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Notes of EAPN members webinar on new governance structures

23 May 2019

**Participants: (members):**

Ian Johnston, IFSW, Rimgailė Matulionytė, EAPN LI, Marius Isenberg, EAPN DE, Julia Desplats, EAPN FR, Jo Bothmer, EAPN NL, Eva Oddveig Karlsen, EAPN NO, Biljana Dukovska, EAPN MK, Paula Cruz, EAPN PT, Vito Leonardo Telesca, EAPN IT, Freek Spinnewijn, FEANTSA, Sérgio Aires, EAPN PT, Olga Leventis, EAPN EL, Carlos Susias, EAPN ES

**Participants: (staff):** Leo Williams, Elke Vandermeerschen, Magda Tancau, Rebecca Lee, Stefania Renna, Amana Ferro

**Recaps**

**Welcome, Introductions and recap of how we have got to where we are today -** *Slide 2*

**Recap of key changes to be envisaged, coming out of Phases 1 and 2 –** *Slides 3 – 13.*

**Recap of the original proposal -** *Slide 14*

**Key discussion points**

* Still some unclarity on what is meant by ‘EAPN enabling, support and nurturing an anti-poverty movement’: structurally about the network or more about how we do our work?
* EAPN is not a movement itself - we are a network, but the way we understand that change works relies on there being a large number of organisations and individuals engaged in these efforts to create change (and this is the wider movement). This is why the Theory of Change talks about the need for EAPN to strengthen the movement, because this is seen as a crucial way to deliver the change we want.
* Question of whether the right amount of resources related to ‘technical processes’ (as referred to in Phase 1 of the Strategic Thinking process) is allocated
* How to balance the need for structural reform and to reduce duplication, with the need to maintain EAPN’s strength is as a full representative network of the poverty sector & its diversity over all nations.

**Feedback**

**Overview of feedback already heard, then time for more feedback** *- Slide 15*

**Key discussion points**

* **FEANTSA** proposes the option of leaving membership sign-up to working groups optional, to naturally reduce them
* **FEANTSA** questions whether the proposed tenure limits on a reduced Ex Co would mean some members would have to wait far too long before assuming a leadership role
* **FEANTSA** Question of whether the survey results really asked for such a reduction of numbers on the ExCo
* **EAPN IE** is concerned that reducing the EUISG cuts the full EU-wide view and reduces buy-in from all networks. Policy focus groups would also need a lot of staff support. There’s a staffing question here
* Confirmation that original proposal is just now for reference, and need now to find which scenario has the majority of support
* Explanation of Portuguese proposal: not merging the ExCo & EUISG groups but rather changing the organisation. Having 1 group like the ExCo now, remains important, though it could have 1 meeting in January to prepare a work plan; and then have permanent working groups meeting several times a year who would be more active. This means no reduction of representation; it splits up practical tasks, then we all meet again at the GA. Bureau would need to be strengthened.
* Question of how regionalisation would work in practice: eg DE/AT/LU having 1 voice on ExCo; divide the 25 countries up, with countries that make sense. Details of the financial savings and how to re-spend this; and timings of when documents would be shared, would be needed here. Whether this makes sense for all countries was questioned.
* **FEANTSA** is concerned that the many meetings and discussions required to make regional representation possible, may not be realistic
* Summary of the Italian position: Exco remains as it is; EUISG is transformed into a permanent political group with 1/3 of the members.In support of the political work and training, there would be 5-6 work groups. All members would be engaged between the political group and working groups. A reduction of 20 000 EUR in relation to original structures, with the main difference being a reduction of the policy group. Note that the Italian proposal may be subject to change.
* **EAPN IE** is concerned about how these decisions affect work on the ground or PeP, and a common approach, with not all networks on a group. Meetings offer those with reduced capacity a chance to input
* **FEANTSA** has the concern that if future EU policy is governed through the semester as it is now, reducing the engagement of national networks would put EAPN at a disadvantage.

**Any alternatives?**

*Slide 16 – highlight potentials we have heard from members so far. Thoughts on these? Any others?*

**Key discussion points**

* **FEANTSA**’s proposal is leave it up to networks to join governance structures, based on whether it has added value for them -- not only ExCo but also EUISG and PeP coordination groups. Keep the places for European Organisations in ExCo and ISG at max 6. The GA and Bureau stay the same.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Action** | **Responsible** | **Deadline** |
| A1. Discuss the proposals in advance of the June meeting within networks | Networks |  11 June |