in the campaign; carry out a survey to know what are the key issues at national level and what they could contribute to the campaign; * Support members in fact checking and exposing candidates’ lies with communication using humour (see the Washington Post’s Pinocchio) => the idea is to be tougher in the conversation, to have strong messaging; * Draw lessons from past campaigns; * Put forward the personal stories, show the impact of policies on people and specifically ethnic minority people; * Ask members to use their social media channels to disseminate all material produced by ENAR and Members.   ***Coalitions:***   * UNITED to run a special campaign in 2019 (ENAR can support when the plans are fledged out); * Focus on social issues and mainstreaming our issues/added value in broader debates. | | | |
| 13:45 – 14:45 | **14. First round of ideas on GA 2019**   * Conversation postponed due to lack of time. | | | |
| 14:45 - 15:30 | **15. AOB**  **DECISION:**   * **The Board commits to becoming a paperless organization. Staff to send all documents to the Board between 1 week and 3 days before the meeting for printing if members wish to.** | | | |