**EAPN Ireland** (received 1.2.)

 We are late with our comments but we think Maria's and Bulgaria comments and suggestions are quite thought provoking.

There is no point in putting new structures in place without addressing the fundamental issues which are causing the current structures to be so problematic.

**EAPN Netherlands** (received 2.2.)

We feel that we should not work in haste, but see how this year things develop and react on that. Especially when it comes to the idea to change the EXCO into a Steering group. This is not how we > would like to see EAPN’s restructure, since it will empower a small group and take away power and involvement from most of us.

**EAPN Hungary** (received 5.2.) – Hungary has already sent a document – these are further reflections

We would like to share our reflections on the document titled Inputs from members and staff EAPN restructuring.

Besides the thoughts described in the input of HAPN, we would like to emphasize the followings:

 1. We do not support creating new managing bodies within the current structure – except the Financial Committee regarding the financial situation of EAPN.

2. We do not support any suggestions which would lead towards the weakening of the internal democracy.

3. We also do not support any concepts which contain additional contributions on behalf of NNs.

 4. Our suggestion is to create a network-based solidarity fund for interpretation issues (especially in the case of the GA where people experiencing poverty attend).

5. We support those initiatives which focus on the better preparation for the meetings, especially: sending the documents earlier with a simplified language and in much more shorter form.

We are aware of the complexity of this reshaping process (we are in the middle of a similar one in Hungary), and since EAPN is a very important background for us we believe that we will see the organization as its best, and we would like to ensure all of you about our support.

**EAPN Estonia** (received 8.2.)

EAPN Estonia fully supports our Hungarian colleagues’ position.

Members’ interest and confidence to the EU level work depends a lot on possibilities of real face to face meetings and discussions. If the representatives of our NGO – s participate in EU level work only by filling in the questionnaires, they will never feel full ownership and responsibility. We find that it is time to look for other funding possibilities than the European Commission.

EAPN publications and positions published in journals should be written so, that ordinary people can read and understand them. EAPN talks and acts on behalf of poor people, but they have too little space to be seen and heard in our work.

**EAPN Greece** (received 7.2.)

As Greek network, we have sent our response directly to Fintan, indicating that we fully support the positions of the Bulgarian and Italian networks.

We believe that it is imperative that we have time to see deeply at the roots of the issues breading the crisis in EAPN, than rush in yet another restructuring which clearly has a significant impact on democratic decision making and representation in the network.

It is worth adding that in terms of the history of our network, a similar process, a proposed restructuring, in a period when EAPN was not experiencing serious problems as now (in terms at least of financial levels), in the GA at Lisbon, split the network in two differing sides, in general it wounded us all; in the end the new structure was endorsed...(I still remember the EXCO in Tallinn).

It is this structure we have experienced for the last period, alongside a chance of Directorship and 2 new Bureaus. If it is the structure that has been proved inefficient and ineffective, we should ask ourselves why it is that.

But we should not be driven again into another more insular structure in such a short period, only by the mere argument of finances. There many options that we should consider, before deleting both EXCO and EUISG & creating a super structure to decide for everything.