



Minutes of the 17th General Assembly held in Frankfurt, Germany on 7 April 2011

Chair: Jan Karel Mak (President)

Venue: London Room, Chamber of Commerce and Industry, Börsenplatz 4, D-60313 Frankfurt am Main, Germany

Participants (see Appendix 1):

- 19 delegates, representing 12 member associations in 7 countries
- 1 observer

NO.	ITEM	ACTION
<u>1.</u>	<u>Welcome from the President</u>	
1.1.	Jan Karel welcomed everyone to the 17 th General Assembly of the European Network of Environmental Professionals (previously known as the European Federation of Associations of Environmental Professionals).	
1.2.	Jochen De Smet was welcomed as an observer from OVED, the Belgian Association of Energy Experts.	
1.3.	New representatives from existing members were welcomed: Peter from the VDI, Iker from Ategrus, and Tinus from VVM.	
1.4.	The delegates each gave a brief introduction to themselves.	
1.5.	Matthias welcomed everyone to Frankfurt on behalf of the VNU, who made most of the arrangements for this General Assembly.	
<u>2.</u>	<u>Approval of the Minutes of the Previous General Assembly</u>	
2.1.	The minutes of the General Assembly held in Brussels in October 2010 were approved without amendment.	
<u>3.</u>	<u>Matters Arising from the Minutes of the Previous Meeting</u>	
3.1.	With reference to point 3.3. Adam has created and forwarded a set of banner graphics.	
<u>4.</u>	<u>Review of Activities and Achievements</u>	
4.1.	Jan Karel gave a presentation on activities and achievements (see Appendix 2).	
4.2.	It was felt by some that the new website address (www.environmentalprofessionals.org) is too long. However, it was explained that the new website address is just a front page to link the two existing websites (www.efaep.org and www.environmentalprofessionals.eu), which remain unchanged.	
4.3.	It was noted that there had been a slight issue with some lost paperwork regarding ENEP's membership of ISO. It was suggested that in the future all ENEP documents are stored electronically and saved in a way that can be easily transferred.	
<u>5.</u>	<u>Project Officer Presentation</u>	
5.1.	Simon gave a presentation of the work of the Project Officer (see Appendix 3). He outlined his role in Brussels but emphasised that it was for just one day a week and that we need to be clear about what we are trying to achieve with limited time and resources.	
5.2.	Simon noted that he appreciates any feedback that he receives on the work that he does for ENEP.	

<p>5.3.</p>	<p>Simon gave an introduction to Green Week, which will be held on 24-27 May 2011 and will this year be on the theme of Resource Efficiency.</p> <p>ENEP has applied for and been granted an exhibition stand at the event and Simon needs volunteers to help with input for the display and also to physically attend the event.</p> <p>Simon is hoping to put together 4-5 case studies of innovative resource efficient projects for the exhibit display but needs volunteers to put these forward to him.</p> <p>The deadline for all preparations is 17 May 2011.</p>
<p>5.4.</p>	<p>Simon also gave an overview of the Newsflashes that he has been putting together and circulating.</p>
<p>5.5.</p>	<p>Many at the General Assembly noted the importance of having Simon in Brussels and where he can be a valuable asset to ENEP.</p>
<p>5.6.</p>	<p>There was a brief discussion regarding measuring our impact in Brussels. Simon responded by saying that he had not yet had time to look into measuring our impact but that it is important for him to get feedback from members in order to help him prioritise his work for ENEP.</p> <p>It was noted that some kind of matrix measuring activities against impact/outcomes could be done in the future.</p>
<p>6.</p>	<p><u>Future Plans and Programme Discussion</u></p> <p>6.1. Jan Karel gave a presentation on our future plans (see Appendix 4), and linked to this was a paper by Jim (see Appendix 5).</p> <p>6.2. Mario presented the view of AIAT (see Appendix 6):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AIAT does not agree that plans do not always work only because of a lack of money, sometimes it is a lack of interest and enthusiasm. • ENEP needs to decide on its actual goals. AIAT believes that ENEP should be focussing on the individual members (i.e. the single environmental professionals belonging to the national Associations) and that too much activity is restricted to the General Assembly. • As for further funding, AIAT believes that ENEP should be primarily looking for sponsorship, for example by offering commercial banners on the website to companies, rather than increasing the current fee charged to the Associations members. <p>6.3. There were differences of opinion relating to what ENEP should be focussing on. Some felt that services and networking should be the priority, whilst others felt that influencing the environmental agenda in Brussels should be the priority.</p> <p>However, ENEP must be careful not to duplicate the work of its member associations, and must also provide a valuable service to those members.</p> <p>Whatever ENEP does, it needs money – resources (time, people, etc.) cost money. Even volunteers, finding new ones and then managing them, require time (which costs money).</p> <p>6.4. It was suggested that we have two ways forward: either we get more money; or we cut down on our priorities. And that if we cannot get more money then perhaps we must cut down on our priorities.</p> <p>A third way was suggested in efficiency savings and using our resources more intelligently, for example, by concentrating staff in Brussels.</p>

<p>6.5.</p> <p>6.6.</p> <p>6.7.</p> <p>6.8.</p> <p>6.9.</p> <p>6.10.</p>	<p>It was noted that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Although ENEP consists mostly of volunteers, they all work to professional standards. • If we want to find funding, we need to match our objectives with those of potential funders. • ENEP is not well marketed, this could be improved to make it more attractive to new members and also funders. • Too much work is done by the Executive Committee, Simon and Jason – more members need to become actively involved. • There is a communication problem with getting information from the Executive Committee and General Assembly to the member associations and then on to the individual members. We need to make more people aware of ENEP, especially within the member associations, and to increase the utilisation of the ENEP platform as a mean for directly communicating to the individual professionals. <p>The initial discussion concluded that we have achieved a lot but that we now need more resources to progress further and so need more paid professional staff. We can either stay as we are or we need to find more money to take the next step forward.</p> <p>Various ways of getting more money were discussed, including raising the membership fee but this could be difficult for some member associations. However, increasing the membership fee will only allow ENEP to grow in very small increments – for significant growth we need to find external subsidies and/or funding.</p> <p>The suggestion of ENEP offering an environmental professional accreditation/qualification was put forward as a way to raise standards, and as a useful benefit also raise funds. There is an existing model in the Society for the Environment's Chartered Environmentalist that ENEP could use as a template. The majority of members were in agreement that this could be useful in their country, provided that it is highly regarded and widely recognised. The accreditation/qualification would need to be centrally co-ordinated somehow.</p> <p>An Accreditation Task Force was created. This will be chaired by Tinus. The other members of the group are Jim, Matthias, Simon and someone from AISA or AIN. It was agreed that the Accreditation Task Force will have a full proposal ready for the next General Assembly.</p> <p>It was agreed that a future funding paper, which will clearly set out the options that we have, will be put forward at the next General Assembly and then a decision can be made on the way forward. This paper will need to be drafted in advance of the next General Assembly so as to give each member association time to discuss the options internally before the General Assembly. Jim is to prepare this paper. The paper will include various options, which may include, for example, raising the membership fee or changing the membership fee to a percentage of the membership fee of each association.</p> <p>Regarding finding outside funding, it was discussed and agreed that Jim would include €5,000 in the budget to hire someone to look specifically into researching and applying for funding. The Executive Committee is to decide on the details of how to implement this.</p> <p>Simon also agreed to try a pilot scheme linked to Green Week to find sponsors.</p>	<p></p> <p>Accr. Task Force</p> <p>Jim</p> <p>Jim, ExCo</p> <p>Simon</p>
<p><u>7.</u></p> <p>7.1.</p>	<p>Financial Update</p> <p>Jim presented the financial update (see Appendix 7). Jim reported that the end of 2010 audit had resulted in slightly better than predicted results.</p>	<p></p>
<p><u>8.</u></p> <p>8.1.</p> <p>8.2.</p> <p>8.3.</p>	<p>Working Group Presentations</p> <p>Mike presented the work of the Biodiversity Working Group (see Appendix 8).</p> <p>Jason presented, on behalf of Leendert van Bree, the work of the Climate Proof Cities Working Group (see Appendix 9).</p> <p>Kristof presented, on behalf of Yoram Krozer, the work of the Innovation and Environment Working Group (see Appendix 10).</p>	<p></p>

8.4.	<p>Matthias presented the work of the Environmental Management Systems Working Group.</p> <p>The EMS Working Group has had a difficult year because of a lack of time from members and a change of members. As a result, the group has decided not to run the EMS Forum in 2011.</p> <p>The group is also represented by Cornelia Fricke on the ISO Technical Committee 207 (TC 207), the next meeting of which will be in Oslo in summer 2011.</p> <p>The Working Group also continues to work closely with the European Commission.</p> <p>The group is urgently in need of new members as it has recently lost members from Belgium and the UK.</p>	
8.5.	<p>Jim presented, on behalf of Luca Vignoli, the work of the Sustainable Development Working Group.</p> <p>Luca has put together a comprehensive work plan for the group but unfortunately the group is only working with one member association (and thus only one country), which is contrary to the Working Groups Terms of Reference.</p> <p>Jim is to contact Luca to discuss this further.</p>	Jim
8.6.	Regarding other working groups, the ETV and ETAP Working Group is to hopefully be incorporated into the Innovation and Environment Working Group.	
9.	<u>Working Groups Funding</u>	
9.1.	Jim presented the options for funding Working Groups (see Appendix 11).	
9.2.	It was noted that there is a difference between a Working Group member going to an external meeting (this would be covered) and the Working Group getting together for a meeting (this would not be covered).	
10.	<u>ENEP Platform Update</u>	
10.1.	Mario gave a presentation on the ENEP Platform (see Appendix 12), which appears in good shape with an increasing rate of new subscribers. When some Associations made targeted marketing efforts with their members, the feedback on new subscribers appeared satisfactory. The presentation included a proposal for a further technical development of the Platform, for a preliminary cost estimate of 10000 – 12000 Euros.	
10.2.	On the proposal of further developments, the following roadmap was agreed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collection of comments from Association members and local Secretariats (by the end of July 2011). • Evaluation of funding opportunities. • Final decision at the Autumn 2011 General Assembly, with budget allocation for 2012. • Development during 2012. 	
10.3.	The new ENEP Platform banners are to be added, by Jason , to the ENEP website for members to download and use.	Jason
10.4.	It was noted that we need a better understanding of the funding options, costs and potential income from the ENEP Platform.	
10.5.	There are 15 companies that currently have access to the ENEP Platform. Mario is to circulate the names of these companies to the General Assembly for information.	Mario
10.6.	Mario also agreed to re-circulate the ENEP Platform Operating Manual to the General Assembly mailing list.	Mario
11.	<u>New and Potential Members</u>	
11.1.	Jason presented information on new and potential members (see Appendix 13).	
11.2.	Any suggestions for future members should be forwarded to Jason.	
12.	<u>Green Week 2011</u>	

12.1.	Further to the previous discussion regarding Green Week, Simon reiterated the urgent need for volunteers to help with the stand and case studies.	
13.	<u>Membership Survey</u>	
13.1.	Jason presented the work that has been done so far by himself, Jan Karel and Mario (see Appendix 14).	
13.2.	It was decided that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the survey will be live online until Friday, 17 June 2011; • we will incentivise the survey with some kind of reward for one random respondent; and • the Society for the Environment will be removed from the list of members to avoid confusion. 	
13.3.	There was some discussion regarding the question regarding cost of membership and it was agreed that it will be updated to: <i>If you were to place a monetary value on the services offered by ENEP, what would it be?</i>	
13.4.	Jason is to send out the survey to all member associations to forward on to their individual members.	Jason
13.5.	There was general support for the survey as it was felt that it would provide an evidence base for future discussions and decisions.	
14.	<u>Executive Committee Election for Treasurer</u>	
14.1.	Jim was approved to stay on the Executive Committee as Treasurer.	
14.2.	It was noted that it would be good to have a staggered replacement of Executive Committee members over the next few years.	
15.	<u>Any Other Business</u>	
15.1.	It was requested that all member associations check their page on the ENEP website and send any updates to Jason to upload to the website.	All, Jason
15.2.	Any upcoming events are also to be sent to Jason to upload to the website.	Jason
15.3.	We have not had a Secretariats Meeting for some time and it was requested that the Executive Committee look into the possibility of holding another meeting.	ExCo
15.4.	This could potentially be Libuse's last General Assembly and so she was thanked for all of her input and attendance over the years that she has been involved.	
16.	<u>Dates of Forthcoming General Assemblies</u>	
16.1.	Jason presented the options for forthcoming General Assemblies (see Appendix 15). Jason is to follow up with the relevant host Associations regarding the organisation of each.	Jason
16.2.	Future General Assemblies were agreed as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Autumn 2011 – Den Bosch, Netherlands (6-7 October 2011) • Spring 2012 – Switzerland (location and date TBC) • Autumn 2012 – Helsinki, Finland (date TBC) • Spring 2013 – Brussels, Belgium (date TBC) 	

APPENDICES:

1. List of Participants
2. Review of Activities and Achievements
3. Project Officer Presentation
4. Future Plans and Programme
5. Funding Options
6. Response to funding options from AIAT

7. Financial Report
8. Working Group Presentation – Biodiversity
9. Working Group Presentation – Climate Proof Cities
10. Working Group Presentation – Innovation and Environment
11. Working Group Funding
12. ENEP Platform Developments
13. New and Potential Members
14. Membership Survey
15. Dates of Future General Assemblies

Jason Reeves (ENEP Co-ordinator)
and Mario Grosso (ENEP General Secretary)
22 May 2011