IAPB Executive Committee

13th March 2014 – Teleconference

Time - 12:00-13:00 London time
Venue - Tele-Conference
Attending - Chair: Bob McMullan (BM)
Member(s): Johannes Trimmel (JT); Adrian Poffley (AP)
In attendance: Peter Ackland (PA); Blandine Labry (BL); Joanna Conlon (JC); Alessandro Di Capua (ADC); Richard Bennett (RB)
Apologies: Kathy Spahn (KS); Serge Resnikoff (SR)

Minutes

1. Membership & Governance Review

PA introduced RB’s paper on feedback from options consultation. He noted the paper was divided in two parts: one with the summary of responses, the other with implications for the board discussion in Singapore.

Decision concerning the first part of the paper mainly concerned whether the Executive Committee agreed with it to be included in the board papers as it was. All agreed.

Discussion then moved to the second part of the paper, dealing with the process for managing the discussion at the Board meeting in Singapore.

RB ran through the proposed process. He noted that given the views from the consultations focus should be in discussing option 3 from the paper and possible modifications. The idea was to first clear some principled questions and underlying themes, and then, once consensus on those was reached, or points of disagreement clarified, move on to more practical themes. He suggested the discussion should be managed similarly to the way it was run for the strategic framework in Bangkok.

Discussion ensured, including the following points:
• All agreed that it was a good idea to focus on the one option that attracted most consensus during consultations and to look at ways to improve it;
• There was also agreement that the style used to manage strategic discussions in Bangkok had been effective and should be repeated;
• Some further points of discussion for the board were put forward, including in writing from those unable to attend this meeting, such as –
  o What does effective governance actually mean?
  o How can members not on the board have effective opportunities to engage?
  o What level of participation from the wider membership is desirable to ensure that IAPB is still a ‘commonly-owned network’?
  o What functions IAPB as a network of members has to take on and where (i.e. which governing body) is the best place to carry out them?
  o What is the role of the board in fundraising for IAPB?
  o Do we agree that higher contributors to the network have to be ‘rewarded’ with a higher ‘stake’ in the network? Principle that goes hand in hand with the follow-up statement that, regardless of the level of contribution, all members must have a real (but not necessarily equal) opportunity to engage in the network.
• Many agreed that the issue underlying the latter point, i.e. the balance between contribution and benefit, and the perception of it being based on a transparent and legitimate principle, was key. It was suggested that a principle in that sense could be the one used in many international organisations (such as the World Bank for example) to correlate voting power to contribution;
• It was also noted that a step-by-step approach in finding solutions to the various issues could help trigger compromises which, by building trust in the long term, could give way to more permanent and satisfactory outcomes;
• Finally, it was noted that, given the limited time at disposal in Singapore and the variety of issues at stake, if needs to be, priority should be given to try reach an agreement on the relationship between Executive Committee, Board and Council, and on members’ participation.

RB thanked all for the feedback and noted he would be re-drafting the process for board discussion in light of the conversation, in particular he would:

- Reframe one of the principled questions so to highlight the key issue of balance between different levels of contribution and levels of engagement;
- Stress that a step-by-step approach would be used when implementing any agreed changes.
It was decided that, particularly given the short time at disposal of RB to tweak the process based on the input above, this should not be included in the board pack (which will instead include the summary of responses from the consultation), but a simple line to the summary should be added noting that discussions in Singapore will focus on a modified version of option 3 and be carried out in the style used for the strategic framework in Bangkok.

The process will be discussed once more by the Executive Committee and RB in Singapore, and a final framework for the process emailed to trustees then.

2. Co-option of Serge Resnikoff to the Board
BM referred to the attached paper outlining the fact that SR had lost his seat on the board due to the winding up of the Group A organisation he represented.

All agreed that SR contribution to the board and the Executive Committee had been invaluable and supported the proposal to recommend him as an individual member to be co-opted on the board.

They also noted that obviously, in light of all the discussions around the review and composition of the board, this decision, like the whole make-up of the board, was going to be subject to whatever direction the board agreed to go following the membership and governance review.

3. Election of Group B representative to the Board
BM referred to the attached paper and to the proposal to decide the Group B representative through a draw in Singapore.

It was discussed whether a last attempt to canvass votes from the Group B should be attempted given the very low turnout (4 out of 9) and it was ultimately decided that a personal exhortation from the President should be sent to those organisations who had not voted, with a last extension of deadline. In case the tie between the two candidates was still standing following that, a draw would be made in Singapore.

4. Date for next Spring Board meeting
Following discussion it was agreed to propose the Board with the following date for the Spring 2015 meeting:

16-18 April 2015 (with 26-28 March as a fall back option).

5. AOB
As there was no other business the meeting was declared closed.