



IAPB MEMBERSHIP AND GOVERNANCE REVIEW OPTIONS CONSULTATION, FEBRUARY 2014 - OUTCOMES

There were 32 respondents (almost 30% of members), answering two questions: a straight choice between the four options presented; and a question about how they would improve their chosen options.

1. If you had to choose between the four options, which would you choose?

Most respondents gave a straight answer; two gave no answer at all; and a number gave half a vote to each of two options (eg '2 as a step towards 3'; 'definitely not 3, but 2 or 4'):

Member type	Option 1 No Change	Option 2 Minor Change	Option 3 Significant Change	Option 4 Complete Overhaul	No option chosen	Total Respondents	Total Members
A	0	1½	1	2½	0	5	12
B	0	½	4½	0	0	5	9
C	0	2½	6 + 3x½	2 + 2x½	0	13	80
Other*	0	½ + ½	4½	1½	2	9	14
All	0	5½ (17%)	17½ (55%)	7 (22%)	2 (6%)	32	115

*'Other' includes officers, regional chairs, honorary affiliates and patrons.)

Just over half of all respondents opted for Option 3. In general, these were looking for significant change but valued the retention of some room for manoeuvre as a practical step to reduce risks inherent in drastic changes.

Those choosing Option 4 generally recognised the difficulties of achieving it, but felt that only this option would change IAPB in the way they felt was needed.

Some who opted for Option 2 were clear that it was what they felt was a realistic step forward, rather than their ideal final solution.

No-one opted for the status quo.

Votes from Group A respondents spread approximately evenly across the options.

B category respondents are predominantly in favour of Option 3.

58% of category C respondents opted for Option 3, with the remainder roughly evenly divided between Options 2 and 4.

Others predominantly 'voted' for Option 3.

This suggests that future discussions should focus on Option 3, but should aim to explore the areas that led those who voted for other options to do so, and vary the option 3 model accordingly.

2. If you had an opportunity to strengthen the option you have chosen, how would you refine the proposals?

2.1. Governance structure

2.1.1. Board

There was no disagreement with, and some strong support for, the idea that the Board should be smaller.

There was no disagreement with the idea that all members should have a stake in elections to the Board; many saw this as a basic requirement for any changes.

On Board composition, one of the key differences between votes for options 2, 3 and 4 was over the relevance and politics of some places on the Board being reserved for larger contributors, whether organisational members or patrons. While some saw this as expedient, some saw it also as legitimate (given the larger stake of big contributors); and others, on the other hand, saw it as damaging to member-ownership and democracy to treat major players differently from others.

Several respondents considered that some representation of Regional Chairs should be retained.

There was strong support in some quarters for the Council being the venue for strategy debate and prioritisation. However, some saw this as being too large and unwieldy and the importance of the Board having ultimate decision-making power was emphasised by some.

2.1.2. Committee structure

While many said nothing on this, there was a variety of comments on the specifics of the proposed committee structure in the options.

No-one argued for the Advocacy Committee to retain its current terms of reference or way of operating, and one or two argued for changing it significantly, including moving to the Council mode proposed in the options.

One argued for abolition of the Executive Committee if a significantly smaller Board is created, on the basis that a wider range of Board members would and could be more active in this way. One argued that the Executive Committee could take on the responsibilities of other committees, reducing the range of committees overall.

2.2. Regional structures and the centre

There were several comments that regional structures, and the place of Regional Chairs, needs deeper consideration than was present in the proposals.

There was support for strengthening the operational capability of regional work, both through clarifying the role of Regional Chairs (and coordinators) and staffing regions adequately.

The demand for further thought is primarily in the specifics of linkage between regional and global leadership.

2.3. Membership categories

There were few comments on membership categories that did not tie closely into comments on fees. Respondents did not have strong feelings on the current A/B/C mix, or changing from it, outside of the resourcing and affordability questions.

2.4. Fees & finance

Fees and finance was the area in which most respondents expressed caution, hesitation with their choice of option, concern about the future, or assumptions which did not necessarily match reality.

Patrons and founder-members could find no point of reference for their own situations in the papers, so were understandably uncertain. The options papers made implicit assumptions about this, which was unhelpful; each patron and founder-member needs the chance for individual conversations about their place in the future structure and the implications for their financial relationship with IAPB.

Smaller members either assumed that their fees would not rise, or stated that they could not rise.

Some large members who make significant contributions to IAPB over and above their fees were also clear in stating that, if fees were to rise, their other contributions may have to fall commensurately.

This implies that the Option 4 scenario – that the entire cost of IAPB would be covered by fees from those who approved the strategy – is not a realistic option. It is important that, this being the case, members settle for the reality that IAPB will have to invest staffing and other resources in fundraising.

There were a few responses that argued for lower IAPB costs, through reductions in staffing. Two of these were explicit in their expectation that members' time and energy, delivering more collaboratively and particularly at regional level, would rise to compensate for this.



Several respondents had comments on the specific ways in which fees might be calculated. They should 'not include fixed assets or in-kind donations', they 'should be based on expenditures on eye health averaging the past 3 years'.

Richard Bennett
Consultant