



Minutes of the 24th General Assembly held in Brussels, Belgium on Friday 10th October 2014

Chair: Kristof De Smet (President)

Venue: The Conference Room, Mundo-B, Rue d'Edimbourg 26, 1050 Brussels, Belgium

Participants (see Appendix 1):

- 21 delegates, representing 14 Member Associations in 9 countries

NO.	ITEM	ACTION
<u>1.</u>	<u>Welcome</u>	
1.1.	Kristof De Smet (ENEP President) welcomed all to the 24 th General Assembly (GA) and paid tribute to the event organiser Via Expo for sponsoring part of the evening reception and dinner on the previous day.	
1.2.	Kristof introduced the agenda (see Appendix 2) and, as during the previous GA, asked participants to think strategically about the day's discussions. He asked everyone to think of themselves as representatives of their organisations and not as individuals, for a constructive and forward-looking discussion.	
1.3.	Each participant introduced themselves and their organisation to the GA.	
<u>2.</u>	<u>Approval of the Minutes and Matters Arising</u>	
2.1.	The previous GA minutes were approved. However, Herman Jan Wijnants (ENEP Treasurer) noted that he had not received everyone's GA costs (hotel, transport, etc. invoices) following the Spring GA in Bucharest. MA representatives were asked to provide Herman Jan with this information if they have not done so already.	All

3. Financial Budget 2014-2015-2016: Update and Implications on Activity Plan

- 3.1. Herman Jan presented an update on the ENEP accounts 2014 and the ENEP budget for 2015 (see Appendix 3). He explained that CIWEM had withdrawn as a member of ENEP due to internal financial difficulties and that there were no new paying members in 2014. As a result, there is a projected deficit of €6.797, subject to CIWEM paying half of their 2014 fee, or otherwise €10.300*. This was the third consecutive year of deficit budgets and the ENEP reserves have shrunk from €45,607 in 2011 to €3.800 (* €300) plus €12.750 (savings Triodos) in autumn 2014.
- 3.2. ENEP has so far received €2.500 in sponsorship contributions, including two sponsored case studies for Green Week 2014 and two event sponsorships from Via Expo.
- 3.3. Paul Goriup (CIEEM) asked if CIWEM's withdrawal was solely due to internal financial difficulties or if they were questioning ENEP's competence. EXCO confirmed that this was entirely due to internal struggles and had nothing to do with ENEP's services.
- 3.4. Tinus Pulles (VVM) stated that ENEP's revenues and spending were worrying. He noted that it was important to discuss how this sort of thing could be prevented in the future and that he was more worried about ENEP's spending than about its lack of income. There was wide agreement among the present MAs.
- 3.5. Herman Jan presented ENEP's membership income for 2015: the fee will remain €1.25 (inflation EU 0.4% YTD), ENEP has lost a member, a loss roughly equivalent to around 5% of its overall membership, and found new member in FedEC. The lower limit remains €250 and the upper limit €7.000.
- 3.6. ENEP's draft budget 2015 was discussed. It was explained that ENEP has developed a new format for sponsorships to be presented later on during the GA. ENEP had made good revenue from sponsorships and the EXCO wanted to discuss how that could be increased to contribute to a balanced budget in the future (see slide '(Draft) Budget 2015' in Appendix 3).
- 3.7. Matthias Friebel (VNU) said that after 12 years of experience he had got the feeling that it was very difficult to receive sponsorships. He suggested that the ExCo calculate ENEP's budget without adding in sponsorships. Tinus Pulles backed the call for conservative budgets due to the high risk of counting on sponsorship deals.
- 3.8. Paul Goriup noted that it would be useful to receive this sort of information impacting ENEP's future – budget and membership changes – more in advance.

3.9 The ExCo confirmed that it would take the MA's comments into consideration and that the budget for 2015 would be discussed in more detail later on.

4. ENEP's Activity Plan for 2014 and 2015

- 4.1. Kristof reported on his "Unite and Inspire" road trip and explained that he had now visited all of the Member Associations apart from CIWEM and CSPZP. He said that there might be an opportunity to meet the Czech organisation during a forthcoming international conference in Prague, and that Adam Donnan (ENEP Vice-President, IES, SocEnv) and he would also be in touch with CIWEM to talk about their future within ENEP.
- 4.2. Kristof presented a number of conclusions he had drawn after his road trip up until now. He said that the feedback from the MAs gave him the impression that the Unite & Inspire trip was generally accepted as a very good initiative to meet all members in person.
- 4.3. However, he felt that there was a huge gap between the 'ENEP floor' and the 'national MA floor'. He noted that some MAs contact ENEP directly to receive information and advice, but he has the impression that there is no awareness of this among the MA boards.
- 4.4. Furthermore, Kristof noted the very wide range of interests, fields and priorities within ENEP and its members. His conclusion was that ENEP is a network of and for ALL of its MAs and needs to find a balance to represent everybody accordingly.
- 4.5. After his visits Kristof felt that there was a general demand for more information about a, each other, i.e. the other MAs' focuses and activities, and b, EU legislation and policies and activities in Brussels.
- 4.6. Kristof that he understood the urgent demand for "real ENEP-results", which the MAs called for.
- 4.7. Another conclusion was that there was an urgent need to improve ENEP's communication and marketing and well as the communication between the MAs and ENEP.
- 4.8. Tinus said that it would be really useful to hear about specific examples and demands that came out of the President's visits to the MAs. Kristof confirmed that he would send a detailed report about his Unite & Inspire trip and the results to the MAs by the end of the year.
- 4.9. Herman Jan presented a Progress report for 2014. He explained that the activities had been based on the four strategic goals that had been agreed by the MAs and ExCo: To promote and support the role of the European Environmental Professional; to facilitate the exchange of environmental information, experience and knowledge; to contribute qualitatively to the EU environmental policy development; and to ensure a sustainable ENEP in the long term.

Kristof

- 5.0. In terms of communications, the following activities were carried out:
- Newsflash, a newsletter for EU policy developments and events
 - Incorporation of the platform on ENEP's website
 - New email/marketing initiative by using MailChimp
 - Special August Bulletin covering news from the wider network beyond Brussels
 - Use of Twitter, LinkedIn and Facebook to guarantee a regular presence on social media
- 5.1. With regard to ENEP's communications, Kristof asked if the effort that went into producing periodicals such as Newsflash was appreciated. Matthias said he was not sure with the regard to the costs involved. Rachel Heijne (VVM) said there were some people who appreciated the newsletter, but it was hard to tell how many overall. Beatriz Medina (COAMB) suggested having the same set of questions for all of ENEP's MAs regarding ENEP's services and carrying out regular surveys in order to receive feedback and sound information.
- 5.2. Matthias asked about the costs involved in producing the periodicals. Herman Jan looked up the information and said €4.350 a year went into ENEP's communication outputs. Matthias noted that this was much less than he had expected.
- 5.3. With regard to sponsorship and networking, the ExCo pointed out ENEP's presence during Green Week 2014. ENEP's application for a stand was successful and the network presented 5 case studies during the exhibition, including two sponsors who were invoiced €500 each for their case studies to be featured. The feedback from visitors of the stand was positive and the Commissioner for Environment, Janez Potocnik, visited ENEP's stand twice during Green Week. The conference also inspired the idea for the GA side event in the European Commission.
- 5.4. In order to improve its networking activities, the ExCo announced that it has produced a draft paper on Thematic Task Forces (TTF) governance to be distributed and discussed later on during the GA.
- 5.5. In terms of EU policy development, Herman Jan reported that ENEP had actively participated in Green Week 2014 (3-6 June), arranged a joint visit to meet the EU Commissioner for the Environment, Janez Potocnik (28 March) 2014 and presented the European Commission to the members (GA Side Event).

- 5.6. With regard to the goal of guaranteeing a sustainable ENEP in the long term, Herman Jan explained that there would be two GAs every year, one decision making one in Brussels and one reflective one combined with an interesting event of an MA. Following Jason Reeves' departure as Coordinator, a quick follow up had been needed to ensure the implementation of the action plan and within the scope of this decision the banking and accounting activities had been conferred to the Treasurer, so the Project Assistant could focus on non-financial issues. Furthermore, the President had visited all MAs, except CIWEM and CSPZP, in order to find out what ENEP members saw in ENEP in the long term.
- 5.7. Simon Pascoe (Project Officer) presented his and the Project Assistant's main tasks and time spent on activities throughout the past 6 months. Together they produced six Newsflashes, created and coordinated input to the Bulletin, including carrying out research, regularly updated the website and social media with topical developments (8 days).
- 5.8. Simon explained that the support for the President's Unite and Inspire approach had taken up six days, for example spent on writing speeches and drafting briefing materials. Three days went into writing a briefing and preparing the meeting on 28th April with the Commissioner for the Environment, Janez Potočnik briefing, as well as for organizing hosting and follow up meetings with DG Environment.
- 5.9. One of the most important events in 2014 was Green Week 2014, the annual environmental policy conference, where the Project team organised a stand and produced communications materials. Overall, this took seven days. Simon noted that a further two days were spent on ENEP's participation at EU meetings (DG Environment Green Infrastructure working group, Horizon 2020 info days, briefings etc). GA arrangements, such as organising side events and presentations in the run-up, were also among the most important tasks.
- 5.10. Simon explained that two days went into the liaison between the two members of the Project team as well as on the liaison with Change Agents and the ENEP Biodiversity Working Group, which took place on 25th June.
- 5.11. Kristof noted that the input from the Unite and Inspire road trip would be taken into consideration when deciding on activities. Tinus said that ENEP should generally do what the MAs ask ENEP to do. He said that he would like to see the list with responses from the trip and not just the result, i.e. the new priorities and reiterated his demand for the list.

- 5.12. Mario Grosso (ENEP Vice-President; AIAT) reported on the progress of the development of an integrated website and platform. He noted that three quotes had been received from potential platform developers: two proposals for a brand new open-source CiviCRM platform and one proposing a complete renewal of the current system, but fully integrating it within the ENEP website. However, both CiviCRM developers unexpectedly withdrew. Mario explained that one major concern connected to this was related to the guarantee to have all current data compiled by the 2300 users safely imported in the new system. The occupation with the different proposals took until the end of July.
- 5.13. Mario presented the third proposal in more detail that the ExCo had selected so as not to waste further time. He said that the new platform was currently under development by Nereal in Italy. He showed screenshots of a beta version (Appendix 4) and said that the integrated website and platform would be fully operating by the end of 2014. The total onetime cost for the development is €4.000 with a yearly hosting and maintenance cost of €1.300. Mario also made clear that marketing and commitment on the part of the MAs would be needed to exploit the full potential of the new website and platform.
- 5.14. Elisa Vignaga (General Secretary) introduced the website and ENEP platform to the new member, FedEc. She explained that members can look for each other and get in touch, but that the old platform was not very user-friendly and the one currently being developed would be more advanced and it would be possible to start subscriptions for different services, e.g. Newsflash.
- 5.15. Rachel asked if the MAs would be informed as soon as the new integrated website and platform was implemented. Mario said that there would be an email or launch. He said that first the problem had to be solved not to lose members, e.g. people that were just registered on the website but not on the platform and the other way round. He said that the third proposal may seem like a second best option but that there were also substantial advantages. All of the 2300 registered members could be kept on board; the development team was very professional and reliable and had proven to be very flexible in the past when it came to “out-of-the-box” requests without asking for additional money. Besides, ENEP was able to save around €500 a year due to lower hosting and maintenance costs by going with this proposal.

- 5.16. Mario explained that companies would also be able to register with another type of registration. The ExCo will check if they will allow the respective companies to join or not. Ioan Gherhes (REA) said that he liked the idea of companies being able to register and that one could possibly create a mechanism to find partners for special projects that way. Ioan explained that in Romania and Bulgaria a lot of projects are being launched and many companies are looking for partners and other companies and individuals to help with the bidding. Mario said an interaction between companies would be tricky, but that maybe there was another way to work together via the individuals working for these companies.
- 5.17. Kristof interjected that it became clear to him from the road trip feedback that it was important to the MAs to put the individual professional at the heart of ENEP's initiatives. The board members stressed that it was important for individual professionals to see what goes on when it comes to information sharing, job opportunities etc.

5. ENEP Member Associations and Partnerships

- 5.1. Kristof introduced the FedEc, the newest ENEP member, to the GA. He explained that FedEc had asked ENEP to carry out some research first of all in order to find out which other MAs are interested in energy issues. The aim was to make energy experts more visible and so the issue had also been addressed during the side event in the European Commission the previous day.
- 5.2. Bram Van As (FedEc) gave an introduction to FedEc, explaining that the organisation represents around 200 specialists and energy consultants in the Netherlands. He said that some of FedEc's members were also members of other organisations, e.g. in the environmental field, and that a focus was on internal sharing of knowledge. A few times a year members come together for energy meetings.
- 5.3. Michiel Steerneman (FedEc) gave a presentation about FedEc (Appendix 5), saying that FedEc had the feeling that a more external mission was necessary for their companies. They want to promote effective professional practice and raise the prestige of the profession. FedEc's website is: www.fedec.nl. Michiel explained that regular meetings take place between ENEP member OVED and FedEc and so they started thinking about the possibility of joining ENEP and making use of joining up with other MAs and individuals interested in energy issues, look into opportunities for tenders etc.

- 5.4. Michiel said that according to the Energy Efficiency Directive all not SMEs were subject to an energy audit carried out in an independent and cost-effective manner by qualified and/or accredited experts. He explained that the reasons for the importance of an energy platform on a European level were
- EU legislation and regulations
 - To exchange knowledge and experience
 - Specific country information needed on energy issues
 - To harmonise energy audits
- He said it would be useful to look into energy saving possibilities together and, if invited by a company to give a presentation, there would be the possibility to phone consultants in other Member States to make plans, including local plans.
- 5.5. Michiel voiced his concern that what was missing was effectiveness and for him the equation was “effectiveness = quality multiplied by acceptance”. He noted that not only the technical aspects of an audit were important but also the acceptance within companies. He said that he wanted to share experience of these developed measures and the way that energy consultants approach companies, e.g. with regard to the communications, because often technical advice is not appreciated and it is necessary to work together with a team in the companies, ask for meetings and involve them in the audits so they recognise the benefits of the suggested changes.
- 5.6. Michiel presented the mission of the new EU Energy Platform to the GA: The speeding up of energy savings and renewable energy at the level of end users (companies and buildings). He said that is was FedEc’s vision to join forces in the EU, exchange knowledge and experience, and identify and discuss opportunities.
- 5.7. Kristof thanked the two FedEc members for their presentation and asked the present GA representatives if they had any questions and if they were happy to accept FedEc as a new member.
- 5.8. FedEc’s admittance as a new ENEP member was agreed unanimously.
- 5.9. Kristof said that the Energy Platform has already been discussed with OVED and invited everyone to join the new initiative. He asked the GA representatives to distribute the information about FedEC to the MA’s energy consultants and said that there would be a leaflet to be circulated.
- 5.10. Matthias said that in Germany there was a legal framework outlining who is able and/or allowed to audit in the field of energy management. Michiel responded that he was aware that the regulation in Germany was quite well organise but that these legal frameworks were dependent on Member State legislation and their aim was to harmonise these standards.

All, FedEc,
ExCo

- 5.11. Tinus said that he welcomed and fully supported the initiative, but that he wondered if something similar does not already exist. He mentioned the Associated European Energy Consultants. Michiel responded that they carried out some research on this beforehand and came to the conclusion that something similar does not exist in this particular way.
- 5.12. Libuse Deylova (CSPZP) noted that one of their members could potentially be interested in joining the Energy Platform. She said that they might be members of the organisation Tinus mentioned but that she was not entirely sure.
- 5.13 Kristof said that VDI had showed interest in the Energy Platform and that IES might also potentially be interested in joining.
- 5.14 Elisa presented the collaboration with Via Expo for 2015. She said that ENEP and Via Expo have been working together for the last 3 years and asked the GA if anyone had an idea how many of ENEP's members have been sponsored by Via Expo in the past. After a few guesses, Elisa revealed that at least 11 members had been sponsored, for example in the form of conference fees and accommodation.
- 5.15 Elisa stressed that the collaboration with Via Expo was not only a sponsorship but a partnership and a very good initiative that should be kept up. She said that ENEP's expertise was appreciated by Via Expo and that they had worked together specifically on waste during the Save the Planet conference. She explained that ENEP had asked members to propose a topic as well as send a CV and abstract to Via Expo and that they had received around 15 abstracts on which Via Expo based its decision. The initiative achieved to get individual ENEP members active and Elisa emphasised that she needs the help from the GA in the future to find key people and continue the collaboration.
- 5.16 Elisa explained that in 2014 ENEP organised its own session with input from Simon and Kristof. Via Expo has financed an ENEP ExCo member's travel and accommodation in order to attend the event, which was a great opportunity for networking and meeting potential new members. Via Expo has offered to sponsor ENEP on two occasions now:
- 1, €1000 at the GA in Bucharest
 - 2, €1000 for the GA in Brussels and the launch of the Energy Platform

- 5.17 For 2015 Via Expo has offered to fund two speakers for a waste topic as well as two speakers for an energy event. Elisa said she would circulate the request after the GA and asked members to spread the call and try to help with finding speakers. Full conference fees and accommodation will be paid for the speakers and translation facilities will be made available. Elisa reiterated her call for help from other associations to put forward the names of speakers for this conference and said that AIAT, VNU, VLAMEX and VVM had already experienced the collaboration and found it of value. Elisa, All
- 5.18 There was a brief discussion on the new sponsorship proposal following the handing out of a summary paper (Appendix 6).
- 5.19 Jörg ten Eicken (VBU) said it was really important that there was no commercial interest involved on the part of the partner companies, i.e. no conflict of interest.
- 5.20 Rachel added that the difference between the gold and the platinum category seemed very big in terms of what you have to pay and what you get in return. She concluded that platinum was much better value of money. There was wide agreement among the rest of the GA.
- 5.21 Tinus said that, trying to think like a company, he would be most interested in the last three offers concerning networking opportunities. He noted that he felt uneasy about giving any commercial organisation access to the network, but added that at the same time he felt sympathetic to the idea of finding additional ways to generate revenue. In conclusion, he said that the proposal should be developed in more detail to avoid any risk of misinterpretation. The ExCo and GA agreed. All
- 6. Open Discussion on “Communications within ENEP”**
- 6.1. Kristof mentioned Adam’s presentation on ENEP communications in April and said that VVM’s approach of distributing ENEP’s communications outputs could inspire other MAs.
- 6.2. Rachel gave a presentation on how VVM communicates with its members and especially how they involve them in ENEP matters.

- 6.4. Rachel explained that VVM counts 1650 members. They receive their Magazine and visit their activities for a reduced price. Then they've got 250 active members. They participate in their sections or working groups (VVM has 21 working groups on different topics). They participate in the VVM Board or in the editorial staff of the Magazine. They are all volunteers. Rachel said that she knows most of them personally and that they are really involved and know what is going on in VVM. Those volunteers organize all VVM activities and write articles for the Magazine. VVM has a small office with a staff of 6 part-time employees. They support the active members with logistical and other practical matters. Then as an organization, VVM has a network of 7.000 individuals. They receive the VVM newsletter, want to be informed about activities and other VVM news and visit VVM activities now and then (for full price).
- 6.5 Rachel explained that they communicate in different ways with their members. To start with: they have an electronic newsletter that contains VVM news, all VVM activities, and activities not organized by VVM but interesting for environmental professionals. The newsletter is sent to the complete network of 7.000 individuals.
- 6.6. Furthermore, they send direct mails to members. They send an e-mail weekly to the 1650 members with new VVM activities. In addition, they send extra e-mails with interesting or important VVM issues. Rachel said that the Magazine appears 8 times a year. It contains articles about new developments in the sector, interesting points of view, and some background information.
- 6.7. Rachel said that of course there is also direct contact with the active members by e-mail and telephone and that she visits meetings of the sections. She said visiting the meetings was important in two ways, so that she knows what is going on in the section and on the other hand it gives her the opportunity to give some more information about VVM matters (and for example ENEP).
- 6.8. With regard to messages from ENEP, Rachel explained that they recognise the different kinds of levels of communication, i.e. messages just to inform the members or requests to do something that needs some extra attention. She mentioned the ENEP Newsflash as an example. To inform the members they would always put a link in the newsletter with a short sentence that it is the newsflash of ENEP, European Network of Environmental Professionals.

- 6.9. Rachel said that they also receive messages and requests that need a bit more attention, for example when they receive a request for speakers on conferences. In that case, VVM most of the time addresses the chairman of the relevant section and asks for recommendations. Sometimes a telephone call will take place to give some more information - a call for participation in ENEP working groups, organising webinars or participation in Green Week for example. Those calls are being sent to the entire relevant section with an explanation. Rachel explained that when she attends the meeting of the section, she uses the opportunity to tell the participants about ENEP and the possibilities to participate and be active in the working group, Green Week etc.
- 6.10. Rachel then explained VVM communications with regard to their survey. She said that when she wants the members to fill out a survey, it's the goal to reach all members. So she sends them an email that contains the ENEP survey, but together with an e-mail with the VVM logo and VVM brand, to be sure they immediately recognize it as a message from VVM. In this e-mail Rachel adds a personal message in which she explains what ENEP is, and what's in it for them and why it is important to fill out the survey. Rachel stressed that to most VVM members she has to keep explaining what ENEP is, what the link is with VVM and how it can be useful.
- 6.11. Rachel ended the presentation by saying that she always considers for who something is interesting before sending messages on, how to reach these people and what information they need to see the relevance.
- 6.12. Michiel Steerneman asked if companies were also part of this and Rachel replied that they have an institutional membership, where the bill goes to the institution with a discount, but that the communication takes place with the individuals.
- 6.13. Kristof wanted to know if VVM translated the ENEP messages. Rachel negated and said that only the introduction was Dutch. Kristof then opened the question to the floor and asked if anyone translated the messages. Bruno Weinzaepfel (Vice-President, AFITE) and Beatriz Medina said that they also only included introductions in French and Spanish respectively. Mario also confirmed that there was no translation for the Italian MAs.
- 6.14. Rachel reiterated that she felt just sending through the ENEP messages was not useful. She said she always needed to introduce what is in it for the members and information of ENEP was also needed. Rachel estimated that it takes her around 10-15 minutes to put through ENEP's information together with some introduction to the topic.

- 6.15. Alessandro Capo (AIN) said there was no centralised way comparable to VVM's approach, but that the messages were managed internally. He said that the national association has a website but that it was much more difficult to circulate messages for specific areas due to a lack of personnel.
- 6.16. Mario explained that most members are subscribers to the platform and that most of the information could be distributed using the platform.
- 6.17. Ioan interjected that they also distributed the messages in English.
- 6.18. Kristof added that ENEP struggled with the distribution of information because it often did not seem to reach the people it was meant for.
- 6.19. Paul Goriup said that most of their members were not aware of ENEP because of a lack of interest in European affairs and that it was therefore not high on their agenda. He outlined that the members were more interested in the autonomy of the regions and that they could also sign up to the EA newsletter, one of multiple other ways of getting the same information. He said that, therefore, the most important thing was to include the context in which you have to read the information. Paul added that pushing the policy agenda was the main reason why CIEEM was interested in ENEP and that CIEEM would like ENEP to do more actual projects to increase its recognition. He said that CIEEM re-disseminated ENEP's messages in a section with European affairs and that it was featured in their magazine as well. Paul said that they received no direct responses on ENEP. He noted that they had a membership survey every two years and the result was that there was little knowledge of ENEP within the organisation. Paul used the legislation on Invasive Alien Species as an example and said that nobody pays attention until something becomes law and then it cannot be amended anymore. He reiterated that there was a lack of interest.
- 6.20. Kristof said that it was difficult to reach members and get responses. Tinus said that he would like to revisit section 5 in Kristof's Unite and Inspire feedback again (see 4.6.), that he wanted to know the responses to what members want in an ENEP Newsflash. He said that he would find it useful to find out about issues that impact on professionals as professionals themselves; the impact on their work, professional life and qualifications.
- 6.21. Jean-Pierre Biber (ASEP) added that their members were also not interested in EU policy, but in concrete opportunities to get a contract outside Switzerland.

7. Working groups, task forces & other debate groups

- 7.1. Kristof kicked off the discussion by explaining that in the context of the EU the expression 'Working Group' has a different, specific meaning and that therefore it was agreed that the name should be changed to 'Thematic Task Forces'.
- 7.2. Bruno presented a suggestion for governance of the new Thematic Task Forces. He started by explaining that a new TTF must originate from a member association; at least 2 associations must agree to participate; at least 4 people need to agree to be members; and each TTF must nominate a Chair as the point of contact. He added that the TTF's goals, objectives and timeframe must be clearly defined and submitted to the ExCo and that these goals should be clearly aligned with the aims of ENEP. Bruno said that for a new TTF to be created, it must have the approval of the ExCo.
- 7.3. Bruno then moved on to explain the organisation of TTFs. He said that a TTF needs to have a clear mandate, an activity plan and a code of practice to determine its way of working. He added that a proposed budget for each year should be produced, that the Chair (or nomination) should prepare a report for each meeting of the GAs to report on progress, and that expenses must be pre-approved by ExCo and receipts provided.
- 7.4. Consequently, Bruno mentioned the elements of the activity plan:
- Members of the TTF
 - Code of practice
 - Description of activities to be performed during the plan period (1 or 2 years), such as position papers, including:
 - Member(s) responsible for/leading each activity
 - Timepath and goals/milestones/products
 - Meetings scheduled
 - Communication of results
 - Budget
- 7.7. To conclude Bruno outlined the support that ENEP will offer TTFs if the draft proposal is accepted by the GA (Appendix 7). He said that they would receive 1, financial support, 2, administrative support as well as 3, publication and promotion opportunities. Bruno added that with regard to the financial support, this would be difficult to achieve if the money was not available.
- 7.8. Kristof added that TTFs should ideally be self-sufficient.
- 7.9. Ioan said that even if an MA was not part of a TTF it would still be interesting to find out about the outcome. Monika Baunach (Coordinator) pointed out p. 5 of the document (Appendix 7) that stated that the approval of the remaining MAs is needed to agree to a position paper.

- 7.10. Herman Jan said he wanted to clarify what sort of financial support ENEP could give (Appendix 8, article 5.6). He said that it would not be possible to get reimbursement for staff costs.
- 7.11. Paul said that in his opinion TTFs should be self-sufficient and finance themselves. He said that CIEEM might want to run a specific project and would be happy to share the budget in such a case. He pointed out that the general ENEP budget was a corporate budget and that the co-financing should therefore be made available only for the final element of support, see 7.7, promotion and publication and possibly for a meeting in the European Parliament or something comparable.
- 7.12. Matthias said that the EMS Expert Working Group has been active for 10 years and that the 21st meeting of the group took place in September 2014. He said this was proof of the group's stability and explained that the WG's main focus was to be a platform and coordinate EMS professionals, to help them standardise these systems, eco management and audit systems, and help developing and writing laws. He said that the EMS Expert Group was part of the revision process of ISO standards and that you can only be a member of this if you work constantly with ISO. Matthias explained that it would be important if ENEP could help with travel costs for international meetings that often last over a week because even missing one of these meetings could jeopardise the group's position. He stressed that they never produce papers because this was not what the group is about. Instead, it was important to participate in meetings and for this support with travel was needed.
- 7.13 Kristof explained that the meetings were not to the benefit of the remaining members and therefore this financial support could not be given. Paul Goriup said there should be the possibility for the EMS Expert Working Group of making a case to the GA and that, if everyone agreed, there might be a possibility to give support for such a case. Tinus joined the discussion by adding that the actor/organisation whose main problem it was, if meetings were missed and something detrimental to their goals was decided as a result of the group missing the meeting, should be the one covering the costs for these meetings.
- 7.14 It was agreed that the paper would be sent to all MAs together with the GA members and that everyone should provide their comments and input on the proposal.

All,
Monika,
ExCo

8. Human Resources

- 8.1. Kristof presented the structure of ENEP. He pointed out the interplay of different actors (Appendix 9) and that the full support of the MAs, the Secretariats and the Boards of Directors was needed to achieve ENEP's goals.

- 8.2. Kristof outlined ENEP's human resources, consisting of
- General Assembly members (max. 22 p.)
 - Executive Committee-members (6 p.)
 - Staff members:
 - 1 Project officer
 - 1 Coordinator
 - 1 Project Assistant
 - National Secretariats of M.A.'s (22 p.)
 - Board of Directors of M.A.'s (6 x 22 = 132 p.)
 - Others (TTF's, ...)
- 8.3. Kristof said that ENEP needed to be efficient but not suicidal. He pointed out the budget limitations for 2015 as well as the current staff changes, i.e. the resignation of the Coordinator and the uncertainty as to whether ENEP would receive another Project Assistant through the Erasmus+ Programme to support the rest of the team.
- 8.4. Kristof said that the ExCo proposed a restructuring of its management and staff, taking into consideration the budget of €25.000 a year. He said that there would be a Manager (Simon Pascoe), whose tasks and responsibilities needed to be redefined, and a Coordinator. With regard to the Coordinator position, Kristof explained that ENEP was looking for someone new to fill the role. He pointed out that there was a budget of €5.000-6.000 for this purpose and that a call to all MAs would be opened in order to try to make use of the talent within the network. Kristof explained that a job description (Appendix 10) would be circulated among the GAs and that applications needed to be received by 20 November 2014. All
- 8.5. Tinus said that he was in favour of the proposal and asked for the job description to be sent as soon as possible. Monika
- 8.6. Kristof then introduced another proposal: the creation of Joint Operating Agreements with each MA. He asked the MAs to define 5 SMART action points that the respective members were committed to and would work on together with ENEP in 2015 and 2016, for the duration of two years. He stressed that the deadline to submit these action points was also 20 November 2014 and that he was asking for commitments on both sides. All
- 8.7. Libuse said she wanted to be more informed about the activities of the Working Groups (note: future TTFs).
- 8.8. Tinus said that it would have been good to have received the documents earlier and that 5 action points was quite a lot. The GA and ExCo agreed that not all of the action points needed to be binding and they could select the most important one/s together.
- 8.9. Jörg noted that the Action Plan and the TTFs should depend on sponsorship.

- 8.10. The GA then revisited the topic of the ENEP budget (Appendix 3). Herman Jan said he felt like many people wanted to see a lower sponsorship revenue.
- 8.11. Matthias suggested that the €7.000 sponsorship revenue be stated in brackets and the total €be 30.00.
- 8.12. Tinus added that the budget should reflect the uncertainty of sponsorship revenues. He stressed that there was no significant financial buffer available anymore.
- 8.13. Bram said there could be a minimum of 30.500 and then another section showing the potential for bigger revenue if sponsorships were realised. He wanted to know when it was expected to find out more about sponsorships. Elisa explained that sponsorships were mainly related to activities throughout the year.
- 8.14. Matthias again called for a conservative budget and said he would be happy to speed it up throughout the year. He said that everybody needed to decide if they wanted a conservative budget or more risk.
- 8.15. Paul said this was a question of presentation. He said there was a high risk of a deficit this year and this was already the third year in a row. He noted that sponsorships were mainly connected to activities, so the €7.000 should be taken out of the budget and connected to TTFs as sponsorships come in.
- 8.16. Elisa said the webinar funding would be in the networking funding.
- 8.17. There was wide agreement that the link between sponsorship and networking activities should be visualised and the cash flow should also be tweaked.
- 8.18. Kristof started a new topic saying that it would be good to add new people to the discussion and suggested a rotation of the GA. He said that this was a proposal the members should consider. All
- 8.19. Tinus strongly objected to the idea saying he was here to represent VVM in ENEP and not the other way round. He said he was representing the Board as a member of the Board and that the GA was the official meeting.
- 8.20. Kristof said that he had received the feedback from the MAs that they would like to be more informed about ENEP's activities and repeated that this would give different people the opportunity to become more involved and that he would like the MAs to consider the proposal.
- 8.21. Tinus asked that he would like it to be included in the minutes that he was against a rotation of the Board.

9. Dates of Forthcoming General Assemblies

- 9.1. Kristof announced that the preliminary date for the next General Assembly was 10 April 2015, the second Friday of April and that the ENEP Spring GA was to be hosted by a Member Association. Simon noted that the date would fall in the Easter holidays in the UK.
- 9.2. Kristof said that there was a new Board at CIWEM and that he would like to have a meeting with the new CEO, together with Adam, in spring. It was pointed out that this was a potential opportunity to hold the GA in spring and have CIWEM organise a side event on water.
- 9.3. There was a brief discussion on where the next GA should take place. It was established that the GA could potentially take place in London or Barcelona. The ExCo asked Beatriz Medina to raise the topic with COAMB to discuss the possibility of them organising the next GA. Beatriz
- 9.4. The ExCo said that there will be a decision on whether the side event could take place in London by the end of November. ExCo, Kristof, Adam
- 9.5. Rachel said that if the next side event was on the topic of water, she wanted the respective section in VVM to be involved in it.
- 9.6. It was noted that there was a third option, according to which the GA could also take place in Milan. The opportunity connected to this option is that the EXPO 2015 will take place in Milan under the theme 'Feeding the Planet, Energy for Life'. The Exposition will be running from May until October 2015.
- 9.7. The second Friday of October 2015, 9 October, was announced as the date for the ENEP Autumn General Assembly in 2015.

10. Any Other Business (Working Groups)

- 10.1. Ioan presented a call for partners in different Romanian environment projects. He said that there were currently a lot of Romanian companies looking for partners and his objective was to offer ENEP members the opportunity to get involved in these projects and offer their expertise. He said the way to do this was to identify suitable projects, search for partners, create a consortium and share activities and the budget. He noted that as a result the chance for individual members to reach an objective would be increased. Ioan said that the financial requirements were 5-20 million as an average in the last 3 years. The technical requirements were 5-15 million in euros from 3-5 similar projects developed in the last 3 years. He stressed that Romanian companies do not fulfil these criteria and this is the reason why they are looking for foreign companies to join. He said he wanted to know if ENEP accepted such a call as practice.
- 10.2. Beatriz joined the conversation and said that there were also a lot of H2020 funding opportunities coming up and asked if there was a possibility to become active.

- 10.3. Kristof said that she should write a proposal and send it to the ExCo and with regard to both questions that, generally, it is ENEP’s task to help MAs with information sharing and communication with regard to these activities and the MAs are always welcome to ask for this sort of help. Beatriz,
Ioan, ExCo

11. Close and Depart

- 15.1. Kristof thanked everyone for their input and wished them a safe journey home after having a group picture taken in the Mundo-B garden.
- 15.2. The General Assembly closed at 16:18.

APPENDICES:

1. List of Participants
2. Agenda
3. ENEP budget 2015
4. Screenshots of integrated Platform
5. Introduction to FedEc
6. Sponsorship proposal
7. Thematic Task Forces Paper
8. ENEP bylaws
9. ENEP structure and resources
10. ENEP Coordinator job description

SUMMARY OF REQUIRED ACTIONS:

<u>No.</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Action</u>
2.1.	All member associations to forward information to Herman Jan Wijnants (ENEP Treasurer) on what they pay for their representative(s) to attend the GA and other events, so that this can be captured in the budget as voluntary contributions if they have not already done so.	All
4.8.	Kristof to circulate his “Unite and Inspire” road trip report to the GA, including concrete demands on the part of the MAs.	Kristof
5.9	FedEc to produce leaflet introducing the Energy Platform. ExCo and ENEP staff to distribute leaflet among MAs. MAs to distribute the information about FedEC to the MA’s energy consultants.	FedEc, ExCo, All

5.17.	Elisa said she would circulate to circulate Via Expo's request for speakers for the 2015 energy and waste events. GA members and MAs in general to spread the call and try to help with finding speakers.	Elisa, All
5.21	GA and ExCo to work together on the sponsorship proposal to develop it in more detail so as to avoid any risk of misinterpretation.	All
7.14.	Monika to write up, and after approval by the ExCo, circulate the minutes, including the TTF paper. Everyone to provide their comments. ExCo to consider changes and amend paper.	All, Monika, ExCo
8.4.	MAs to circulate Coordinator job description and applicants to send CV and cover letter to ENEP by 20 November 2014.	All
8.5.	Monika to circulate Coordinator job description among ENEP network (see 8.4.)	Monika
8.6.	MAs to send 5 action points within the frame of the Joint Operating Agreements to ExCo.	ExCo
8.18.	GA members to discuss and consider proposal to have a rotation of the Board for the forthcoming GAs.	All
9.3.	Beatriz Medina to discuss forthcoming GA and the possibility of organising it within COAMB.	Beatriz
9.4.	ExCo to find out if next GA could take place in London and to announce outcome by the end of November.	ExCo, Kristof, Adam
10.3.	Beatriz and Ioan to send calls for cooperation/proposals to ExCo. ExCo to organise circulation of information.	Beatriz

Monika Baunach (ENEP Co-ordinator)
Elisa Vignaga (ENEP General Secretary)
17 October 2014 [TBC]