



Minutes of the 21st General Assembly held in Brussels, Belgium on 12 April 2013

Chair: Jan Karel Mak (President)

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

Participants (see Appendix 1):

- 22 delegates, representing 13 member associations in 8 countries
- no observers

NO.	ITEM	ACTION
1.	<u>WELCOME</u>	
1.1.	Jan Karel Mak (ENEP President) welcomed all to the 21 st General Assembly.	
1.2.	Each participant introduced him- or herself to the General Assembly.	
2.	<u>Approval of the Minutes and Matters Arising</u>	
2.1.	The minutes of the previous General Assembly held on Friday 7 th September 2012 were approved without amendment.	
3.	<u>Membership</u>	
3.1.	Elisa Vignaga (ENEP Secretary) presented the proposal for the Society for the Environment (SocEnv) to become a full voting member. Emanuele Regalini asked about SocEnv being an umbrella body and whether this represents a new way of considering the Statutes. Alex Galloway explained that SocEnv does have contact with individuals in the form of Chartered Environmentalists. The General Assembly agreed that Statute point 7.1.1.1. can be interpreted in this way and ENEP will be able to open to federations and networks, as long as they fulfil the above condition. The General Assembly approved the upgrade. There was also a discussion regarding the overlap of members with CIEEM, IES and CIWEM as SocEnv is an umbrella body.	
3.2.	Elisa also listed potential new members, including the Marine Mammal Observers Association (Ireland), the Dutch Association of Energy Consultants, the Finnish Nature Conservation Association, and the	

Hungarian Environmental Law Association.

- 3.3. Jan Karel noted that the Finnish Association of Environmental Professionals (FAEP) have indicated that they would like to terminate their membership of ENEP. FAEP have however paid their membership fees for 2013, and so will remain as members for the rest of the year.
- 3.4. It was also reported that APEA has been removed from the website, Platform and mailing lists.

4. President's Report

- 4.1. Jan Karel presented the President's Report of activities since the last General Assembly (see Appendix 2). The presentation included: Enhancing financial foundation; Exchange of knowledge and information; Promotion of role of environmental professionals in Europe; Influencing EU policy; and Management and governance.

5. Working Groups

5.1. Biodiversity Working Group (BioD WG)

- 5.1.1. Mike Barker (BioD WG Chair) reported that the WG had not been very active over the past 6 months as it has been waiting for the European Commission's green infrastructure strategy, which has been delayed several times but should be published very shortly.
- 5.1.2. Mike noted that there is an opportunity for the WG to get involved with a LIFE project with AISA, that the WG supported the LIFE+ bid, supported the Tipik Communications work, will help with Green Week 2013, and will also help with AFIE's annual conference on 13th December 2013 in Lille.

5.2. Environmental Management Systems Working Group (EMS WG)

- 5.2.1. Matthias Friebel (EMS WG Chair) reported that the WG is a member of ISO 14001 and EMAS groups.
- 5.2.2. In particular, revision of ISO 14001, which will terminate in 2015, is underway and the WG is heavily involved in this as a liaison partner. The WG's last report was from Cornelia Freike in March 2013 and is on the ENEP website.
- 5.2.3. Matthias reported that he is directly involved in EMAS, through contact with the EC working officer.
- 5.2.4. The WG has met twice since the last General Assembly, and have discussed their objectives and actions.
- 5.2.5. It was reported that VNU has now started the "EMS-Club" for companies as it is good to have direct industry input. The Club uses the views of these companies to feed into revision processes for ISO 14001 and EMAS.
- 5.2.6. The "EMS Forum" is an event usually held annually, but VNU has decided that it will not organise this event for 2013 as it has no budget

from ENEP. Instead VNU has decided to hold a VNU-Club conference, and then hold an EMS Forum event again in 2014. Matthias also reported that the WG has found a sponsor for the EMS Forum in 2014.

5.2.7. The WG has 2 forthcoming meetings already organised – 19 September 2013 and 6 March 2014. Both meetings will be held in Brussels.

5.2.8. Lastly, Matthias reported that new applicants will shortly be joining the WG.

5.3. Other Working Group Matters

5.3.1. Elisa noted that in the Expertise Matrix she conducted that several member associations have indicated that they have members working in EMS, so we must make sure that we continue to communicate work of all WGs to members on a regular basis.

5.3.2. Rachel Heijne suggested that it would be good to have brief updates from each WG every few months. Kristof De Smet (ENEP Vice President) said that each Bulletin must have an update on the work of each active WG, which the General Assembly agreed with. Jan Karel suggested that these updates should also include an invitation for individuals to participate in the WGs. Jason

5.3.3. Elisa suggested that we need to look into video-conferencing for the WGs, as this will help those members who cannot afford to travel to meetings. Elisa, Jason

5.3.4. Jan Karel noted that there is a budget for the WGs, but that any request according to the Statutes for funds needs to be proposed and approved in advance by the Treasurer. Matthias said that this is not always possible for the EMS WG. Jan Karel stressed that even an estimate with an upper and lower limit would be acceptable. Mike said that the BioD WG has put in a proposal to the Executive Committee for funding in relation to the AFIE conference in December.

5.3.5. Mike Barker suggested that the funding for the WG should cover the possibility to support a member to attend a specific conference. The ExCo will consider this option and report back at the next GA.

6. Website Redevelopment

6.1. Simon Pascoe (ENEP Project Officer) reported on the specification developed for the new website. Tenders are being requested at the moment. The tender specification will be circulated to the General Assembly. Simon

6.2. The website is being redeveloped because it is no longer fit for purpose. It is not a good “advert” for ENEP. The website also is reported to have some serious security issues and limits the external communication of the Network.

7. Co-ordinator Report

7.1. Jason Reeves (ENEP Co-ordinator) reported briefly on the work that he does, including: being the first point of contact; answering emails; putting together the quarterly Bulletin; maintaining the website (currently with help from Alice Goodbrook); updating the Platform mailing list (interacting with Alien8; sending out news and jobs via the Platform messaging system (with Elisa); organising the General Assemblies (with help from host associations) and Executive Committee meetings; maintaining the relationship with Mundo-B (with Simon and Alice); conducting the day-to-day banking and maintaining the relationship with the bank; and helping the Treasurer conduct the annual financial audit. Jason also reported that he has helped with the following projects: skills matrix; communications issues; new members initial contact; website redevelopment; registering the copyright for the new logo and name; and being involved with Green Week.

7.2. Jason was thanked for the work that he does for ENEP.

8. Project Officer Report

8.1. Simon Pascoe (ENEP Project Officer) presented the work that he does for ENEP (see Appendix 3). His overview included the ENEP objectives, the role of the Project Officer, key outcomes, and time allocations.

8.2. Angels Moragues asked for information regarding the Tipik Communication agreement to be circulated. In particular how the ENEP expert were chosen. Kristof explained that the deadline was very stringent for the proposal; hence it was not possible to use other means (e.g. the Platform); however if the trial is to carry on, a list of expert will be created that considers the wider network. Simon agreed to send more information on the agreement. Jim Thompson (ENEP Treasurer) agreed that this is a great opportunity for ENEP.

Simon

8.3. Simon was thanked for all of the work that he does for ENEP.

8.4. At this point Meghan Stringer (Hodos Consulting) joined the meeting to report on the feedback from the European Commission after the LIFE+ bid failed. We did not score very well (Policy relevance 19/35, Potential impact 19/35, Environmental education and organisational development 6/15, where our proposal did not add value in the international agenda of the EU) and Meghan suggested that ENEP needs to get itself in order before the EC will fund us. She noted that ENEP not having any employees means that the EC likely sees ENEP as not being a stable and established organisation. She said that we also need to improve our communications systems – especially the website and the fact that we have two websites (including the Platform), so not clarifying the focus of our activity. Meghan suggested that ENEP could also look at the private sector for funding. Meghan was thanked for her input into the bid and the useful feedback.

8.5. Jan Karel noted that ENEP does not particularly want to be an employer at the moment, so it adds to the reasons not to apply for LIFE+ funding

again.

- 8.6. Simon agreed to circulate the LIFE+ bid and feedback documents to the General Assembly. Simon
- 8.7. Kristof noted that although we had been unsuccessful with the LIFE+ bid, we have learned from the process, and have also gained the Tipik Communications agreement.
- 8.8. Adam Donnan volunteered to undertake a communications review. He did however say that if he did take on a communications review he would have to give up chairing the Accreditation Task Force. Elisa offered to help with the communications review. The General Assembly agreed to the need for the review and to Adam leading on it. It was also agreed that this review needs to be undertaken before the website is redeveloped. Adam, Elisa
- 8.9 To facilitate the communication with the GA Members and to keep everyone up-to-date Elisa has agreed to collect an ExCo monthly Newsletter to be circulated.
- 8.10 Based on Meghan report, Emanuele Regalini observes that one of the reasons the grant did not get funding is because ENEP at present can mainly be considered only a disseminator of information coming from the Commission (top-down) rather than an aggregator of opinions coming from the professionals (bottom-up).

9. Other Activities and Projects

9.1. Targeted Services Proposal

- 9.1.1. Kristof gave a brief update on the proposal from Filip Raymaekers regarding members paying extra for specific services from ENEP. At the last General Assembly the Executive Committee were asked to undertake a case study after presenting a detailed description of the proposal, but this has not come forward. Kristof reported that we have been doing similar work with the SEE Conference.
- 9.1.2. Jan Karel noted that if anyone wanted to they are welcome to bring forward other proposals.
- 9.1.3. It was noted that there are also concerns regarding liability and interference with the code of conduct.

9.2. Accreditation Task Force and Code of Conduct

- 9.2.1. Adam gave a presentation on the proposed Code of Conduct (see Appendix 4). It was noted that the Code will be voluntary for member associations to join up to (e.g. being specified in the Platform), which means that if a member association does not sign up to the Code that its individual members will not be eligible to sign up to the Code.
- 9.2.2. Sally Hayns was concerned about the lack of a preliminary auditing in the individual associations and of the confidence of applying the code: without this there could be complaints. Moreover Sally was worried

about the fact that the initial disciplinary is delegated to the member association, but that the appeal process then reverts back to ENEP. Mike Barker was also concerned that ENEP does not have the resources to manage appeals and track records.

9.2.3. It was agreed that the Code would be voluntary, and that the appeals process will be dealt with by the member association.

9.2.4. The text for the Code of Conduct was agreed as:

Signatories to the ENEP Code of Conduct will:

- 1. Seek to promote sustainability and the mitigation of environmental harm;*
- 2. Ensure to use appropriate, trustworthy and scientifically sound data and understanding in all professional activities;*
- 3. Have full regard for the public interest at all times;*
- 4. Have the necessary professional qualifications and experience to perform the tasks undertaken;*
- 5. Avoid or disclose any real or perceived conflict of interest that may influence their actions or judgments; and*
- 6. Commit to undertaking appropriate continuing professional development.*

9.2.5. Angels Moragues was concerned that it will be difficult for AFIE to adhere to point 6 of the Code regarding continuing professional development and Emanuele Regalini supported such concern.

9.2.6. Sally was concerned that there was a problem with the initial proposal in that it has no value or indeed is a disadvantage to those member associations that do have Codes.

9.2.7. It was noted that the added value of the Code over the individual member associations' own Codes is that the ENEP Code is at the European rather than national level. Also, it provides a baseline for those member associations that do not currently have a Code. Hopefully this will lead to them creating their own Code.

9.2.8. It was agreed that the proposal be changed such that if a member association has a Code that is deemed to be sufficiently robust then ENEP will approve that Code. ENEP will need to undertake an audit of member associations' Codes in order to implement this. The Code will then provide a template for those member associations that do not have a Code of their own.

ExCo

9.2.9. Emanuele was concerned that the ENEP Code sets the standard too low for it to be of real value to those member associations that do not have their own Code.

9.3. Common Expertise Matrix, Youth in Action and SEE Expo

9.3.1. There was not time to look at these in detail, so Elisa agree to circulate the presentations that she had prepared to the General Assembly (Appendices 5,6,7). There was a very brief explanation of the SEE Expo

ExCo

that will take place in Bulgaria and that a Waste Management Working Group will be set up as a result of this.

10. Financial Update

- 10.1. Jim presented the financial update (see Appendix 8), noting that there is a concern over the balances at the end of each of the last few years. ENEP is currently operating at a deficit of around -€11,000 per year. The deficit this year was increased due to IEMA leaving the Network (-€7,000) plus the extra expenditure for the Life+ (auditing for the accounts for the grant, -€2,500).
- 10.2. Adam and Emanuele asked if ENEP has a reserves policy or a revised budget, to which Jim replied that ENEP does not. Jan Karel noted that the budget was approved by the GA last year and hence it will not be changed; he however stated that ENEP does not have any long-term commitments or liabilities (for example to Simon, Jason or Mundo-B). Jim added that it is good practice to have some reserves.
- 10.3. Matthias Friebel suggested that ENEP should focus on ENEP's income and so match our income to our expenditure and therefore stop losing money.
- 10.4. Jim said a few words as he stepped down from the Executive Committee as Treasurer. He thanked the Executive Committee and staff that he had worked with, who he said do a lot of excellent work. He added that we must not lose the vision of what ENEP is about. He said that there have been some difficult times as Treasurer but that this is part of the job. Jim said that he will miss ENEP and the exceptional and very nice people that he has met through it. Jim finished by saying that we have a very capable new Treasurer in Herman Jan Wijnants and wished him good luck.
- 10.5. Jan Karel thanked Jim for his input into ENEP. Jan Karel said that the Executive Committee will miss his dedication and hard work and that ENEP owes him a great debt of gratitude. Jim had been involved with ENEP since 2002 and had been Treasurer since 2005 (having served 2 terms and then also extended his second term because no replacement candidates came forward). Jim was presented with a card and a small gift.

11. Executive Committee Election for Treasurer

- 11.1. Herman Jan Wijnants was put forward by VVM as the only candidate for Treasurer (see Appendix 9). He was approved unanimously by the General Assembly and was welcomed to the Executive Committee.

12. ENEP of Tomorrow

- 12.1. Jan Karel explained the reasons for the new paper put forward. The paper put forward by AIAT was also noted (see Appendix 10).
- 12.2. Jan Karel said that we cannot continue with the current situation – we are under-funded and under-staffed for what we want to achieve.

Volunteers already put in a huge effort for ENEP, including extra time by Simon and Jason. The Executive Committee also currently puts in a huge effort, and we need to be aware that future Executive Committee members may not be able to put in the same amount of time.

- 12.3. Adam said that IES is guided by “value for money” thinking, but that this does not necessarily mean “less money”. He said that IES does not currently think that ENEP is working properly but that they are willing to put more money in to get real benefits.
- 12.4. Sally said that CIEEM is also concerned that ENEP is not delivering, and would also be willing to pay more if ENEP has a clear business plan. If things do not change CIEEM may decide to leave ENEP – Sally noted that this was not a threat, just a possibility.
- 12.5. Rachel said that VVM would also pay more for ENEP to perform better. She also said that the VVM office could help with some of the administrative duties that Jason and Simon cover. VVM will also support Herman Jan in his role as Treasurer on the Executive Committee. Rachel added that the videoconferencing idea is also worth looking into, perhaps having one virtual General Assembly and one physical General Assembly each year. Jason, Simon
- 12.6. Matthias proposed that – before the next General Assembly – we need to completely rethink the structure of ENEP’s spending and office setup. He said that VNU has the same budget as ENEP and has two very professional and effective FTE (full-time equivalent) staff members who work from home as they have children to look after.
- 12.7. Alain Rouse said that AFITE has lost 10% of its members each year for the past two years and is now at the limit of its finances without any reserves. However, he said that AFITE is well-respected in France and promotes ENEP whenever it can. Alain said that we need to find out the priorities and activities of each member association – and suggested that ENEP should then create a yearbook of members. Alain agreed to an increase in fees if it led to improved benefits.
- 12.8. Elisa gave a brief outline of the Common Expertise Matrix, which could be used as the basis of a yearbook, but said that some member associations fall into vague areas, or are difficult to get information on. She said she will send out more information after the General Assembly. Elisa
- 12.9. Emanuele said that the facts are that there is a north-south divide in ENEP, which means that there are different reasons for being a member of ENEP, which can be based on expectation, age, and priorities. He said that in general the “southern” members invest a bigger proportion of their income in ENEP than the “northern” members, and so the “southern” members cannot afford a fee increase. He said that he fears a split in ENEP if there is a fee increase. He added that ENEP members have not seen an increase in benefits as

the budget has increased over time. He said that the effort is high, but that the results have not been delivered. He suggested that before there is a fee increase there needs to be a performance improvement. He said that ENEP should do more with less.

- 12.10 Giacomo Cozzolino said that AISA has not always had constant contact with ENEP. However he felt that ENEP needs to change its strategy, even if it has more money. He felt that ENEP needs a spending review and suggested that we need to look further into ICT options. Giacomo further suggested that we need to make better use of the external consultant contracts than have been so far.
- 12.11 Mike said that looking further into ICT solutions is good, but that we will not save money here as we currently spend very little money on ICT anyway. He said that we need to be clear about what we want to review spending on.
- 12.12 Emanuele said that we spend 70% of our income on the Project Officer, and so need to have a more sustainable way of spending our money.
- 12.13 Kristof noted that the reason we appointed a Project Officer was to add benefits to ENEP members.
- 12.14 Emanuele said that AIAT members want knowledge and best practice exchange from ENEP and suggested that we need a change of direction.
- 12.15 Sally said that ENEP needs to be clear on its priorities for the coming years. She said that she could make the case to the CIEEM Board for more funding (to ENEP from CIEEM). Each member association could take more responsibility for finding out from their own members what they want from ENEP. She added that CIEEM cannot commit to continue to invest in ENEP if there is no clear direction.
- 12.16 Jan Karel agreed that ENEP will do a survey to find out what member associations want from ENEP. Rachel said that each member association must take responsibility for finding out what its own members want. Sally added that each member association needs to ask the same questions to make analysis easier.
- 12.17 Kristof said that the Executive Committee needs to take responsibility, and to present the results of what members want at the next General Assembly. Mike added that this is preparatory work for the next General Assembly, in line with agreed priorities, actions and structures.
- 12.18 Emanuele noted that being a member of the Executive Committee costs the member association (as ENEP does not pay travel expenses) and that this also impacts on the decision of the fee increase.
- 12.19 Herman Jan said that having had experience of being VVM's Treasurer when Dutch government subsidies ended he understood the situation and suggested that we need to look at income and expenditure and match them, because ENEP cannot afford to have another budget deficit. He suggested that we need a review of expenditure. A small fee

ExCo

increase would be needed anyway, given the current level of expenditure.

- 12.20 Jan Karel concluded that we all understand the importance of the situation and that the Executive Committee will produce an action plan and priorities list for the next General Assembly, which will be produced with input from the member associations. He agreed that the Executive Committee will look into virtual meetings but that we must understand that someone still needs to organise these meetings. He said that the Executive Committee will be in touch with the General Assembly on a more regular basis to both inform members of what the Executive Committee is doing and also to find out what the members want. The Executive Committee will revise the SurveyMonkey.com survey conducted in 2011 and reissue this to members to help find out what members want from ENEP. Lastly, Jan Karel asked that member association representatives need to be ready at the next General Assembly to make a decision on a potential fee increase (i.e. they need authority from their own Boards to vote on a fee increase).
- ExCo

13. Forthcoming General Assemblies

- 13.1. The Autumn 2013 General Assembly was confirmed for Rome, Italy on 17-18 October 2013 and will be hosted by the three Italian associations. A side event will also be organised.
- ExCo,
AIAT,
AISA, AIN
- 13.2. AFIE proposed that the Spring 2014 General Assembly be hosted by them and held in Lille, France. The date for this General Assembly needs to be confirmed by the summer.
- ExCo, AFIE
- 13.3. Carlin Baciu suggested that an alternative for the Spring 2014 would be for REA to host the General Assembly in Romania, if needed. He said that they would like to link the General Assembly to a conference or fair and would be an excellent way to link EU policy to ENEP. He did however say that REA would need help to organise a General Assembly.
- ExCo, REA
- 13.4. It was agreed that the Autumn 2014 General Assembly should be held in Brussels.
- 13.5. It was noted that virtual General Assembly meetings also need to be considered.
- ExCo

14. Any Other Business

- 14.1. Simon reminded those present that if they are planning to attend Green Week that they need to register themselves on the Green Week website.
- 14.2. It was noted that with Adam stepping down as Chair of the Accreditation Task Force we will need to find someone to take over this role.
- 14.3. Matthias reported that VNU has changed its name. It does not affect the abbreviation, only the full name. Matthias will forward this
- Matthias,
Jason

information to Jason to update the website.

14.4 There was a brief discussion about the IT management that in 2012 cost €4,000, for management, hosting and the mailing lists. It was agreed that the ExCo and AIAT will discuss the rate (e.g. hourly rate) for the future.

14.5 AIAT stated the desire to be part of the tendering process for the website redevelopment. Simon will circulate the information. Simon

15. Close and Depart

15.1. Jan Karel thanked everyone for their input and wished them a safe journey home.

15.2. The General Assembly closed at 16:05.

APPENDICES:

1. List of Participants
2. President's Report
3. Project Officer's Report
4. Code of Conduct
5. Common Expertise Matrix
6. Youth in Action
7. SEE Expo
8. Financial Update
9. Herman Jan Wijnants recommendation from VVM
10. ENEP of Tomorrow response from AIAT

Jason M. Reeves (ENEP Co-ordinator)
Elisa Vignaga (ENEP General Secretary)
28 May 2013