

Date:	19-20 November 2016	Place:	Tisvilde
<h1>Board Meeting Minutes</h1>			
Present	<p>From the Board: Anders Hamming (AH) (Chairman of the Finance and Audit Committee), Andreas Dybkjær-Andersson (ADA) (Vice Chairman), David Archer (DA) (agenda 1-9), Gunver Bennekou (GB), Helle Munk Ravnborg (HMR), (Chairwomen), Jens Elsig (JE), Lea Simonsen (LS) (agenda 3-7), Nana Gerstrøm Alsted (NGA), Sine Jensen (SJ) (institutional member) (agenda 1-9), Tea Balle Fromholt Hansen (TFH), Trine Pertou Mach (TPM) (agenda 3-10).</p> <p>Absent: Ole Anand (OA), Søren Bøllingtoft Knudsen (SBK) (institutional member),</p> <p>Others: Kirsten Bruun (alternate- institutional member) (KB). Adriano Campolino (agenda 1-3), Stanley Aurugam (agenda 1-3), Henrik Hagemand (Parliamentary Audit)</p> <p>Absent: Adam Moe Fejerskov (AMF) (alternate), Birgitte Rhode (BR) (alternate),</p> <p>From the Secretariat: Tim Whyte (TRW), Jakob Kirkeman Boesen (JKB) (agenda items 1-7), Vibeke Vinther (VVI), Hannah Brejnholt (HBR)</p> <p>Absent: Kirsten Devantier (KID),</p>		
Absent			
<p>Minute –Taker: Hannah Brejnholt The meeting (agenda 1-10) was conducted in English</p>			

Agenda	
01.	Welcome and approval of the agenda
02.	Approval of minutes and matters arising from the last Board Meeting
03.	International ActionAid Strategy
04.	ActionAid Denmark's new strategy
05.	MS rootedness in Denmark: Member and volunteer engagement and new forms of campaigning and mobilization
06.	Walk and Talk
07.	Towards a thematic focus: youth and democracy
08.	Reflection on day 1

09.	Open space discussion: Post-Trump, post- Brexit, what's AADKs role?
10.	Fundraising
11.	Any other business

01.	Welcome and approval of the agenda
	<p>The agenda was approved.</p> <p>TRW: there was a wish from the Board to do things a little differently. Therefore, the agenda is a little more open with a little more time for each item.</p>
02.	Approval of minutes and matters arising from the last Board Meeting
	The minutes were approved with no further comments.
03.	International ActionAid Strategy
	<p>As a background information Adriano Campolino and Stanley Amurugam participating from the AA International Secretariat, and HMR gave a short account of how AADK has engaged in the discussion and formulation of feedback on earlier drafts of the proposed international strategy.</p> <p>HMR continued by providing comments from the AADK board on the second draft of the International ActionAid Strategy: The first part (p. 1-9) reflects the way AADK sees the world too. Furthermore, AADK agreed with revising/ rewriting the strategy before time, due to changes in the world around us; spaces around us in which ActionAid should be and is active in are opening and closing. Hence, it is time for us to react and act on this.</p> <p>However, the second part of the draft strategy, which ideally should spell out this analysis into concrete priorities, actions and organizational shifts, is less clear and only to a limited corresponds with the analysis of the world around us presented in the first part. Thus, the draft strategy does not in a sufficiently clear way show what ActionAid should be doing more and less of. The issue of Rootedness is also not as clearly spelled out as it could be. And finally it is not clear how ActionAid affiliates are to come together as one organisation to address global issues through rooted action.</p> <p>In response AC, the CEO of ActionAid gave an account of the four areas of reflection he believes are most relevant for AADK:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Challenges 2) Key choices 3) Where will this bring the Federation 4) what is the role of DK <p>This 2nd draft is what will be considered by the membership at the General Assembly.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The most important challenge: this is a federation of very different partners. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Some organisations see themselves as

- a. the organisations that can be the wind behind the movements that brings about change
- b. a child sponsorship organisation
- c. a classic development organisation – through service delivery
- d. an organisation with a strong focus on campaigning
- e. as the movement that will bring about changes on its own.

2) Key choices: This strategy is bringing the Federation forward to becoming a Justice Organisation, an organisation that does social justice, economic justice and gender equality. A number of areas where the organisation has made choices are:

- a. ToC which now much better defines how AA must seriously implement our human rights based approach (HRBA).
- b. Strong emphasis on movements
- c. Fundability – is the strategy really fundable? And can it be funded with the funding that we already have? The answer to this is yes.
- d. Rootedness – there has been a lot of feedback saying that there is not enough focus on rootedness – but the intent is to say that rootedness is important but it needs to be connected to national and global levels through movements.
- e. Services can only be part of a HBRA and not an end in itself
- f. The role of children – the strategy recognizes the importance of this focus, but the focus is on youth and women
- g. We should move forward with regards to internationalization
- h. As a network federation, we need to be greater than the sum of our parts – there is a big need for good internal collaboration. Countries have an invitation to carry out international work – so it is not just the international secretariat that can or will play this role.
- i. Digitalization: we are currently a dinosaur, we need to develop and evolve in this area.

3) The 3 Rs: Rights, Resilience and Redistribution – Resilience is the newer of the concepts. AADK is already well acquainted with Rights and Redistribution through the work it has been involved in during the past years. Resilience is relevant in relation to climate, but also in a broader context.

4) What is the role for AADK – and which are the areas that AADK could lead on:

- a. There is still work to be done around capacity building, there are initiatives running in parallel that should be integrated better e.g. Global Platforms.
 - i. The presence in the thousands of LRPs is not sufficiently integrated at other levels.
 - ii. Deeper level of connectedness and integration between rootedness and our other strands of work.

This was followed by a lengthy round of debate, question from AADK Board members and management and answers and clarification from Adriano Campolino (AC).

HMR: How do we ensure that this strategy brings us together and not further apart?

JB: Echoes HMR's reading of the strategy. The invitation of integrating rootedness with other strands of work – isn't that what we have been trying to do? Different funding modalities have tried to do exactly this – but if this hasn't worked well enough – why is that?

TRW: The Strategy is a good invitation for members to join. It is a good vision. And it can also be a good piece of work for approaching donors. But bringing the rootedness closer together and closer to other work in practice is really quite difficult. Different LRPs will be closely linked to where the funding has come from. It will require strong clear management.

Youth is not mentioned in the priorities listed for the coming years. And although we agree with the focus on women, we do find that there is not enough focus on youth. It is understood that there is room to work with, but it should be stated clearly in the strategy as well. If not, we will face challenges around this.

TPM: The issues around young people and women have been battles throughout the process. The paper still lacks strong clear wording around young people and women. Therefore, we in AADK should make it very clear in our national strategy that our focus is on young people.

Considering the difference between members the international draft strategy does in fact push the federation in the direction, we as AADK we want. Pushing the Federation in our direction was the reason for joining.

The issue of dual citizenship can be a danger if members decide to interpret the strategy in different ways and thus using the flexibility of the strategy to go separate ways. Hence, the major issue is that a clear identity for AA is lacking. And maybe pushing this common identity is one of the roles AADK should play.

JB: The strategy should also help give direction to where funding should come from and go. What you are asking us to do with the new strategy seems to be what we have been trying to do.

Answers from AC:

There has been a lack of connection between the Global Platforms, the countries and programmes. The reason for this is shortcoming by Countries, the IS and AADK. We may not have had the knowledge or not used it well enough to integrate the rootedness with the rest of our work. This includes

- Countries having diverted funds to relieve issues that did not link to the rest of the organisation.
- AADK Platforms, at least at the beginning, not having been linked to LRPs; a lack of AADK initiatives to properly integrate with the rest of the Federation.
- Knowledge and input should come from the local levels, but there is a gap between work at the local levels to the rest of the organisation and other levels.

In response from the AADK Board and management:

DA: The process of writing a strategy is complex, but what happens next is very important. The priorities in the first 9 pages are important. And the work looking forward is very important. This is where the collaborative leadership is to be applied. And what AADK supports in different countries will be aligned with the priorities outlined in the document. The other documents are therefore quite important as they outline how we will implement the strategy and there is room for AADK to engage in all of these.

TWR: There is a risk that AADK will start of wrong footed with a focus on youth if it is not mentioned explicitly. This is also important from a point of view of talking with donors who will need to see some of this explicitly in writing.

In response to this AC said: What is said in the first part of the strategy with respect to ToC, identity, who we work with (youth and women), building power from below, influencing and shifting power + the three R's, apply to the entire strategy, including to the work envisaged to address the four priorities.

Priorities 1 and 2 do mention young people (could have been youth and women led resilience, but it is already included in the beginning). The 'who' we are etc. at the beginning of the document is a crucial part of the document, not just an introduction. The 2nd draft of the International ActionAid strategy contains a mandate to work with youth applies to all four priorities.

HMR: We recognize the development and the changes in the strategy and the way in which the federation is moving. We also recognize the importance of linking rootedness (for us in the North it is especially through our supporters, members and activists) with the rest of our work in the Federation. But we would like to have that explicitly reflected in writing with respect to the strategic actions that we as a federation will undertake during the coming years.

AC: Doing programme work in the North is still questioned, but now being understood as part of the ToC. And the priority of youth is recognized alongside that of focus on women.

DA: How do we achieve transformative change – deeper rootedness in less places?

GB: Question around the wording on page 4: The Strategy does not clearly define or state the direction in which we will go. In relation to democratic governance of the Federation: the strategy process has not been as open and democratic as we would have expected. What is the status of the background document?

NGA: P.12 what is behind the working on p.12 e.g. around the democratic governance of the Federation. E.g. the Boards in the different countries work very differently.

Answers by AC: Regarding the process, the papers were developed by working groups in which countries were parts, so they were not developed by the International Secretariat. The status of the background papers is that they are background papers and the idea is not for them to be approved, but to give countries a sense of the direction on how to implement the Strategy and on how get from a to b.

We have to ameliorate our own political rootedness. We need to become more accountable to movements e.g. who should be part of the general assemblies etc.

TWR: There is a risk that there will be an interpretation that youth are mobilized to carry forward other peoples' interests and work. Young people need to be driving their own agenda and making changes on their behalf.

JB: In practical terms, how do we ensure our focus on youth?

Answer AC: use the language in the strategy around our identity, ToC etc.

NGA: How do we bring this forward at the GA? What is the process, will there be an opportunity to make changes?

AC: The actual process is still to be determined, but a proposition is:

	<p>Everyone expresses concerns and views and thereafter gives the International Board the opportunity to review and analyse these concerns, and have them present this the next day and try to make sure this is addressed. There is currently a concern that motions are solidified too early splitting the organisations into groupings.</p> <p>Based on the discussions, questions and clarification the Board came to the following <u>Decision</u></p> <p>The way forward is for the Chairmanship, TPM and NGA to write a proposal for a mandate for NGA to take to the GA. This will be done in the coming week. This will be shared with the Strategy Working Group and the Board for their approval.</p> <p>The first 9 pages include very important wording that AADK embraces. It should be underlined at the GA that all national strategies need to be written in alignment with the first nine pages of the Strategy as a means to bring the federation together and ensure there is a collective understanding that this is the core of the strategy. This could be done as part of the framing when the document is presented at the GA.</p> <p>AADK will prepare inputs for a motion in order to be prepared.</p>
04.	ActionAid Denmark's new strategy
	<p>HMR started this agenda item off by proposing that we should aim at having a brief and concise document that adopts most of the first nine pages in the international strategy.</p> <p>This was followed by VVI presenting the process, which is an open process so everyone has the opportunity and is invited to join the process with input and ideas. The process was presented graphically as follows:</p>



TWR continued give a short account of where we are at in the strategy process: There was a first strategy day on 13/11 and there will be a second day in mid-January. One of the important issues which was covered on the first strategy day was re-visiting the WHY question: Why MS? And Why me in MS? There were significant common core in these perceptions of the Why! "Mellemfolkelighed", "Samvirke/activism", "Global Struggles", "Indignation", "Equity – common aspirations and equal opportunities" were some of the key words (see notes from Strategy Day).

A first step was to bring people together around our/MS' history – what animated us, what was and is the reason for our being. Discussions and conversations were subsequently discussed at tables in smaller groups (the notes can be found on the website

<https://www.ms.dk/strategi>, which has been created to facilitate the participation of everyone). The aim of the workshop was to bring everyone together and also make sure that everyone feels ownership of the organisation, not only a member, but an owner and therefore takes an active part.

Conclusions from the first strategy day were: consensus around rootedness and being strategic about funding. While AADK wants to have a strong focus on youth as part of our ToC, the sense of the participants in the Strategy Day was that AADK should not adopt an exclusive focus on youth. “Fællesskaber” (communities/collectives) and “organizing” was a key word/common denominator for much of what we do and work for.

Comments from the Board

- Bringing in history was a good to start the meeting bringing us together
- Questions around youth was what kind of youth organisation do we want to be – a youth organisation with only young people as member or is it about the way we engage with our communities. Would a focus on young people exclude others? – the answer to the last is of course no, but it is important to keep this in mind in communication.
- The meeting brought everyone together – left with a proud feeling.
- Good follow up on the Council meeting in May.
- What are the expectations from the people who partook in the meeting? And next steps?
- Questions around what is your biggest fear were very good – it opened up the organisation to the World around us.
- The listening exercises were good.

Suggested next steps of the strategy process were presented by HMR: Global was a key word. Furthermore, we should continue to work rootedness – and define what we mean when we talk about rootedness. The next strategy meeting will therefore among other things flesh out the issue of rootedness. We should continue to work through listening exercises – what can we do by supporting or chipping in to work, which is going on around us.

Next steps

Dates: The listening exercises should be finalised at the beginning of January 9. The next Strategy meeting will be held shortly after this.

We are currently in the “gathering stage” including Power Talks and listening exercises. We will need to convene meetings at the beginning of January to discuss how the new AAI Strategy will influence the AADK Strategy.

Potentials (see annex 1) :

There are 9 potentials (papers ranging from 4 to 20 pages)

#1 Youth Social Movements and Global Platforms (#1 and #2 were joined)

#3 Deepening Democracy

- as an objective as itself, not just a means, what would our role be in that? Including our current role in the governance work in the Federation.

	<p>#4 Financing – economic strategy</p> <p>#5 The Global Contact Volunteer Programme</p> <p>#6 Our presence, our brand, our cause (including the work and themes we are working on)</p> <p>#7 Organising, social movements, rights based work (work in Denmark)</p> <p>#8 Our own structure – agile, focused, open, rooted.</p> <p>#9 The Digital World</p> <p><u>In Conclusion the Board agreed</u> that the process is moving well and the larger and open group will need to convene when the ‘gathering part’ is completed at the early days of 2017. The Strategy Group will meet shortly after the next open strategy day. The second strategy day will be on January 22.</p>
05.	<p>MS rootedness in Denmark:</p> <p>Member and volunteer engagement and new forms of campaigning and mobilization</p>
	<p>This agenda item was introduced shortly by VVI (see Annex 2) as a means to inspire the discussions to be had during the walk and talk.</p>
06.	<p>Walk and talk</p>
	<p>The Board was asked to consider the following questions for their walk and talk:</p> <p>Inspirational questions for discussion</p> <p>Rootedness: 3 – 5 years from now</p> <p>What does it look like?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How are people engaged? What do they do? 2. In which part of the country are they working? 3. How is their relation to the secretariat and the political system? How are we organized? <p>Upon returning the Board was asked to give their feedback. Answers and comments from groups were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Membership, do people want to be members? Or can we attract people on a case to case basis? - Rootedness and connectedness – the added value is the connectedness to the World? - Connecting to, organizing and linking across the issues that are disturbing people right now - Promising number of supporters on political campaigns, this can increase our rootedness - Ways of addressing what young marginalized Danes, including those who are frustrated with cut backs, could be by working on the following themes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Climate, food security/sovereignty could be a way of linking to people

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Tax and welfare as an area where we could link to disadvantaged Danes as well ○ Inequality <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Rootedness linked to geography - Where are people looking to get support for what they think? “Ikke i mit navn” and “Haiti” were two successful campaigns. - Being rooted in Denmark is a case of being present and active when things happen - People want to act themselves e.g. “Welcome to Denmark” - Address local concerns - Take ownership of work, create own programmes and build up own projects, - Global Contact alumni groups - Local citizen alliances: “Medborgerne” is an example of a local work led by another organisation that we could maybe add value to. - How can experiences from Global South be relevant here too? - How to use competencies of people who have been active in AADK – how do we maintain competencies within the organisation? <p>In summing up HMR concluded that there will be a need to prioritise and discuss how to move forward – one way might be to enhance the aspect of ‘Mellemfolkelighed’ (people to people) across all of what we do.</p> <p>TWR supplemented by suggesting that we could reintroduce the work camps in Denmark. Rootedness can have many different purposes.</p>
07.	<p>Towards a thematic focus: youth and democracy</p>
	<p>JB presented current thinking on areas of AADK thematic work (see Annex 3). The background for this agenda item is that in February we will be handing in an application to Danida and the present presentation will be feeding into this application.</p> <p>Where are we coming from including previous challenges:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Focus on the ability of people to claim their rights. Very broad programme led thematic spread. Our work was equally broadly spread geographically in 9 country programmes and on top of that work through P4C, Global Platforms etc. - The Global Platforms were not well integrated in countries. And work in other AACountries was not focused on young people but came out of Reflect Circles focusing on women. - Much focus at local level and less at linking at global levels – much work was delinked. <p>Development in 2015-2016</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - More focus on gender responsive public service and progressive tax and shrinking political space, as well as deepening democracy and governance in protracted crisis. - Delegation of AAI governance team to Denmark. - Creation of thematic working groups - 2nd generation Global Platforms - Strengthened focus on governance themes and development of policy <p>Continued Challenges</p>

- We have made good progress, but we have also lost a lot of funding with the cut backs last year, hence for this and other reasons we cannot just continue the way we are going now.
- There is also the question around which themes we should be focusing on, and
- What will the next delegation be? What is important to us?
- Handing over ownership of Global Platforms to countries and how to balance this with the role and added value of AADK.

Summing up, the programme was more flexible and had a bottom up approach, but it was difficult to make a coherent narrative of what we are/were, and did maybe not relate so well to our ToC.

Now there is less flexibility, and less focus on organising (as an end itself) which was a central part of our identity. But we have a clearer and more focused narrative internally and in relation to Danida and other potential donors.

When thinking for the future one should keep in mind that a strategy is as much about what you choose not to do than what you choose to do: E.g. Democracy as governance or democracy as values and culture?

Mapping the direction in which AADK should go – the question is where should we focus, what should we optimize, develop, renew and rethink in our programmes. E.g. should we continue to optimize our work in AA established programme and program approaches? Or should we develop new youth focuses in our programmes and projects around our global platforms, activists and local youth organisations and in relation to mobilisation and campaign?

There is a grid of possibilities: The role of AADK - Why, what, how? JB gave a few examples of ways that could be taken:

- Focus on deep involvement in programmes (on a couple of priority area) – example from the Health sector in Mozambique, where programme work led to governance structures being adapted by the local, regional and national authorities.
- Focus on Youth (more reactive could be across all priorities – an example from Guatemala, where young people who had been through the global platform campaigned to close a gold mine that was polluting. This was done without AADK involvement after the GP. And an example from Bangladesh on the abolishing of a legislation introducing more VAT.

Following the presentation, the Board went into groups to discuss directions given based on a number of set questions (see Annex 4).

Feedback from the groups

Group A

1. Do both but incorporate better
2. Should be in many countries
3. Should focus on long term programming, and a small reactive capacity
4. Should priorities work with global and regional alliances
5. Both
6. Objective: to influence “formal structures” (but from a bottom, up approach)
7. Focus on broad global/national challenges

		<p>Non-decisive on youth focus (see annexes 07.A and 07.B)</p> <p>Group B</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Optimise programme work into AA 2. Both 3. Both 4. Both 5. Focus on 1-2 priority 6. Objective: to influence “formal structures” (but from a bottom, up approach) 7. Focus on broad global/national challenges <p>If possible integrated</p> <p>Group C</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Both 2. Leaning slightly toward focusing on priority countries 3. Leaning slightly to long time programming 4. Leaning slightly to the working national work <p>If possible both, a youth focused programme could be linked to LRP and there could be ownership by the AA Country office. Youth programming should be integrated.</p> <p>The conclusion is that there is a tendency leaning toward AADK focusing its work in the following way:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Integrating work into established AA programmes 2. AADK should be in many countries rather than only a few 3. AADK should focus on long term planning rather than focusing on reactive work and responses 4. AADK should support global and regional alliances rather than at national level 5. We should focus on a few cores themes rather than focus on all the four priorities in the AA strategy 6. The objective is to influence “formal structures” rather than having organisation as an end in itself. 7. Our programme should focus on “Just and Democratic Governance” rather than on themes around the extremely marginalized and inequality.
08.		Dinner
09.		Reflection on day 1
		Reflections on day 1 were taken as part of the overall feedback at the end of the day.
10.		Open space discussion: Post-Trump, post- Brexit, what’s AADKs role?
		This session was run as an open space session.

The Board was asked to come up with themes and issues they wanted to discuss and were will to chair and take forward. Based on this a great number of issues related to the current situation in Europe and the world were brought up and discussed in groups ranging from 2 members to more than a handful.

Feed back from the groups :

What is Democracy and do we have democracy in DK and is it the way forward?

Yes, we have democracy and what should we put instead? It is the best we can get and especially in the Nordic countries. But of course we have problems and democracy is a dialogue (Hal Koch), but often the conversation does not work – we have different values and are not good enough to listen. Another democratic problem is that we listen to people we already like and googles logarithms does not help. Because of our ‘likes’ we are spammed with the same things and rarely meets our opponents and vice versa. It blocks the conversation. To make the conversation better we need to create open communities and think about how and with whom we cannot talk or listen to. This can be role for AADK– we are doing, but can we do it better. And the media has role too – they do not encourage the good debate and mostly bring out conflicts. You cannot have real dialogue in the media and you are only quoted if you have a strong point of view and you can never change your point of view.

It is important the we have state funded organizations that dares also criticize the state – that is also a good democracy. MS need to demand better/good governance.

Questioning of Conventions and Migration

Some of the very large challenges currently in Europe are the questioning of conventions set in place to protect human rights. One area especially present is that of migration. Denmark was in shock when we suddenly had refugees walking our motorways and when thousands of people were drowning on their perilous voyage to get to Europe. The situation is appalling. The EU can’t agree on sharing the responsibility of receiving refugees and migrants, and many countries including Denmark are becoming more and more closed focusing instead on internal issues and closing itself off to the outside world. And even worse some of our decision makers are questioning the relevance and pertinence of human rights conventions.

What is the solution? And what is AADK’s role?

The history of MS/AADK and our entire raison d’être compels us to act and engage in this debate, like we did with our campaign “Ikke i mit navn”, we must argue for the upholding of conventions. But what are the alternatives to the political rhetoric that we are hearing? As compelling as it may be to simply open up our borders and welcome refugees, it is a naïve approach. But we could however campaign for legal and secure roots for refugees while also campaigning for Denmark and the EU to receive more people.

The role of AADK is to: safe guard conventions and international frameworks to resolve the situation. We should argue for common solutions, while taking our own responsibilities seriously, argue how why we can afford to do so – it’s a political choice – and finally provide alternatives. AADK should campaign for compassion as a means to connect people and combat the indifference (of people no longer reacting to the suffering of other, because we are becoming immune). AADK should connect people of all colours and continue to counter prejudices. AADK should provide space for action and activism through training, media, campaigning, dialogue, communities and democratic participation.

	<p>Does it take 250.000.000 to be a success?</p> <p>We discussed what kind of organization MS would be if we didn't focus so much on external founding as the driver, but on relations and ways to involve supporters instead as a source of income. We should be much better at involving the secretariat and volunteers in political, campaign. We also discussed how this could be a part of AAs work worldwide.</p>
11.	<p>Fundraising</p>
	<p>The agenda item was a little different than initially anticipated due to sickness of members of the Secretariat.</p> <p>HMR kicked of this agenda item by posing a number of questions: What would happen if our AADK economy looked completely different, e.g. with respect to the funding (level and modalities) we receive through Danida? What if AADK became more like Amnesty, what would happen?</p> <p>This was followed by VVI giving a presentation on political fundraising (see annex 6).</p> <p>Face2Face fundraising has been key and a central way of raising funds, however, it is expensive and there is a certain degree of drop out of supporters. AADK has therefore been experimenting with reaching new potential members and with fundraising through political fundraising petitions. This has been very successful. This is a method that looks as if it works well now and probably for the coming couple of years.</p> <p>Comments from Board:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - One of the good things about political fundraising petitions is the fact they offer an opportunity to act. - There needs to be a strategic decision and plan around when and how to make use of political petitions in order to make sure they reflect what AADK stands for and does. While there should be room to react quickly to specific events, the Board should hence be involved in the overall political planning/priority setting, while the operational issues should be left to the Secretariat. The framing of each petition should be carefully framed since it is an important part of our political communication. - - - Earmarked funding may be a possibility but this might also take the political power out of an action – and there is a need for un-earmarked funding. - Fundraising petitions are a good way of political communication related to our work. - Marketing should include a message around who we are and the fact that we are democratic member-based organisation <p>Answers/ comments from Secretariat</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Fundraising is a way of starting a dialogue with our supporters, it is a way of offering people an opportunity to take action. - Fundraising leads can also be a way of engaging people in work (not only for fundraising means).

	<p>Board members then broke out into small groups to discuss future options. The feedback from the groups was as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What would our profile look like with less Danida funding? - Maybe we could fundraise via testaments with the working title “hvil i verdensfreden” - AADK could start an “Activity fund” (somewhat like a fund for catastrophes) - Could we invite experienced business people in to have a look at some of our socio-economic projects and make them better – e.g. Global Platforms? - How can we fund the kick-start of socio-economic financially sustainable projects? - Can we crowdfund more/better? - Is there a risk that we become a ‘consumer organisation’? - Could we hire some young people to look at crowd funding? - How do we ensure that members don’t leave the organisation? - Amnesty has an annual meeting that people take part in, maybe AADK could do something similar? E.g. AADK “folkefest”? <p><u>In conclusion:</u> HMR summed up the discussion: Fundraising petitions and the political and strategic discussions and opportunities around this are really very interesting and should be pursued and developed further . They should however also be supported by a sound business case like the business case developed for the ‘Take Action’ campaign. This will be prepared and presented by the secretariat at the following board meeting.</p> <p>Last year, the Board <u>decided</u> to invest in strengthening our institutional fundraising efforts. As a follow-up, the Board should be presented with a preliminary result of that investment, e.g. what have been the results to date, what is in the pipeline, etc. as the basis for further efforts in this field. The secretariat will prepare a clear overview of the financial results for the Board meeting in December. The secretariat will also keep the Board informed about political petitions in the pipeline through the chairmanship.</p>
12.	<p>Any other business</p>
	<p>Board travel</p> <p>It was decided at the last Board meeting that the chairmanship would propose when and how to travel with the Board.</p> <p>The chairmanship proposes to travel to visit AA Italy because they are working in local areas and are walking the path that we will want to take in relation to the new strategy.</p> <p>The proposed date is March 9-11 (and move the Board meeting from the 8th)</p> <p>Strategy day</p> <p>There has been a discussion around when and where to hold the next Strategy day. It was decided that it will be at Fælledvej on Sunday 22/1 2017.</p> <p>Evaluation of the weekend</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There has been time for the Board to actively take part and discuss dilemmas and issues, which was good. - Great day Saturday, but Sunday less full.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Two whole days maybe a bit long – proposal to stop at midday on the 2nd day - The meeting has been activating – give a feeling of having responsibility as a Board member. - A feeling of having moved - Great negotiation on the International Strategy on the Saturday: some confrontation and discussion followed up by good comments leaving the door open - Open space on the second day worked well – recommendations for new ways of working. <p>TTIP – Steen Folke is still working actively on this. AADK is supporting this. There will be a petition on this.</p> <p>The Consumers’ organisation TÆNK has done some research around banks. AADK has asked to meet and discuss whether we could collaborate on doing more on banks and their social responsibility.</p>
--	--	--

The meeting closed at 15.45

Enclosures	Annex	
	1	The Potentials
	2	Our People
	3	Framework 2017
	4	Hand out I
	5	Hand out III
	6	Politisk fundraising
	7.A & B	Graphic over view of youth work