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Notes of EAPN Executive Committee

27 April

Zoom call

‘Considering the PeP Report’

**Participants:** Magnus (Sweden), Eleni (Cyprus), Iris (Romania), Carlos (Spain), Luigi (SMES), Richard (France), Vito (Italy), Olga (Greece), Freek (FEANTSA), Jo (Netherlands), Biljana (North Macedonia), Ian (IFSW), Neil (UK), Karel (Czech Republic), Kamila (Poland), Vera (Austria), Aiste (Lithuania), Caroline (Belgium), Kärt (Estonia), Anne (Ireland), Marjatta (Finland), Marius (Germany), Vilborg (Iceland), Noël (Malta), Honoratte (Norway),

**No attendance:** Maria (Bulgaria), Nedjeljko (Croatia), Laila (Latvia), Katalin (Hungary), Raoul (Luxembourg), Jasmina (Serbia), Anna (Slovakia), Ana (Slovenia),

**Staff and interpreters:** Leo, Philippe, Sigrid, Elke, Magda, Sian, Mathias, Joe, Danila, Mathieu, Théodore

**Presentation of, and reflection on, the PeP report**

**Key discussion points, based on key questions**

* How do the priorities coming out of the PeP meeting reflect the priorities of EAPN?
* How to we deal with any differences of priorities / positions?
* Members saw themselves in the priorities, but would have also liked to have seen **education, health care, social care and inequalities** covered – especially in the current context.

**Decisions**

|  |
| --- |
| N/A |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Action** | **Responsible** | **Deadline** |
| A1. Feed these points back to the National Coordinators Group | Vera | 28 April |
| A2. Share report with media | EAPN Netherlands | ASAP |

**Mainstreaming PeP work throughout EAPN (including using the report)**

**Key discussion points from 2 breakout groups, based on key questions**

* How could / should EAPN, as a whole network, focus on key demands and advocacy messages that are meaningful and relevant for PeP and the specific body in question?
* What needs to change / improve in how we mainstream PeP work into these bodies?
* What needs to change / improve in how we mainstream PeP work at the national level?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **PeP and Governance -  *How to mainstream PeP work through governing bodies*** | **PeP and Policy** |
| **It would be useful to have Ex Co members involved in the PeP meeting,** or to have the PeP meeting just before / after an Ex Co to enable participation. | Messages from the national level must be based on PeP – they should be the basis of all media work, all comms, and indeed policy too. |
| **We could organise a General Assembly with PeP who were at the PeP meeting** | Ideally policy work should represent a structured group of PeP, not just a few individuals |
| Everything we should do must have PeP voice at the core – **nothing about us without us**. This is essential at the national level first – this is where PeP participation has to be strong first. PeP participation in some national networks is quite weak – we should focus on strengthening this. In some cases, the Journalism Prize is the only concrete space where the network includes PeP. | EAPN members often work through their members to secure participation (BE, NO). When members have this focus, it makes it easier. |
| Perhaps PeP could monitor our governance – there should be a feedback loop between Ex Co and PeP. **Promising practise:** PeP audit EAPN Spain, who try to include PeP in all bodies. They are working with PeP to change the organisation’s statutes!  | Language is a barrier at the European level |
| It could be useful to envisage an Ex Co meeting where PeP / PeP NCs are present, to discuss such issues | Not all members have a primary focus on PeP – EAPN CZ, for example, includes members who work on participation, but it is not their main aim. |
| PeP don’t all have the same problems and are not a homogenous group. We need to think further about how to support them – service providers are the most important part of EAPNs network for this. | When strategies are revised / developed, PeP should be included |
| We need a **‘Nothing About Us Without Us’** approach, like the disability sector. |  |
| **Promising practise:** EAPN Portugal – who organises their GA after the EU PeP Meeting. **They invite PeP to participate in the GA**, including the delegation who participated in the Brussels meeting**. PeP are the first to speak in the GA,** they share their experience of the EU PeP Meeting. **PeP are also invited to their ExCo meetings.** |  |
| **Promising practise:** EAPN North Macedonia, **all bodies and working structures include PeP;** when position papers are prepared they are shared with PeP for discussion and feedback. |  |
| **Promising practise:** EAPN Spain **sends messages from the regional and national PEP meetings to regional parliaments and Ministry of Social Affairs.** Politicians are held accountable on what they did after they received the messages coming from PEP. |  |

**Decisions**

|  |
| --- |
| N/A |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Action** | **Responsible** | **Deadline** |
| A2. Ensure these points are considered in the next steps of the Strategic Thinking process | Leo | End June |

**Next steps**

Currently there is no clear structure within EAPN which guides our work on participation. The PeP NC group is really focused on organising the European PeP meeting, rather than focusing on the overall issue of participation. This group is preparing a Terms of Reference for its work, as requested by the Ex Co – this document will be shared with the Ex Co for consideration.