EAPN
Strategic Thinking Process

Phase 1: Reaching A Shared Understanding

Contents

1   Introduction

The purpose of this report is to provide a summary of the initial consultations undertaken to support the EAPN strategic thinking process. This is a short version of the report that contains key findings from initial consultations only. An unabridged version of this report which includes project context, the purpose of consultations, the process of consultation and other relevant contextual information, will be available in due course.

EAPN members and staff have been engaged in via two consultation processes for this first phase of the strategic thinking process, a confidential staff survey and a staff away day and 12 confidential interviews with members. Of the latter there was both a geographic and capacity mix, as well as a mix of national and European networks, and representatives of the Commission. Consultations were facilitated by independent research charity Quality Matters. Addtionally, the Director of EAPN initiated a membership survey, the preliminary results of which were presented on July 7th with this material.

2   Process

There are three stages to the strategic thinking process, this report marks the end of **Phase I: Reaching Shared Understanding.**

Phase II : 'Drilling down' will see the Director lead work on a Theory of Change and a Political, Economic, Social, Technical, Legal and Enviromental (PESTLE) analysis, each of the major stakeholder groups within the members will have an opportunity to respond to this material.

Phase III: 'Decision making' will see each of the constituent elements of the organisation having an engagement moment against a series of recommendations. It is expected that the final recommendations will take the form of a resolution to the General Assembly.

Please see Appendix I for the detailed stages of the process.

2.1   The workshop

The strengths and challenges detailed in this report were presented to a special workshop of EAPN members, including representatives of the ExCo and EUISG and staff facilitated by Quality Matters. In total 53 delegates from 30 different national networks participated. 3 European networks also participated.

It was stressed to all delegates that this meeting was **not** a decision making one, but an opportunity to reflect on what we had learned to date. Six themes were presented to the delegates, and for each theme a proposed priority action, to be done during the strategic planning process and a broader recommended change to be considered as part of the decision making process were presented. Participants had the opportunity to respond to the themes, priority actions and recommended changes by a show of hands and then to discuss them in depth in tables of six - eight people with a facilitator and a note taker.

3   Strengths

3.1   Overview

Stakeholders were invited to identify what they felt were the key strengths of the EAPN and its work. While a broad range of strengths were identified, three in particular emerged commonly through consultations. Firstly, the unique nature of EAPN and it's particular relationship with the Commission, secondly the collegiality and benefit of being part of a network that is strongly felt at a personal level, and finally, the enthusiasm people feel for the Vision of EAPN and the ambitions they have for the future of the organisation.

3.2   Unique Role of EAPN

EAPN is uniquely placed among European Networks; it has a wide and diverse membership, including both national and European networks, and has a unpparelled breadth of voice. It has a very high standing with the Commission, and this is valued by its membership. European organisations reflect on

the special standing that EAPN has vis a vis the Commission, and national networks cite how being involved in EAPN gives them insights into the policy processes and changes happening at a EU level, often before the civil servants in their own countries are aware of the changes.

It is really helpful to use the name of EAPN when we are talking with our national Governments – it is like having a family that supports us and having good luck when you have problems.

We absolutely recognised the unique relationship EAPN has with the Commission, this is a key asset of the organisation.

3.3   Collegiality of the Network

Members also value the collegiality and opportunities for shared learning that they experience through their participation in EAPN.

I am always enthused when I go to Brussels, because it reminds me that we have the ability to fight and to advocate.

The European wide work makes me enthusiastic, meeting people in the Brussels office and exchanging views is very interesting. Even though there are dark clouds in Europe politics at the moment, there is some hope that European politics will go in a better direction. Because the network is very large, there is always something new.

3.4   Buy In to EAPN Vision

There is a very high level of buy in for the vision of EAPN among the members (this is echoed in the preliminary results of the membership survey as well), and a high level of ambition for the organisation for the future. While the EU is still seen as a very relevant target, the importance of challenging the EU and going beyond it is widely felt.

Health, housing and childcare are all social issues, but the EU treats them almost exclusively as economic ones. For example, in the area of childcare, the EU is focused on childcare as a part of the package in terms of labour market access for women, but they are not focussed on child care in terms of tackling child poverty or delivering on children's rights in terms of development and education.

In 25 years' time EAPN should not exist because poverty and inequality no longer exist in Europe. EAPN should be the reference organisation in the meantime. EAPN should not restrict itself to Europe - we need to go worldwide, the SDGs should be achieved in 25 years, we need to make the whole world fair and sustainable.

When we are thinking about our long term vision we need to acknowledged that climate change and digitisation alone will change things substantially. I would like to see EAPN become a stronger network, with more people directly connected to it, with more NGOs and more parts of civil society engaged with it.

4   Challenges

While it was important to articulate the strengths of the EAPN, participants generally agreed that focussing on challenges provided a real opportunity for recognising areas of potential growth. Again, there was a diverse range of views on what the primary challenges are, however, there was a considerable range of challenges where there was significant agreement or unanimous agreement.

The common challenges which emerged during the consultation process have been grouped under six themes:

1. Identity
2. Analysis
3. Participation
4. Membership
5. Human Resources
6. Change

For each theme Quality Matters have proposed a priority action as part of the strategic planning process and a broader recommendation for change, some of the recommendations which would require a mandate from the membership. These actions and recommendations will be presented to members on July 7th for review and discussion.

4.1 Identity: The identity of EAPN is constrained by its relationships with, and financial dependence upon, the Commission

EAPN was 'born' from Commission conferences in 1989 and 1990. While EAPN does receive limited funding from other sources, a substantial proportion of its funding has always come from the Commission. This has significant implications including an identity clash from being so closely interlinked with the Commission, a threat to sustainability from current financial reliance on the Commission, and potentially influencing structures that may create unnecessary bureaucracy.

The work programme of EAPN is dominated by responding to Commission processes, and while this has yielded some successes, these processes are technical, time consuming and often challenging to make relevant to national members let alone to people living in poverty. This level of engagement in Commission processes also creates an internal identity clash: EAPN identifies itself as an organisation championing the voices of people experiencing poverty, however, a substantial proportion of its work is not accessible to a lay audience.

> *The Commission has an increasingly instrumentalist approach and wants us only to produce research data for them and support implementation of their policies.. i.e. not a critical voice.*

Membership and staff identify lots of other opportunities for EAPN activity like the Sustainable Development Goals and the human rights framework, but there has not been a systematic analysis of where EAPN should focus its work beyond participating in and responding to Commission structures.

> *EAPN choose to get tied up in technical processes, they are not required to.*

> *The Semester process only works if the national Governments are going to do the work anyway, it is a burdensome process with little in the way of deliverables.*

Relying on one donor source is felt by stakeholders to be unsustainable and a threat to the future work of the organisation. Recent cutbacks in Commission funding have negatively impacted on the outputs of EAPN and the working conditions of the secretariat. While it is likely that the Commission will continue to fund EAPN, the funding diversification target of 20% in three years (agreed by the Executive Committee in 2017) needs to be a priority action, and it was felt by stakeholders that members that play a leadership role need to commit to this process.

> *The commission are getting more critical, they are asking more questions about value for money, EAPN is undoubtedly valued, but it would be foolish not to be seeking funding elsewhere.*

Finally, a number of stakeholders raised the concern that the EAPN's own voting structures echo the structures created by the EU, as opposed to being based on principles of solidarity and equality. It was felt that this is unnecessary to the effective functioning of the organisation.

Priority Action:
The income diversification strategy needs to be prioritized, with an analysis of potential income sources and opportunities completed in parallel with the strategic review process (ie within a year).

Recommended Change:
A one member one vote policy should be adopted at the General Assembly to underpin solidarity among members.

4.2   Analysis: EAPN would benefit from a clearer shared political analysis

EAPN has a vision statement and eight very broad ranging values. There is a high level of buy in for the vision as noted above. However, beyond the headline statement of the values, the analysis by the organisation on key political issues is not always clear, nor are there concise easily accessible policy statements on key issues. It is not clear that all member organisations or the individuals that represent them have a shared interpretation of what the values mean in terms of practice or work priorities. This challenge is compounded by the fact that EAPN works across a multiplicity of issues and often through relatively technical processes.

This lack of clarity or agreement on issues makes it difficult for the organisation to have an accessible, shared theory of change, prioritize actions and resources accordingly, measure impact or respond to any changes in the external environment strategically.

While there is broad interest in having a larger public advocacy profile, there has not been a detailed analysis of which processes or activities would present the most strategic use of EAPNs extensive expertise and reach.

We need to begin with a political vision and recommit ourselves to this.

There was a paper issued recently by EAPN on migration, but we don't have a unanimous stand on this – we also don't have one on poverty or gender either.

Sometimes when we discuss issues in plenary and working groups it is clear that not all people agree on the basic assumptions. We need to have a basic framework that everyone is aligned to on human rights, civic rights and social welfare.

Priority Action:
The Director to lead the development of a Theory of Change for EAPN, with inputs from the staff team and engagement opportunities for the membership and for people experiencing poverty.

Recommended Change:
EAPN to translate its Values statements into accessible analysis documents that inform the work programme. The Implementation of the values to be monitored as part of evaluation framework for all EAPN activities, reports on which will be communicated to the membership to build ownership and accountability.

4.3   Participation: While participation is highly valued, it is not always clearly understood

Participation is a central theme in EAPN, and one that is highly valued by members, however it is not clear that the all parts of the network are able to enable meaningful participation of people experiencing poverty (PEP) either in their own structures or as part of the lobbying and advocacy activity at a European level beyond the Annual Meeting of PEP.

The Mission of EAPN includes "*empower the people living in poverty and social exclusion.*" Among the eight EAPN Values is "*That people have the right to influence and participate in the decisions that affect them and to have their views and experiences listened to and acted on*". The desire to see more meaningful participation of people experiencing poverty is keenly felt among members and staff, and

in particular, the need to amplify the voices of people living in poverty and to make the reality of poverty part of the political discourse. However, there appears to be a high level of anxiety about how to do this in an effective and appropriate way. The Dutch Resolution, approved at the last General Assembly makes general recommendations about the importance of participation and the place of people experiencing poverty within EAPN, however, there needs to be more clarity for all members on the practical implications of the resolution and any potential to structure and practice.

Right now, EAPN is mostly member led, and PEP have a secondary role, in the national organisations we are succeeding in getting people participating in leadership roles. If we claim we are an organisation that defends PEP we need to have them more integrated into the organisation

The annual meeting leaves people incredibly frustrated, they get nothing back.

We have all these recommendations arising at the end of the meeting of people experiencing poverty and they don't go anywhere

People experiencing poverty and vulnerability need to own EAPN – to be the leaders, not just the participants.

Priority Action:
The Director to present a paper during Phase 2 the strategic thinking process on the implementation of the Dutch resolution, and any arising financial or structural changes necessary for decision by Ex Co by latest June 2019.

Recommended Change:
EAPN to become the European expert on the human right to participate in decisions that impact on one's life, to model best practice internally and to advocate for participation rights in the most relevant European forums

4.4   Membership: The intensive consultation processes for members are not necessarily delivering on meaningful engagement

While the EAPN structures allow for multiple participation points by members, with every national organisation having representation at the General Assembly, Ex Co and the EUISG, this does not necessarily translate into effective or meaningful participation by members, according to consultation participants. This presents a real challenge for members who feel burdened by the various processes that they are asked to engage in, where they don't feel that they can contribute effectively but must engage in processes that do not necessarily feel meaningful to them or engage their expertise. The majority of members interviewed flagged that they felt it was a challenge to engage fully at the policy level.

'We are invited into too many fields, and the networks are not prepared for that, we simply don't have the people to focus on all of these issues. Sometimes I get 15 emails per week, I can't deal with it.'

'If the things I was doing locally were sent to Brussels rather than it being extractive it would be more useful.'

'The team in Brussels should be more focused on coordinating things happening at national level, the deliverables we send to Brussels should be a reflection of what we do anyway, not a process in itself seeking extra work that is not connected to what I am doing. It's not that members don't want to do it, but they are likely to be overwhelmed.'

This challenge was also named by the national networks, who feel that while they are involved in EAPN because of their expertise, this is not drawn on or used effectively. A number of European networks have questioned the value of membership but recognise the significant access EAPN has to the Commission and the value this offers them.

I feel over consulted and undervalued as a member.

It's very difficult to see where the value is for us as a European network. We are experts on a specific topic, they take input of national members as 'truth' and they don't take input from us if there is a difference, they will always go with the national members. So we feel a bit useless.

We were invited to participate in a process that ended up being a complete waste of our time and our resources

The membership of EAPN is extremely diverse, ranging from well-resourced large scale national networks to small under resourced organisations, and including the European network members. While decisions can be taken by a clear majority, there is a culture of consensus building, which while laudable has resulted in a lack of clarity about positions and strategy, as also identified in the previous section. The structures further reinforce this with every national member (and almost half of the European Organisations) having the right to participate in the Ex Co and the EUISG, as well as all members participating in the General Assembly.

Consultation participants felt that members with very varying resources and capacity cannot be expected to engage in the same processes in the same ways. Clearer, more concise decision making, and policy positions should result in greater trust among members, whereby they do not feel they need to be engaged in every space in order to ensure their priorities are reflected, or to be seen to be participating.

Some members are more focused on policy and advocacy, some more on providing services - we could turn this from a weak point of EAPN to a strength with proper coordination.

We are a network we are very heterogeneous, there are very weak networks, others a very strong, some are not yet members of the EU. So a challenge for EAPN is to speak for everyone and this can weaken them.

The real challenges in terms of the diversity of the membership need to be addressed, including the current voting arrangements.

An additional barrier to some members' meaningful engagement is low levels of resources/capacity and it was felt that the EAPN could potentially have a role in supporting national networks to address this. EAPN might use its collective strength to argue for better resourcing of national NGOs.

There are very varying views among the network members. During the crisis and the troika process the differences really came to the fore. It is very different if you are Norway vs Eastern Europe or the Med or during that time a Troika country.

Priority Action:
As part of the diversification strategy prioritization needs to be given to fundraising opportunities that build the capacity of weaker members.

Recommended Change:
EAPN to focus on five or six issue areas for the next five years and orientate its structures to have specific, time limited, thematic working groups where members can opt into processes that are of most use and value to them.

4.5   Human Capacity: Attention needs to be paid to ensuring that EAPN is maximising on its most important asset, people.

EAPN has a very high standing with the Commission and is recognised by its peers for its longevity and the unique space it occupies. However, it is noteworthy that over the course of its 28-year history it has

had just four directors, two of whom account for just four years. While this is not perceived to be problematic in and of itself, it was felt to be a contributory factor to a culture of longevity that can impact on the participation levels of new members, and also on the need of members to have high levels of engagement in the management structures of the organisation.

At a membership level there are no tenure limits for membership of the Ex Co or Bureau. While continuity is perceived to be an asset, it is widely accepted that best practice for NGOs is to have an active process of dynamism and opportunity through having clear tenure limits for elected positions. Many respondents reported feeling that participation in meetings was dominated by a limited number of people who had been involved in EAPN structures for a very long time, leaving little room for new members to either understand EAPN processes or contribute to them.

The history of the EAPN is like a weight – there is too little rotation in the staff and in the members

The same people have been involved for a very long time, we need a new generation coming up

We have low capacity and regular change among some members, no change among other members

There are also human capacity challenges in the staff team. As is the case in many NGOs and member organisations, the cutbacks in funding to the team have resulted in reduced working hours, but without a concurrent cut back in the programmes that are being progressed. Some staff have availed of burn out leave which further impacts on capacity. As with many NGOs EAPN finds it challenging to say 'no' to potential opportunities and to have a clear prioritization process in order to ensure workload is reasonable and staff are appropriately challenged and supported to undertake their work. Stakeholders noted that there have also been high levels of tension and conflict between staff in recent years that are having negative personal and organisational impacts.

Priority Action:
The Director to lead a review of staffing structures during Phase 3 of the strategic thinking process to ensure that resources reflect the priorities of the organisation, for presentation to the Bureau and sign off by the Ex Co by June 2019.

Recommended Change:
EAPN to adopt tenure limits for participation in all elected roles and a system to actively support the full participation of new members.

4.6 Change: Structural reform needs to be implemented to increase effectiveness and participation and reduce duplication

EAPN has undergone a number of debates and processes about structural change, which have not resulted in systemic or lasting change. Feedback from some members is that this is time consuming, disheartening and ultimately takes away from the 'core businesses' of tackling poverty. All four Directors have suggested to the Ex Co that the structure is unwieldy and too costly , but it has not changed. The Membership Assessemnt and Support System (MASS) process was adopted, but then did not progress, largely due to cutbacks in staff capacity and some reluctance within the membership

EAPN have a management board of 35 people – this should be reduced, it is too much of an administrative burden, they need to streamline, it can lead to bad decisions.

Make meetings shorter, less meetings per year, more agile and sharp

Some members think that by meeting three times a year you are in 'control' of the organisation, but this is the wrong way to look at it. You control the organisation by being part of the actions and activities, being part of the story.

The structures of EAPN are cumbersome, and rather than increasing accountability, participation and transparency they have the potential to contradict each other resulting in, at best, unclear policies, at worst, blatant public disagreement between different elements of the organisation. The development of a policy on Migration was raised by interviewees as an illustrative example of these challenges. During the process, different entities within the organisation issued contradictory policy statements. The policy which emerged from the task force was met with objection from some members, with ambiguity about the status of the policy being reflected by members who raised this issue.

> *Notwithstanding all the processes and pedantry (in EAPN structures), it is possible for a body within the organisation to autonomously issue a statement, which then results in a chapter who issue a contrary statement, all using the EAPN name. It is humiliating, it was a complete waste of our time and a kick in the teeth for the staff.*

The lack of connection between the Ex Co and the EUISG was mentioned on multiple occasions, with people feeling that there is a doubling up of activities and a waste of resources.

> *When we set up the current structure with Ex Co and the policy group, the policy group would follow more formal processes and the Ex Co would be more creative and follow more alternative approaches for change. The first two years we tried to do this coincided with a financial crisis, staff changes, and crisis in members states. So, the process got a bit lost at the start.*

Priority Action:
A cost and risk assessment of the current decision-making structures to be undertaken by the Director and presented via the Bureau to the membership as part of the strategic thinking process.

Recommended Change :
EAPN to adopt new streamlined structures which gives all members adequate representation and ensures the most efficient decision making and appropriate use of resources.

5 Workshop responses to the Themes, Recommendations and Actions

There was a very high level of agreement with the themes, priority actions and recommended changes proposed, with all of them having a positive response from more than 70% of delegates. There were very engaged conversations at all of the tables during the workshop and excellent points of clarification that emerged from the floor.

Below some of the key points raised during the table discussions are captured. In the instances where half or more of the participants at a given table did not agree or did not understand something it is noted. All the feedback notes have been filed by the Director and will be reflected on during the next phase of the process.

5.1 Identity

Theme: Identity
The identity of EAPN is constrained by its relationships with the Commission

Priority Action:
The income diversification strategy needs to be prioritized, with an analysis of potential income sources and opportunities completed in parallel with the strategic review process (ie within a year).

Recommended Change:
A one member one vote policy should be adopted at the General Assembly to underpin solidarity among members.

Notes:
- o There was majority or unanimous agreement with this theme, priority action and recommended change at all bar three tables. At two tables the majority disagreed with the theme (one clarified that they felt the work as opposed to the identity of EAPN was constrained by the relationship with the Commission) but agreed with the priority action and recommendation. At another table three of seven participants did not understand the recommended change.
- o Some participants felt it wasn't the identity of EAPN, but the work it engaged in that was contstrained.
- o Participants felt it was important to continue to have a relationship with and focus on the Commission, but to ensure that it was contributing towards EAPN's own objectives.
- o There is currently a live debate on voting among the membership.
- o The concept of 'one member one vote' might be more helpfully presented as 'partiy of voting' for example each member has three votes.
- o The issue of whether when people attend EAPN meetings they are acting as indiviudlas or representatives of their networks was raised.
- o Some participants felt there wasn't an obvious connection between voting rights the the theme.

5.2   Analysis

Theme:
Analysis -EAPN would benefit from a clearer shared political analysis

Priority Action:
The Director to lead the development of a Theory of Change for EAPN, with inputs from the Staff Team and engagement opportunities for the membership and for people experiencing poverty.

Recommended Change:
EAPN to translate its Values statements into accessible analysis documents that inform the work programme. The Implementation of the values to be monitored as part of evaluation framework for all EAPN activities, reports on which will be communicated to the membership to build ownership and accountability.

Notes:
- o There was majority or unanimous agreement from all participants for the theme, priority action and recommended change, bar one table that disagreed with the proposed action, their tables notes indicate that they felt this action was one among a number of changes necessary
- o The importance of a shared political analysis came through strongly in the feedback from the table discussions, the participants noting that the political analysis should be clear and accessible for external audiences like the public and politicians.
- o The importance of converting values into meaningful action points and policies was stressed, and making them accessible to the national networks and to PeP.
- o It was noted that we need to be conscious of the diversity of membership in formulating the values.

5.3   Participation

Theme:
Participation - While participation is highly valued, it is not always clearly understood

Priority Action:
The Director to present a paper during Phase 2 the strategic thinking process on the implementation of the Dutch resolution, and any arising financial or structural changes necessary for decision by ExCo by latest June 2019.

Recommended Change:
EAPN to become the expert on the human right to participate in decisions that impact on one's life, to model best practice internally and to advocate for participation rights in the most relevant European forums

Notes:
- o There was majority or unanimous agreement with the theme, priority action and recommended change at all tables bar two exceptions. One table felt that the recommended change needed to be much more specific to be meaningful and at one table half of the people (3) did not understand the priority action.
- o There was a commonality of response from the table feedback on the importance of participation with comments including giving people participation rights at all levels with EAPN, resourcing training and ensuring that PeP had meaningful ownership over EAPN.
- o It was also noted that the principal of participation applied not just to PeP but to all members.

5.4 Membership

Theme:
Membership - The intensive consultation processes for members are not necessarily delivering on meaningful engagement

Priority Action:
As part of the diversification strategy prioritization needs to be given to projects that build the capacity of weaker members.

Recommended Change:
EAPN to focus on five or six issue areas for the next five years and orientate its structures to have specific, time limited, thematic working groups where members can opt into processes that are of most use and value to them.

Notes:
- o There was majority or unanimous agreement for the theme, priority action and recommended change except for one table where the majority disageeed with the priority action, however they specified that this was because they felt the action needed to be further refined.
- o The main item of feedback from tables was focusing on the definition of 'weaker' members, and ensuring that EAPN was sensitive to those with low resources, low influence locally, low participation opportunities due to language barriers.
- o In terms of the recommended change participants noted that the 'key issues' should reflect what is being prioritized by membership and also be flexible enough to respond to emerging themes
- o It was noted that there may be structural changes arising from focussing on a limited number of issue areas for the structures of EAPN.
- o The need to reinvigorate the MASS process was noted, and to be more responsive to members needs and tying these to priority work.

5.5 Human capacity

Theme:
Human Capacity - Attention needs to be paid to ensuring that EAPN is maximising on its most important asset, people.

Priority Action:
The Director to lead a review of staffing structures during Phase 3 of the strategic thinking process to ensure that resources reflect the priorities of the organisation, for presentation to the Bureau and sign off by the Ex Co by June 2019.

Recommended Change:
EAPN to adopt tenure limits for participation in all elected roles and a system to actively support the full participation of new members.

Notes:
- o There was majority or unanimous agreement for the theme, priority action and recommended change from all tables bar one.
- o At one table the majority of participants disagreed with the adoption of tenure limits, this table also had a majority of particpants who did not understand the priority action.
- o In relation to tenure limits, it was noted that some national networks struggle to have a representative who can participate fully in EAPN because of language barriers and capacity issues and that supports need to be given to these organisations to ensure that their participation is meaningful.
- o It was noted that 'human capacity' also means the national networks and that this requires attention.
- o It was noted that any changes in work programme may impact on staff and that EAPN need to be cognisant of it's legal obligations in this regard.

5.6 Change

Theme:
Change - Structural reform needs to be implemented to increase effectiveness and participation and reduce duplication

Priority Action:
A cost and risk assessment of the current decision-making structures to be undertaken by the Director and presented via the Bureau to the membership as part of the strategic thinking process.

Recommended Change:
EAPN to adopt a new streamlined structure which gives all members adequate representation and ensures the most efficient decision making and appropriate use of resources.

Notes:
- o There was unanimous or majority agreement by all of the tables on the theme, priority action and recommended change bar two instances.
- o On one table the majority of people disagreed with the need to undertake a cost and risk assessment of the current decision making structures, this table had also disagreed with the need for tenure limits and on one other table the majority of people did not understand the priority action.
- o It was felt by a number of tables that that recommended change needed to be more specific, and it was noted that the risk assessment should also analyse the benefits of the current structures in order to create balance.
- o It was also felt that lessons needed to be learned from change processes that had been attempted in the past.

6 Feedback on workshop

While many delegates said they found the process refreshing and clear, some felt that in order to facilitate meaningful participation and to build trust all participants should have been given the issues for discussion in advance. It was also suggested that while the 'temperature check' of a show of hands at the start of the debate was very helpful, some participants may be reluctant to express their views publicly, and that it would also be helpful to do the 'temperature check' again at the end of each discussion to reflect any changes in opinion due to increased clarity. These suggestions were noted by the faciliattor and a commitment has been given to provide all reports in advance for the next stages in this process and to further reflect on how to maximise engagement of participants.

7   Appendix I The Process

Phase I – Reaching a Shared Understanding:

Date	Activity	Lead	Participants
January 2018	Exchange on best practise for strategic reviews and areas on which to focus	EAPN Director	Bureau
March 2018	Identify organisational learnings based on key successes in recent years	EAPN Director	Executive Committee
May / June 2018	Membership and Stakeholder Interviews on vision, successes, challenges	Quality Matters	12 interviewees
11 June 2018	Staff day to reflect on vision and strategy (informed by anonymous staff survey)	Quality Matters	Staff team
June 2018	Membership survey: Analysis of members views on vision, values and structures	EAPN Director	All member organisations
July 2018	Presentation of the findings from each of these processes to the membership to reach agreement on priority areas for attention	Quality Matters	ExCo, EUISG and Staff

Phase 2 – Drilling Down: Agreeing EAPN's Theory of Change based on a shared PESTLE analysis

Date	Activity	Lead	Participants
July 2018	Introduce the PESTLE tool and Theory of Change framework	EAPN Director	Staff
July - August 2018	Creation of initial PESTLE analysis	EAPN Director	Staff
July – September 2018	Testing key concepts with experts with experience of poverty at the national level	EAPN Director	National Coordinators, people experiencing poverty
Early September 2018	PESTLE & Theory of Change workshop	EAPN Director	Bureau and Staff
28 September	PESTLE & Theory of Change workshop	Quality matters	All members via General Assembly PEP
December	Work to agree and outline top level policy positions	Quality Matters	Staff

Phase 3 – Decision Making: Agreeing our Strategic Direction

Date	Activity	Lead	Participants
Jan / Feb 2019	Presentation and discussion of final strategic recommendations to new Bureau (see comment)	Quality matters	Bureau
March / April	Presentation and discussion final strategic recommendations	EAPN Director	EEP National Coordinators
April / May	Presentation, discussion and agreeing final strategic recommendations	EAPN Director	Ex Co

| June 2019 | Presenting strategic direction to wider group | Quality matters | Ex Co and EUISG together |
| September 2019 | Resolution on Future Strategic Direction | Bureau | General Assembly membership |