



Minutes of the 18th General Assembly held in s'Hertogenbosch, the Netherlands on 7 October 2011

Chair: Jan Karel Mak (President)

Venue: Brabantallen, Diezekade 2, 5222 AK, 's-Hertogenbosch (Den Bosch), the Netherlands

Participants (see Appendix 1):

- 21 delegates, representing 14 member associations in 8 countries
- no observers

NO.	ITEM	ACTION
1.	<u>Welcome from the President</u>	
1.1.	Jan Karel Mak welcomed all of the participants to the 18 th General Assembly. He thanked VVM for hosting us and particularly welcomed the applicant members, AFIE and OVED. The third applicant member, COAMB, were unfortunately unable to attend, but are very enthusiastic about joining.	
1.2.	Each participant introduced him/herself to the General Assembly.	
2.	<u>Approval of New Members</u>	
2.1.	All of the applicant members (AFIE, COAMB and OVED) were approved as new members. Jason Reeves, the Co-ordinator, will arrange for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • them to be added to the relevant email lists; • access to the website; • access to the ENEP Platform; and • their details as a member to be added to the website. 	Jason
3.	<u>Approval of the Minutes of the Previous General Assembly</u>	
3.1.	The minutes of the General Assembly held in Frankfurt in April 2011 were approved without amendment and signed by the President, Jan Karel Mak.	
4.	<u>Matters Arising from the Minutes of the Previous Meeting</u>	
4.1.	It was noted that the Sustainable Development Working Group is no longer active.	
4.2.	Any updates for the website are to be forwarded to Jason Reeves, the Co-ordinator, at coordinator@efaep.org .	All members
5.	<u>Review of Activities and Achievements</u>	
5.1.	President's Report (on behalf of the Executive Committee)	
5.1.1.	Jan Karel Mak presented the review of activities and achievements (see Appendix 2), in which he discussed our five priority areas of activity: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Enhance financial foundation >>> Develop new Sources of Income 2. Exchange knowledge, information, experience >>> Communicate 	

	<p>3. Promote Role of Environmental Professionals >>> Acquire Members, Add value</p> <p>4. Contribute to EU Environmental Policy Development >>> Market/Influence</p> <p>5. Management/Governance >>> Carry Out Operational Tasks</p>	
5.1.2.	Regarding enhancing our financial foundation, Jan Karel Mak also reported on the meeting with ELMA Multimedia the previous day. Jan Karel, Jim Thompson and Jason Reeves met with ELMA to discuss possibilities for generating advertising income through the ENEP website and ENEP Platform. ELMA reported that the two sites attract very low traffic, saying that advertisers would not be willing to spend money on advertising on a site that relatively few people visit.	
5.1.3.	It was suggested that the ENEP homepage become the landing page for all of the member associations' websites, such that the ENEP homepage could have a list of all the member associations which would be weblinks to the member associations' own websites. It was agreed that we need to attract much more attention to our communication platforms but it was felt that the idea to make the ENEP homepage the opening screen to all association websites would annoy the members of the national associations, whose first priority will be their own association and not ENEP.	
5.1.4.	It was further agreed that each association could try to have a link to the ENEP website on their own homepage, which all member associations were asked to look into.	All members
5.2.	Project Officer Report	
5.2.1.	Simon Pascoe, the ENEP Project Officer, presented his recent activities (see Appendix 3), including explaining his role (taking queries of associations to Brussels; representing ENEP at EU conferences and seminars; supporting the Task Force and Working Groups; monitoring EU financial opportunities; and develop links with potential business partners), the Newsflash, an extensive explanation of the outcomes from Green Week 2011, a brief look at forthcoming EU issues, and lastly a call for volunteers to help with Green Week 2012 which will be on the theme of water. There was general agreement with and praise for Simon's activities.	
5.2.2.	Kristof De Smet mentioned his and Simon's meeting with Catherine Bearder MEP; she is a Liberal Democrat MEP (UK) and is a well-known environmental campaigner and hard-working activist.	
5.2.3.	It was also suggested that the Newsflash could be more regular, perhaps monthly, even if it contained less information in each individual edition. Simon agreed to look into this.	Simon
5.3.	Membership Survey Report	
5.3.1.	Jason Reeves, the ENEP Co-ordinator, gave a brief overview and presented the key findings from the membership survey (see Appendix 4).	
5.3.2.	It was noted that a 1% response is not uncommon, and that the European single market is a major issue for labour recognition across the EU. A European environmental qualification could be quite important and also an opportunity for ENEP.	
5.3.3.	Emanuele Regalini had produced his own analysis of the membership survey results, which he circulated at the meeting (see Appendix 5). Some of the key findings were: i) for the vast majority of associations, the most appreciated service is "Furthering and promoting the role of environmental experts in Europe"; ii) the greatest expectations from ENEP are related to the creation of opportunities: Projects and funding opportunities; more job offers from the ENEP Platform; opportunities in my field of expertise; iii) the monetary value on the services offered by ENEP has been valued equal to 1€. Point (i) was believed to require more discussion to understand its true meaning; point (iii) highlights that the fee issue is still unclear. However, others noted that the fee is still very low, that it has not increased since 2001, and that only compensating for inflation would justify an increase ¹ .	
5.3.4.	Lastly, it was agreed that it would be a good idea to repeat the survey in a few years to compare with this data.	
6.	ENEP Platform Update and Development	
6.1.	Mario Grosso gave a brief introduction to the Platform and the previously proposed developments using some of his slides from the Frankfurt General Assembly held in April 2011 (see Appendix 6),	

¹ Assuming an average annual inflation rate of 2% or 2.5% since then, the fee would for 2012 have to be increased to € 1.27 or € 1.31, respectively.

	specifically the last three slides.	
6.2.	Mario continued by showing some statistics on the use of the ENEP Platform (see Appendix 7) with the main conclusion being that the usage of the Platform is constantly increasing (almost 1700 members in October 2011). However, the Platform requires updating in the following specifically: i) upgrade of the code to keep up with online developments; ii) introduction of statistical tools for Platform usage; and iii) improve visibility levels by merging the Platform with social networks. Mario noted that the proposed €10,000–12,000 needed for developing the ENEP Platform had not been included in the draft budget for 2012 and asked to reopen the discussion on the proposed developments for the Platform.	
6.3.	It was reported that the Executive Committee had discussed the Platform upgrade, and that they could not reach consensus, and so had decided independently of the General Assembly to get an external assessment of the viability of the Platform before proceeding further. The external assessment is to be conducted by a KPMG social media expert who has worked on a similar project with WWF. The KPMG audit was agreed at a strongly reduced cost of €5,000. KPMG had been specifically asked to look at whether or not the ENEP Platform is a suitable tool to meet ENEP's goals and objectives, and what tools within the Platform would need to be developed or altered to meet ENEP's goals and objectives.	
6.4.	Concerns were raised over the Executive Committee's decision to spend €5,000 (nearly 15% of ENEP's total annual budget) on this audit without consulting the General Assembly. The President explained that the Executive committee felt that – based upon the discussion in Frankfurt - it had to provide progress on ENEP's understanding of how to improve its visibility and potential funding sources, and that the proposal to increase spending on the Platform asked for a reaction. It was agreed that without some discretionary powers it would be difficult for the Executive Committee to make progress between General Assemblies, and it was agreed that such a discretionary authority should be established with a limited budget to be available without getting prior consent from the General Assembly. It was suggested that the Byelaws be amended to address this. It was agreed that the Executive Committee would prepare an amendment to the Byelaws for the next General Assembly to discuss.	ExCo
6.5.	The Statutes and Byelaws do not give any guidance regarding variation of the budget but the Executive Committee does have delegated powers of management, which was agreed needs to be assessed.	
6.6.	It was pointed out that the KPMG audit may eventually make a net profit if we are able to use its recommendations to create new income streams, attract new members, and engage with advertisers, sponsors and other commercial interests. It was also noted that KPMG will have significant communications and marketing skills to share.	
6.7.	It was suggested that the Platform could be used as a central benefit for attracting new members and Elisa Vignaga offered to help promote it further, offering her free time to do this and without the need to spend any money to promote the Platform. A possible way to pursue this is by creating a biweeks or monthly newsletter for young members, advertising jobs and scholarships. She also suggested that ENEP needs to develop a social media presence, which she and the Co-ordinator, Jason Reeves, will look into.	Elisa, Jason
6.8.	Mario continued by highlighting that the ENEP Platform needs to be part of the business strategy of ENEP as a whole, and as such the Italian member associations had prepared a vision and strategy paper (see Appendix 8). Elisa Vignaga then continued to explain this paper with a presentation (see Appendix 9). The most important outcome of the presentation was that :i) Individual members must come first in our list of priorities; ii) Communication is the key: we need to find a way for members to appreciate it and use it to inform them of recent legislation and best practice; the ENEP Platform represents the best tool we now have for this but needs effort to advertise it and underline its potentials; and iii) More interaction among associations and professionals should be assured,	
6.9.	The General Assembly noted that the paper had not been submitted prior to the 30 days required nor proposed by two thirds of members but that it would still be discussed.	
6.10.	Elisa clarified that it was just a coincidence that it was the three Italian member associations that	

	had put the paper together as they had been in contact with each other.	
6.11.	It was felt that the proposed vision and strategy paper did not really challenge the current situation, but rather reaffirmed our challenges and priorities. Furthermore, it was noted that the original priorities as stated in the Vision Statement had not been set out in any order of priority.	
6.12.	It was also suggested that any new proposal for a budget allocation needs to be accompanied by a detailed breakdown, and that we need to be able to assess the impact of any activity.	
6.13.	It was recognised that ENEP needs to get the members more involved and engaged before contemplating increasing the membership fee, although we do need more funding (of some kind) to invest in services and benefits. However, it was also noted that although we want more involvement from “grass roots” members, without the General Assembly and the Executive Committee nothing would happen.	
6.14.	Paul Horton offered to share CIWEM's experiences with online learning tools as an option for ENEP to expand its services and benefits.	Paul
6.15.	It was suggested that the member associations could learn from each other to find out what improves sign up to the ENEP Platform. Elisa Vignaga offered to look specifically into what makes students and graduates sign up to the Platform. All member associations were asked to forward an e-mail address for the person responsible for students and graduates to Elisa at elisa.vignaga@efaep.org for her to follow up.	All members, Elisa
6.16.	Following the discussion over priorities and activities it was agreed that the Executive Committee would draft a Business Plan for the next 2-3 years for discussion at the next General Assembly.	ExCo
6.17.	It was also suggested that we should cross-check our activities and priorities with our budget allocation and spending, and also the ratio of spending on administration and activities.	
7.	<u>Accreditation Task Force Update</u>	
7.1.	Tinus Pulles presented the work of the Accreditation Task Force (see Appendix 10), from which he hoped to garner the thoughts and opinions of the member associations.	
7.2.	Tinus pointed out that the primary objective of accreditation or a Code of Ethics is not financial gain, but that there could be potential for a small amount of income, for example, to charge a few Euros per member per year to be listed on an online register of members who have signed up to the code.	
7.3.	The benefit to member associations that already have an accreditation system or Code of Ethics was queried, to which the answer was that many environmental professionals now work internationally, especially across Europe, and that this is likely to increase in the future.	
7.4.	There was some unease over the use of the word “accreditation” and it was agreed that it would be best to use the wording from the EU Directives to minimise this risk.	
7.5.	Tinus presented proposals for a full option and a light option. The light option was favoured as it is easier to start from a legal point of view, would be a voluntary sign up, minimises the risk to ENEP and the member associations, and could later be developed into a heavy option if required.	
7.6.	It was felt that the light option could also potentially be implemented through the ENEP Platform.	
7.7.	There may however be issues with any complaints and subsequent appeals as contact with the member associations is not always as good as it could be.	
7.8.	It was agreed that a ENEP Code of Ethics should not be very detailed but rather draw on the codes of ethics (or equivalent) of all of the member associations, and retaining the common principles. This would then not affect any member association's own Code of Ethics, it would merely indicate that the member association's code is endorsed by ENEP.	
7.9.	Liability arising from an individual failing to comply with a Code of Ethics was raised as a potentially serious issue and it was felt that this was best left to the procedures of the individual organizations.	
7.10.	It was noted that the Chartered Environmentalist system administered by the Society for the Environment has not been without its problems and that the resources required to make a Code of Ethics work should not be underestimated.	

7.11.	It was further noted that the UK Engineering Council could provide some useful information as to administering a European level Charter.	
7.12.	It was agreed that the Task Force would: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • look into the implementation of the light option; • look into the requirements for the light option to work in practice; • look into the resources required for the light option; • look into the possible options for a heavy option; and • have these details ready for discussion at the next General Assembly. 	Acc. Task Force
7.13.	All member associations were asked to forward their Code of Ethics (or equivalent) to Tinus at tinus.pulles@tno.nl to help start this work.	All members
7.14.	It was suggested that the Code of Ethics could also have a logo that could be used on business cards, websites, etc.	
8.	<u>Working Group Presentations</u>	
8.1.	EMS (Environmental Management Systems) Working Group	
8.1.1.	Matthias Friebel presented the recent work of the EMS Working Group.	
8.1.2.	He reported that the group had recently had its 15 th meeting (since forming in 2004) and highlighted their achievements in EU expert areas where they are in close contact with the European Commission, particularly performance indicators as ISO will not be doing this and it will be very important for the EMS sector. The group is also a member of the ISO TC207 committee and a member of three subcommittees. Cornelia Fricke is the group representative to the ISO committee.	
8.1.3.	The Working Group will hold their next EMS Forum on 8 May 2012 in Brussels, which will include members from the Commission. The event will include topics on ISO 20006, ISO 15001, environmental indicators, EU standardisation issues, and water footprint issues.	
8.1.4.	Matthias will forward a report on the Working Group in the near future to Jason Reeves, the Co-ordinator, to add the ENEP website.	Matthias, Jason
8.1.5.	The EMS Working Group is still looking for new members. Matthias asked if all member associations to look into potential new members for the Working Group and to put them in contact with him at M.friebel.gwoe@t-online.de .	All members
8.1.6.	Matthias asked if the members of the Working Group could be listed on the ENEP website. This was agreed and Matthias is to send the names to the Co-ordinator, Jason Reeves, to add to the website.	Matthias, Jason
8.2.	Climate Proof Cities Working Group	
8.2.1.	A presentation (see Appendix 11) from the Working Group Chair, was prepared by Leendert van Bree, who was unfortunately unable to attend the General Assembly.	
8.2.2.	The Working Group was complimented for an excellent side event organised for the previous day, which will be reported on and published on the ENEP website. Rachel Heijne offered to forward the presentations from the side event to the Co-ordinator to upload to the website as well.	Jason, Rachel
8.3.	Innovation and Environment Working Group	
8.3.1.	It was reported that Yoram Krozer, the Innovation and Environment Working Group Chair, has been very busy, and has also not had much input from other group members.	
8.4.	Biodiversity Working Group	
8.4.1.	Mike Barker, the Biodiversity Working Group Chair, was unfortunately unable to attend the General Assembly. He did however prepare a presentation (see Appendix 12).	
8.4.2.	Both participants from new member AFIE, Guillaume Marchais and Angels Moragues, asked for more information regarding this Working Group. The Co-ordinator will ask Mike to contact them.	Jason, Mike
8.4.3.	Guillaume suggested that he would be particularly interested in pulling together information from	Jason, Mike

	the UK and Germany on the cumulative effects of windfarms on bats as this is not being studied in France. He also suggested that there could potentially be funding to pull this information together. These details will be passed on to the Chair.	
8.4.4.	Jochen De Smet offered to look into the situation in Belgium regarding bats and windfarms.	Jochen
8.5.	Other Working Group Issues	
8.5.1.	Jim Thompson, the Treasurer, reminded all of the Working Groups that any budget requirements need to be forwarded to him for approval as soon as possible.	
8.5.2.	Any dates for forthcoming Working Group meetings should be forwarded to the Project Officer (Simon Pascoe – simon.pascoe@efaep.org) and the Co-ordinator (Jason Reeves – coordinator@efaep.org) as soon as possible to help with any necessary arrangements.	
8.5.3.	It was suggested that the side event being organised by one of the Working Groups was a good idea for the future, but that it might not always be possible.	
8.5.4.	Jean-Pierre Biber offered to look into the possibility of the Biodiversity Working Group organising the side event for the next General Assembly.	Jean-Pierre
9.	Green Week 2012	
9.1.	Simon Pascoe covered this to some extent in his Project Officer's presentation (see 5.2. and Appendix 3). The theme for 2012 will be water and its blueprint. There was general agreement that ENEP should try again to acquire a position at next year's Green Week, and it recognized that this would take considerable time from Simon Pascoe to secure and to prepare this.	
9.2.	Paul Horton reported that CIWEM are working on a "water blueprint", and that ENEP should consider working jointly with the European Water Association (EWA) on a proposal for a shared stand at the event. Simon will follow this up.	Simon
10.	Financial Update and Budget	
10.1.	The Treasurer, Jim Thompson, presented ENEP's financial situation and proposed the 2012 budget (see Appendix 13, not updated with the extra expenses e.g. new funding person (€5,000) and ENEP Platform audit (€5,000)).	
10.2.	Jim reported that APEA had not yet paid their 2011 membership fees and that it is understood that they are having some financial difficulties. If APEA do not pay for 2011 it was agreed that their membership status would have to be suspended until they did pay. Other options for their continued membership may need to be explored if their financial difficulties continue and they are unable to pay future membership fees.	
10.3.	Continuing, Jim reported that the expected balance for 2011 will be around €35,000 rather than the €46,124 reported in his presentation as the presentation does not take into account the €5,000 allocated for the funding person (agreed in Frankfurt) nor the €5,000 allocated for the audit of the ENEP Platform.	
10.4.	Kristof De Smet reported that he had been in touch with two consultants, PNO Consultants and Bylund/Fazio, regarding looking into funding options and opportunities for ENEP. He also reported that any contract would be on the agreement that the fee would only be paid if funding is secured, to minimise the financial risk to ENEP.	
10.5.	It was noted that an overall loss of around €15,000 in 2011 is cause for concern. The Treasurer agreed that this would be a concern if looked at in isolation, but he pointed out that the €10,000 for the Platform audit and funding research is a one-off cost for 2011 and will not repeat in the future. He also referred to the policy agreed in Frankfurt to make extra efforts aimed at improving and broadening ENEP's revenue stream and income sources, and that dedicating part of the reserves available to this purpose would be well spent. However, this is still a loss and it is obvious that ENEP cannot operate like this indefinitely. It was reconfirmed that ENEP needs to spend money in order to make money and that it should use some of its reserves which had been accumulating steadily.	
10.6.	There was a lengthy discussion over the Project Officer, Simon Pascoe, regarding the cost of his fees and also his work and outputs. Simon left the room for this discussion.	
	There was a query over the €18,000 spent on the Project Officer in 2011 in comparison to the	

	<p>€10,000 agreed in the previous budget as a yearly payment; Jim explained that this was due to the Project Officer only working part of that year. Emanuele Regalini (AIAT) suggested a fixed salary of €10,000 plus a variable extra payment based on achievements (e.g. funding secured). There was some concern over the contribution of this item to the overall overspend. It was noted that the Project Officer contract is renewed annually. It was also noted that the Project Officer's work had been welcomed and approved earlier in the meeting. However, it was felt that it would be short-sighted not to renew the Project Officer contract without an overall strategy and also acknowledging the fact that the need for a Project Officer had been agreed two years previously. It was agreed that the role of the Project Officer be included in the new Business Plan (see 6.16.).</p> <p>There was also a discussion regarding the work and outputs of the Project Officer with some participants unaware of the full extent of the work that Simon carries out and others stating that the work of the Project Officer is not beneficial to all members.</p>	
10.7.	Regarding the estimated income for 2012, Jim noted that COAMB had not been included in his calculations as he was unaware of how many members they have at the time of putting the presentation together. It was noted that they have around 1,000 members and so this will increase the estimated income for 2012 by around €1,000. AFIE, OVED and COAMB will all be invoiced for their membership subscriptions from 1 January 2012.	
10.8.	Regarding the estimated budget expenses for 2012, Mario asked that the item labelled "Mail box maint.- AIAT & ENEP devel." should be updated to "IT Matters and Mail box maintenance" as this does not include any development work.	
10.9.	Jim reported that the expected end of year result for 2012 is €25,000.	
10.10.	The budget was approved, however AISA and AIAT voted against it.	
11.	<u>New and Potential Members</u>	
11.1.	Potential new members were covered in Jan Karel Mak's President's Report. These included potential members in Croatia and Iceland, and also a number of contacts to follow up from Green Week 2011.	
12.	<u>Proposed Secretariats Meeting</u>	
12.1.	The dates of Friday 10 th and Friday 17 th February 2012 were suggested as possibilities for a secretariats meeting in Brussels next year.	
12.2.	The Co-ordinator, Jason Reeves, will circulate these dates to all of the member association secretariats to find out which is preferred and then organise the agenda, room booking and other arrangements.	Jason
13.	<u>ExCo Election for General Secretary</u>	
13.1.	Elisa Vignaga was approved as the new General Secretary and welcomed to the Executive Committee.	
13.2.	Mario Grosso, standing down as General Secretary, was thanked profusely for his contributions to ENEP during his time on the Executive Committee and was presented with a small token of appreciation.	
13.3.	Mario thanked ENEP and said that he would still like to be involved, potentially with the ENEP Platform.	
13.4.	Mario also shared a few words on Elisa, saying that she would be an excellent addition to the Executive Committee and wished her every success.	
13.5.	<p>The Co-ordinator, Jason Reeves, will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • add Elisa to the website as the new General Secretary, and remove Mario Grosso as the outgoing General Secretary; • add Elisa to all of the ENEP mailing lists; • arrange a personal ENEP e-mail address for Elisa; and • provide Elisa with a login to access and edit the ENEP website. 	Jason

14.	<u>Any Other Business</u>	
14.1.	The Co-ordinator, Jason Reeves, asked for contributions to the next edition of the ENEP Bulletin.	All members
14.2.	It was agreed that AFIE would be the member highlighted in the next Bulletin.	Jason
15.	<u>Dates of Forthcoming General Assemblies</u>	
15.1.	It was noted that the next General Assembly will take place on 26-27 April 2012 in Basel, Switzerland and will be hosted by ASEP.	
15.2.	The General Assembly discussed possible dates for the autumn 2012 General Assembly, which will be held in Helsinki, Finland and hosted by FAEP. It was agreed that 6-7 September 2012 and 13-14 September 2012 be forwarded to FAEP as the preferred alternatives. The Co-ordinator, Jason Reeves, will follow this up with FAEP.	Jason
15.3.	The spring 2013 General Assembly is due to be held Brussels. No dates have yet been set.	
16.	<u>Depart</u>	
16.1.	Rachel Heijne and the VVM team were thanked for hosting the General Assembly and for all of their efforts in its preparation. As small token of thanks was presented.	
16.2.	Jan Karel Mak thanked everyone for their participation and wished them a safe journey home.	

APPENDICES:

1. List of Participants
2. President's Report
3. Project Officer's Report
4. Membership Survey Report
5. Emanuele Regalini's Additional Analysis of Membership Survey Results
6. ENEP Platform presentation from Frankfurt General Assembly
7. Statistics for the ENEP Platform
8. Italian Member Associations' Vision and Strategy Paper
9. Italian Member Associations' Vision and Strategy Presentation
10. Accreditation Task Force Presentation
11. Climate Proof Cities Working Group Presentation
12. Biodiversity Working Group Presentation
13. Financial Update and Budget Presentation

Jason Reeves (ENEP Co-ordinator)
Elisa Vignaga (ENEP General Secretary)
November 2011