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Notes of EAPN Bureau meeting

Draft

15 – 16 June

Brussels

**Participants: (members):** Vera (Austria), Eleni (Cyprus), Richard (France), Biljana (Macedonia), Honoratte (Norway), Carlos (Spain), Ian (IFSW)

**Participants (staff**): Leo

**Apologies:** Honoratte on the 16th, due to technology!

|  |
| --- |
| D1. We should never have meetings in places which are not accessible. The staff team must ensure this decision is implemented immediately. |

**Session 1 Debrief on Policy Conference, Theory of Change session and Ex Co**

**Key points from discussion**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Conference** | **Theory of Change** | **Ex Co** |
| Political intervention (Greens) was strong. More political groups would have been better. More influential politicians and thinkers are needed. | Very helpful session which diffused many tensions | We need to build a common culture in the Ex Co so we all feel we are working to progress EAPN Europe, rather than trying to progress our national networks |
| Bureaucratic intervention was weak – we should not give the stage to civil servants. | Having Eleni co-facilitate worked well, and demonstrated Bureau leadership and ownership | Crucial to have Bureau meeting the day before and 2 hour debrief after |
| Disappointing lack of engagement from EOs and others |  | Important for Ex Co members to fully understand all of our structures and groups – we may need to reexplain this to members and relook at the roles and responsibilities of the Ex Co and other bodies. |
| New Commissioners and / or new MEPs should be invited speakers for future conferences |  | The democratic approach to enabling everyone to input was appreciated |
| Could a future conference(s?) better connect to the PeP meeting? |  | There is a clear lack of communication between Ex Co and EUISG – we hear reports that 85% of EUISG members are unaware that the Ex Co was talking about structural changes. This needs to change, and Ex Co members need to take full responsibility for having these discussions at the national level. |
| Perhaps we build towards having a bigger, more impactful conference every two years? |  | Language is a clear barrier within the Ex Co, and we need to find a way to solve this, without providing interpretation and translation into all languages. |
|  |  | We might like to start each meeting with a little exercise on the documents under discussion, as a way to introduce the topics. |
|  |  | We need to best tap into the expertise of the Ex Co members – to do so, we need to map this expertise. |

**Decisions**

|  |
| --- |
| **D2.** Small Committee will lead on planning for 30th birthday celebrations, looking at how a 2020 conference, General Assembly and PeP would contribute. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Actions** | **Responsible** | **Deadline** |
| A1. Eleni, Carlos, Honoratte and Vera to lead an exchange about the 30th anniversary celebrations (in 2020), across the Conference, GA, PeP meeting, coming up with a proposal | Eleni | End August TBC |
| A2. Plan session at next Ex Co to explain roles and responsibilities of our different groups | Leo and Magda, with Biljana and Vera | End August |

**Session 2 Defining our Political Focus**

**Key points from discussion**

* We need to be clear about which institutions, which decisions makers we target and why. There are certainly other DGs which are important actors in the fight against poverty, and we need to be clear on the focus we should put on the Council and the Parliament.
* In order to do so, it would be useful for us to undertake a ‘stakeholder analysis’ to clarify the influence we feel these actors have on the eradication of poverty.
* We note that the Parliament only has limited powers in this fight, so we should tap into the powers the do have – asking the Commission official questions, and helping in setting the political agenda of the Commission (or at least trying to do so)

**Decisions**

|  |
| --- |
| **D3.** We will undertake a Stakeholder Analysis of the priorities coming out of our Theory of Change and our recent decisions on priorities, to be discussed at Ex Co in September.  |

**Action points**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Actions** | **Responsible** | **Deadline** |
| A3. Map new MEPs against those who signed our pledge | Rebecca | 21 June |
| A4. Inform office of other ‘friendly’ MEPs | Members | 21 June |
| A5. Send message to new MEPs, pushing them to form an anti-poverty Intergroup in the Parliament, come to the PeP meeting, engage with EAPN in their country, participate in roundtable on poverty in October, and organise a poverty hearing in the Parliament. | TBC | TBC |
| A6. Explore how we map the expertise of our Ex Co members | Leo, Sigrid and staff team | End August |
| A7. Plan a session on a Stakeholder Analysis, based on annex 1. | Leo, Eleni, Vera, with Sian | Mid-August |

**Session 3 - Staffing**

**Key points from discussion**

* Elke has requested to move to 3 days a week, recognising the risk of a repeated burnout. This request has been accepted, starting in September, for a year. She has been asked to outline how she spends her time, so we can understand which areas we can remove from her workload. There will be a need to ensure another member of staff can take up these areas.
* This brings us again to the need to reflect carefully on the issues of burnout and workload, and the Bureau welcomed the efforts led by Ian to tackle these issues.
* Amana is planning to leave at the start of September. We recognise there is thus a risk for the Policy Team, and the policy side of EAPN. We need to bring in a quality replacement, though recognising that her replacement will take some time to come up to speed.

**Decisions**

|  |
| --- |
| D4. The Bureau recognises that the Director, having discussed staffing issues with Ian (Bureau member with responsibility for Staffing) should simply inform the Bureau members of his decision. |
| D5. The President should be informed of these issues in advance. |
| D6. We should start the recruitment process for Amana asap, ideally bringing a replacement on board for a fixed term contract, recognising that a staff review should start in September. This person should be an experienced Policy officer who should be able to support Sian in delivering the current work programme, and whatever policy aspects will be in the 2020 work programme. |
| D7. Application process should be open, we should not bring in friends of the staff team or the members. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Action**  | **Responsible** | **Deadline** |
| A8. Refine job description of Policy Officer  | Bureau, after Amana has updated it | Asap |

**Session 4: Ways of Working (Bureau, Ex Co)**

After the Ex Co decision yesterday to not reform structures but to focus on improving how we work, there are many issues to consider, both within the Bureau and the Ex Co.

**Decisions**

|  |
| --- |
| D8. All documents should be sent 2 weeks in advance. Bureau and staff must plan accordingly – though we recognise exceptions are of course possible. |
| D9. Docs to be clearly marked – draft v1, 2, 3 etc, or final. Tracked changes should be used. Longer documents should have very short Executive Summaries. We should also follow the procedures for creating and finalising external policy documents, with the paragraph at the end which explains the status of the document (See annex) |
| D10. Session chairs (could be Bureau members or other Ex Co members) have the full responsibility for chairing that session. Bureau members should support each other during the sessions, and can use the whatsapp group for these purposes. |
| D11. Bureau members should sit together during Ex Co sessions and session chair should sit next to the President – we’ll thus need to change seats! |
| D12. In order to ensure democratisation of Ex Co, we need a limit on individual interventions. Individuals cannot manipulate the discussion, and the Bureau shouldn’t respond to each question / criticism individually. A few points must be taken, then the Bureau can respond – under the leadership of the chair of that session, who may either respond, or ask the relevant member (Bureau or staff) to respond. |
| D13. Bureau members should not respond immediately to individual requests / queries, before we have discussed as Bureau. Responses should only come from Bureau members with responsibility for the specific area – other members should respect the agreed division of responsibility. |
| D14. Ex Co meetings could include country updates on politics and poverty – this could be prepared in advance by members and could be the basis for exchange and positions. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Action**  | **Responsible** | **Deadline** |
| A9. Share a video on how to use google translate to help prepare for sessions | Leo to draft, Carlos to send | 20 June |
| A10. Develop email policy (i.e Never mix email chains, how we label emails (for info, for decision, for feedback etc), avoid sending long emails, have fewer emails from the office, emails should contain a couple of lines from a doc and then the link to Members Room…) | Leo, with Elke | End August |
| A11. Remind Ex Co of importance of conferring with EUISG, Comm’On, PeP NC in advance – this is part of their responsibilities as Ex Co members.  | President | End June |
| A12. Incorporate some of these points into the draft Code of Conduct | Ian and Eleni | End August  |
| A13. To explain the decision about structures, prepare an email to send to members asap. | Leo and Carlos | 20 June |

**Session 5 Alliances**

**Key discussion points**

We need to come back to the various alliances we have been part of in recent years, and clarify which ones we want to be part of, why, and how we will be part of them. It is not possible to meaningfully be in so many alliances, so we should prioritise, based on our theory of change, our thematic priorities, and the stakeholder analysis we will undertake.

**Poverty Indicators Committee**

* Both Vera and Richard are interested, and have expertise
* It is likely to be quite technical
* We could create a ‘support group’ of members from Ex Co and EUISG who have expertise here. We certainly have the knowledge for this within our network, with people like Karel, Maria, colleagues from EAPN France and Spain
* We should have clear objectives for our engagement in this Committee
* To avoid conflicts of interest, the money should come to EAPN Europe rather than to the individual who would represent us.

**SDG Multi-stakeholder Platform**

* Leo should engage here, for the Social Platform, only if Timmermans continues to lead the group, and someone equally as influential. If it seems like the impact of the group is diminishing, he should not spend his time here.
* Our priorities within the Social Platform should be firmly focused on pushing the Platform to push on participation and civil society funding

**Decision**

|  |
| --- |
| D15. We will accept to be on the Advisory Committee of the Poverty Indicators project. Before deciding who will represent us, we will obtain further information about exactly what is expected of us. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Action** | **Responsible** | **Deadline** |
| A14. Use the stakeholder analysis form as a basis to analyse our different alliances, and clearly propose which alliances to prioritise and how to engage. The Bureau will **inform** the Ex Co of this decision. | Carlos and Leo |  Mid August |
| A15. Assess what is likely to happen with the SDG Multistakeholder Platform with Kelig, and decide  | Leo | TBC |

**Session 6 Finances**

**Key discussion points**

* Unsubmitted boarding passes and similar issues have cost EAPN over 7000 euros over the last 2 years.
* In some cases, the same individual has not submitted boarding passes or other justifications 3 or 4 times

**Decision**

|  |
| --- |
| D15. Individual members will not have future travel funded until they have submitted their boarding passes, and they will not be eligible for pre-booked tickets |
| D16. Individual members will not be reimbursed until they have provided all justifications  |
| D17. Individual members who do not attend meetings (after flights have been booked) will not be reimbursed, unless there is a valid medical reason, with justification provided. ‘Workload’ or ‘other meetings’ are not acceptable reasons.  |
| D18. Finance Manager and Treasurer should monitor this situation regularly, as part of the ongoing Risk Management System |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Action** | **Responsible** | **Deadline** |
| A16. Draft and send email to the members who are regularly not sending justifications, with the general rules and these decisions. | Philippe to draft, Leo to check, Philippe to send |  End June |
| A17. Check whether the Commission now accepts electronic boarding passes under EaSI | Philippe |  End June |
| A18. Draft and send reminder email to Ex Co, EUISG, Comm’on, PeP NC, outlining the general rules for reimbursement, and these decisions. | Philippe to draft, Leo to check, Richard to send |  End June |

**Annex 1, Bureau meeting June 2019**

**GOAL 16 ADVOCACY TOOLKIT Handout 2: Undertaking a Stakeholder Analysis**

**What is it?**

Stakeholders are people who are involved in, influence or care about your target(s). Through a stakeholder analysis you will identify who is involved in your target(s) and their perspective, and you will identify who you could usefully work with as you move forwards with your own efforts to support implementation.

**Guiding methodology for this exercise**

Potential stakeholders to include in the analysis: government ministries, law and justice institutions, local government, parliaments, civil society, private sector, media, (See the toolkit, p15, for further details).

Go further than simply identifying stakeholders: reflect upon the importance of each stakeholder identified as well as the power they each have to influence your target(s), their capacities, their needs and their current openness to engagement.

A stakeholder analysis will be stronger if undertaken it in a participatory manner, with some stakeholders, who will be able to tell you directly how they feel about the issue. If this is not possible, it could be undertaken with civil society colleagues who may have a better knowledge of the specific stakeholders.

**Guiding questions to consider while doing this exercise**

❖ Who is already working on your target(s) and are they making a difference?

❖ How easy is it for these stakeholders to create change?

 **How to do it, step by step**

❖ Brainstorm a list of all the main people and groups who influence or are influenced by the target(s) on which you focus. It’s a good idea to ask for support from experts or those affected by the issue when brainstorming.

❖ Using the grid below, write the name of the stakeholders into each box depending on whether you think they have a lot of (or little) power to influence change on your target(s).

❖ Check the list of potential stakeholders in the Advocacy Toolkit (P15) – where they would fit on the grid in your national context?

❖ For those with ‘high power to influence’ but to whom your target(s) doesn’t really matter, you should aim to monitor their position on your target(s) as your advocacy progresses.

❖ Those with ‘high power to influence’ and who care a lot about your target(s) are your key advocacy targets. Try to influence them by speaking directly with them, and by speaking with colleagues and experts to see what might influence them.

|  |
| --- |
| **Stakeholder Analysis Grid** |
| High power to influence changeLow power to influence change |  |  |
|  |  |
| Doesn’t matter much to them and they don’t work closely on the issues | Matters much to them and they work closely on the issued |

**An alternative model to use**

**Stakeholder Analysis – running the session**

* This session should take about 30 minutes. The facilitator should start by briefly explaining the Stakeholder Analysis tool and by referring people to Handout 2 as well as P14-15 of the toolkit.
* The facilitator should create new groups, based on one specific SDG 16 target. (For example, the facilitator may decide to create 3 groups, because there were 3 popular targets identified during the Gap analysis). Ideally the groups should have a relatively even spread of participants.
* The facilitator should ensure that each group is aware that they will be asked to feedback, so they should select a rapporteur before they start.
* Each group should work through the table in Handout 2, in relation to the specific chosed. Groups should be given a maximum of **30 minutes for this exercise**.
* Participants should be encouraged to consider the challenges they are likely to face in reaching their key targets, and how they might overcome them.
* Depending on time, one or two groups should be asked to feedback to plenary.
* It is important to make flip charts and markers available for this session, so groups can properly note what they have agreed.
* The organisers should ensure they collect copies of the stakeholder analysis undertaken by each group. At the minimum they should take a photo of the completed handout / flipchart of each group.