

# Minutes of the Conference in Barcelona, Spain, July 2004

## page 1

---

### **Minutes of the General Assembly of Servas International, Spain 18-24 July 2004**

Acknowledgements: These minutes have been made on the basis of the drafts made by volunteers during the GA meetings. They worked in groups of two and mostly worked out their text to a draft immediately after the meeting. Many thanks for their work go to: Judith Bennett (Australia), Georgia Shiells (Australia), Homora Clemens (USA), Christine Powischer (Austria), Ann Dowsett (Britain), Sylvia Krogh (Canada), Chris Jones (Canada), Helga Smith (USA), Ann Beaumont (Australia), Nancy O'Toole (Australia), Steven Hilton (Canada), Zosia Dzierzawska (Poland) and Gwyn Grace (Ireland).

#### **Monday 19 July session 1: 9.30**

Start: We arrange the seats so that the delegates can sit in the front two rows. Later it is arranged so that the delegates are in the front row only.

We sing the Servas song in a new tune, led by Roger Martin Voting paddles distributed. Amir announces that WHALE training sessions are now available.

#### **1.1 Opening**

- President Roger Martin welcomes the delegates and observers.
- Forty-five voting delegates are counted.
- Approval of four vote counters: Honora Clemens, Margaret Whitehead, Walter Borrmann and Anne Dowsett.

#### **1.2 Addition and removal of countries which have suitable/unsuitable size to be active members of**

**Servas** Laura Ragucci (Host List Coordinator) gives the names and reasoning why different countries will be added or removed from being member National Groups Additions proposed:

1. Malawi – which now has 24 hosts) Botswana – which has had steady growth
2. China – now has 14 members. No delegate is currently present.
3. Malaysia – which now has 21 members
4. Kyrgyzstan – which now has 20 hosts. No delegate is currently present.
5. Croatia – which now has 17 members.

Removals proposed:

1. Kenya

2. Tanzania
3. Mali
4. Cuba

Removals are due to these countries having significantly less than ten members or no contact in the last three years.

**Vote to accept additions:** the results: For 42, Against 0, Abstain 0 **the vote carried unanimously**

**Vote to accept removals:** the results: For: 40, Against: 5, Abstain: 0 **the vote carried**

- Mullai Pathy (Singapore) Questions why these countries will lose membership, and states concern that minutes were not being taken.
- Roger Martin (President): Reiterates that two countries had significantly less members and two had been out of contact for at least three years, and that this information is sufficient.
- Denmark (?): Notes that a member group may have less than ten members in some cases. \*Roger Martin (President): Reads aloud guidelines for removal of a group as according to Servas statutes. Emphasises that this vote is to remove voting rights at the General Assembly for the next three years only, for these countries.

**1.3 Minute-taking procedure** Frits Stuurman (General Secretary) explains the procedure for minute-taking (with two different minute-takers to appear at each session) which is accepted, The General Secretary understands to be responsible for the minutes.

**1.4 Introduction of moderators** Roger Martin (President) introduces Graham Warwick and Julie Dotsch as moderators.

**1.5 Distribution of Timetable for the Agenda to delegates** The timetable for the GA is distributed including some papers: Financial Statements 2003 (including the external Auditors report), Stamp statistics, Some data on Growth in Servas and the Report of the International Youth project Co-ordinator)

- Gerald Hoelscher (Germany): States that delegates need a few minutes to look through the Agenda to see that all proposals are covered and that the election of officers is properly covered.
- Mary Jane Mikuriya (USA): Observers should also have an opportunity to see the agenda. The agendas should be made available to all participants.
- Moderator Graham Warwick: Copies will be made available to all and will be initially posted on the wall.

- Gerald Hoelscher (Germany): The agenda has just been published today. The correct procedure is to look at the agenda before going on with the meeting. A formal request is now made to a vote on taking time out to view the Agenda.
- Moderator Graham Warwick: May we proceed and accept the minutes and the Reports before going to our break.
- Michael Johnson (Area Coordinator) asks how different is the current Agenda to what we have seen already?
- Roger Martin (President): It's not a different Agenda, it is the timetable.
- Moderator Graham Warwick: We will have a vote as to whether we will take a break now to review the Agenda.

**Vote to take a break to review the Agenda:** the result: For: 12, Against: 32, Abstain: 1 **Motion is defeated.**

## 1.6 Review of Minutes

- Mary Jane Mikuriya (USA): Documentation is a problem at this conference. How many delegates do not have a copy of all of the documentation?
- Masahiro Nishiyama (Japan): Would like some time to speak about South East Asia's activities.
- Mullai Pathy (Singapore): We have not done things in the proper order.
- John Dowsett (Britain): Perhaps we should consider the guidelines for behaviour at the General Assembly.
- Moderator Graham Warwick: I would like to now move ahead and talk about past minutes. Anyone who does not have access to all of the documentation should try to make a copy from a neighbour.
- Gin Kudor (Treasurer): To make it clear, the Agenda was distributed months ago. Now what you have received is the timetable. Everyone has had the opportunity to read the Agenda.
- Eva Meggeneder (Austria): This is not just a timetable, it is important when certain topics are being discussed. If things are not in a good position, I think that we should change things.
- Roger Martin (President): A document has been produced with corrections and deletions in the Minutes of Thailand
- Moderator Graham Warwick: We will go through these and then can accept or reject the minutes. [Graham Warwick begins to read aloud the items].
- Gerald Hoelscher (Germany): It's not clear which document we are talking about.

- Moderator Graham Warwick: The document is “Proposed additions, deletions and amendments to the Minutes of the General Assembly of Servas International Thailand 16-19 July 2001”
- Penny Pattison (Canada): This is something that Exco asked each delegate to print off the web.
- Jacqueline Spaak (France): We received many, many documents, all in English, and it has been difficult to have the time to translate them and print them.
- Moderator Graham Warwick: We should take it away from this conference that the distribution of information electronically must be effective and equitable. Hard copy versions should also be available. If we don't all have them, I will read this aloud.
- Graham Warwick reads aloud the amendments.

I must have a vote to accept these additions and deletions.

- Gerald Hoelscher (Germany): On point number one, the interpretation was not clear; we need time to read.
- Moderator Graham Warwick: I think we should devote our time to actual policy matters.
- Gerald Hoelscher (Germany): In Thailand the finance group and the money workshop vote was not recorded in the minutes, and from then on we have had problems. So such a thing has consequences.
- Moderator Graham Warwick: It is the first recommendation that this correction be added.

**Vote for amendment – point 1:** the result: For: 35, Against: 0, Abstain: 10 **Motion is carried.** **Vote for amendment – point 2:** the result: For: 36, Against: 0, Abstain: 9 **Motion is carried.** **Vote for amendment – point 3:** the result: For: 34, Against: 0, Abstain: 11 **Motion is carried.**

- Penny Pattison (Canada): Point number 4 is not clear to me.
- Roger Martin (President): This point rests entirely on memory, as no note of a vote was taken.

**Vote for amendment – point 4:** the result: For: 9, Against: 0, Abstain: 36 **Motion is carried.** **Vote for amendment – point 5:** the result: For: 0, Against: 20, Abstain: 25 **Motion is defeated.**

- Moderator Graham Warwick: Are there any additional changes?

[No response]. **Vote to accept the minutes as amended:** For: 40, Against: 0, Abstain: 5. **Motion is carried**

## **Monday 19 July session 2: 11.30**

Start: 12:19 p.m.

**2.1 GA approval to place structure change workshop in Monday evening session** As there is no room in the GA programme for a workshop planned by ICT for preferably everybody (at least all delegates) an afternoon workshop is announced: 15:00–16:30 workshop ICT

The proposals by Germany, France and USA are so drastic that it is important to discuss the consequences in workshops before taking decisions. Therefore workshops are planned: 16:30–18:30 Structures and Statute Changes, to prepare to vote on Tuesday

- Mullai Pathy (Singapore): asked to have a Thursday workshop on DFC
- Roger Martin (President): clarified that in this GA Monday and Tuesday are for the past and Thursday and Friday are for the future. Therefore the DFC workshop is on Thursday
- Penny Pattison (Canada): requests a place on the agenda to bring the workshop results to the Assembly
- Roger Martin (President): The workshops have a place on the agenda to discuss and decide
- Penny Pattison (Canada): asks for a clarification of content and topic
- Moderator Graham Warwick: Do you want to go to workshops tonight before making a decision?

**Vote on having workshops first:** the result: For 46 (**unanimous**) No 0, Abstain 0

- Rami Rafaeli (Israel): Please summarize workshop information to speed the process

The workshops are:

1. Host list production and distribution
2. Power of the GA ("proxy" voting procedure)
3. Administration of SI
4. Stamp fee model

- Roger Martin (President): Each will present his own report
- Mary Jane Mikuriya (USA): Wants the report of the recent Pacifica Area meeting incorporated in the agenda
- Rami Rafaeli (Israel): It is not clear who are the officers, chairs of committees who have speaking rights
- Roger Martin (President): Delegates speak and vote, Officers speak and not vote
- Mullai Pathy (Singapore): Where is the definition of officers

(answer: in the statutes)

- Mary Jane Mikuriya (USA): how many delegates have their statutes here? Copies should be made for those who haven't. Number of people who haven't got the statutes.
- Moderator Graham Warwick: copies will be dealt with.

Shortly afterwards Laura brings copies of the Statutes for those who want them.

- Roger Martin (President): GA has the right to permit speaking rights for anybody they choose at a certain time.
- Gerald Hoelscher (Germany): reading from statutes (III): officers... There is no talk about area coordinators
- Moderator Graham Warwick: We have to balance in order to get things done; according to whether person can contribute – interpretation of the chairman, who has to try and keep things moving, try to be fair
- Mullai Pathy (Singapore): GA doesn't have president – trust GA to judge by itself
- Moderator Graham Warwick – have to accomplish the big picture and balance it out; GA has the right to correct the chair
- Gerald Hoelscher (Germany): takes up suggestion – GA helps chairperson to give speaking rights
- Moderator Graham Warwick on the floor: restriction? – GA may allow to speak any time; flexibility
- Gerald Hoelscher (Germany) would like to vote on letting chair people speak
- Eva Meggeneder (Austria): proposal – first round of voting if people want to have committee members speak – if yes, then ask: can they speak on any topic or just on topics related to their issues
- Moderator Graham Warwick in favour of Gerald's suggestion that GA can direct the chairman as to whether an officer can speak or not
- Chris Patterson (New Zealand): not sure that is clear on what an "officer" is. (Are chairpersons of committees and area coordinators officers, may they speak?)
- Chris Patterson (New Zealand) moved that officers, convenors of committees, and area coordinators may speak on their area of expertise.

**Vote.** The results: Yes 45, No 0, Abstain 0 **unanimous**

- Gerald Hoelscher (Germany): in Thailand, committees were elected
  - Moderator Graham Warwick: proceed with Germany's motion; going to vote to give all officers the right to speak at any time
  - Roger Martin (President): we need to have a definition of what we mean by "officers"
- not everybody who had been elected in a committee is automatically an officer
- Moderator Graham Warwick let's get to that after Gerald's motion all officers should have the right to speak

- Roger Martin (President): suggests that groups included are Exco, area coordinators, SI news editor, elected committees
- Moderator Graham Warwick all the committee or just chairs?
- Ömer Özkan (Turkey) – GA has the right to give speech right, so if any one wants to give the right to speak to anyone, he can –
- Eva Meggeneder (Austria): no, not one person, but would have to be voted on
- Chris Patterson (New Zealand): if we had an unofficial vote on Gerald's proposal which includes all members of committees, we'd see who would support it.
- Moderator Graham Warwick: according to procedure, Gerald's proposal is on the floor – lets get a quick vote on it:

–anybody who is an elected officer (members of committee) can speak at any time to any topic

**Vote:** the results: For 15, Against 21, Abstain 8. **Motion defeated**

- Moderator Graham Warwick error? When Gerald asked earlier to have one of his committee people to speak, I didn't bring it on the floor; in future: if anybody wants to say anything, approach the chair and he will bring it to the vote whether the person can speak or not
- John Dowsett (Britain): there was general sympathy for what Chris (NZ) says –
- Chris Patterson (New Zealand) – would move that the people nominated by Roger (Exco, area coordinators, chairs (convenors) of committees, SI news editor) are given speaking rights at this GA but restrict comments to areas of expertise.

**The vote:** results: For 45, Against 0, Abstain 0. **unanimous**

- Moderator Graham Warwick: start accepting the reports; pass the reports as one instead of individually?

## 2.2 Exco report

- Roger Martin (President): presents report for Exco and the president in one go (see report).

Roger explains that the Exco report is divided into two parts: first a section describing the activities and achievements of Exco as a whole, and then reports of each individual Exco member, describing their own area of responsibility.

Exco feels it has achieved a lot, but would have liked to achieve more. Being only human, Exco made mistakes, but its work was made harder by a very small number of people who spent a lot of time and energy telling them that it only made mistakes.

This had a profound effect on Exco. At times, each member considered resigning. Each member of Exco suffered a serious illness. They were kept going by the Servas spirit – solidarity and trust.

Roger points out that he made it clear when starting that he would not be standing for re-election, but the other members of Exco considered doing so. One year later, Frits and Laura were keen to continue their work in a second term of office. At the end of the second year, they had both seriously considered resigning mid-term, and were unshakeable in their determination not to stand for re-election. The yearly income of Servas International is less than the yearly salary of two office workers in Switzerland. For the price of a few kind words and a lot less rude ones, Servas could have had not two average Swiss workers but Frits and Laura – with three years of experience in the job – for three more years – free, gratis and for nothing!

Exco has of course looked after Servas's money. But SI's greatest resource is people. They too must be looked after. If people are kept at the centre of Servas, peace is inevitable.

- Frits Stuurman (General Secretary) says that this is an emotional thing for him. Servas is about meeting persons and he thanks the many persons for the nice correspondence in the last three years. He also says that the rude letters that some persons were sending to him made him feel very depressed at times and that it was only the good team spirit within Exco that kept him going. Like other Exco members he had considered stopping working, but he did not stop because it would have caused more pressure on the others. He thanks ICT for the good communication possibilities they always arranged and the Spanish team for the good work they did in organising this conference in good co-operation.
- Bibendra Pradhananga (Vice-President) says that he liked to do the work and apologises for the times he was not available because of computer problems or other reasons.
- Gin Kudor (Treasurer) says that many emails Exco received didn't help to solve problems; very rude, angry, very disappointing emails. She considered several times to giving up; thinking that Spanish people did a lot of work to organize conference, she didn't want to leave them to solve the problems. One of her disappointments was that it is very difficult to work when the Audit committee says that there are too many mistakes. There also were some encouraging emails, which helped a lot to do her work; Exco worked together very well.

The meeting closed for today.



# Minutes of the Conference in Barcelona, Spain, July 2004

## page 2

---

### Tuesday 20 July session 3: 9.30

Session moderated by Graham Warwick **General announcements** Laura Ragucci, Host list coordinator introduced newly arrived delegates: – Elena Otegui from Argentina – Catherine Calderon of Philippines – Changxian Yi from China Count of delegates – 50

#### 3.1 Exco report continued

- Laura Ragucci (Host List Coordinator): reports about overall growth of Servas

Report attached with conference papers and with these minutes.

- Marco Kappenburger, Peace Secretary is absent but Roger suggests all refer to his written report.
- Jacqueline Spaak (France) asks about Roger's response to a query from Servas France about the Hospitality Club (HC) and the fact that the Servas logo is on HC's web-site. Roger says that the HC refused to take out its reference to Servas which contained damaging comments, so Roger negotiated an agreed statement with the HC which was approved by EXCO to appear on both web-sites for HC and Servas.
- Gerald Hoelscher (Germany) says that the HC operates out of Germany. It looks like Servas and the HC are the same except that Servas uses paper and forms and the HC uses the internet. Gerald doesn't want Servas to just be free accommodation as the HC is and he asks for this to be put on the agenda and for EXCO to keep us all informed.
- Mary Jane Mikuriya (USA) says that the US is very concerned. They had written to EXCO saying that US Servas did not want to be linked in any way to the HC.
- Jacqueline Spaak (France) was pleased with Roger's response, except for the last phrase of "Many people belong to both organizations and you are invited to do so" (*italics added*).
- Penny Pattison (Canada) says that EXCO made the best decision it could at the time and shouldn't be criticized for doing their best.
- Frank Berauer (Area Coordinator) says that at Roger's request he had contacted all similar hospitality clubs and tested them. He will do a workshop on them later today.
- Gary Sealey (UN representative) reports on Servas International peace activities. He has done an email survey of Servas peace secretaries, NS, area coordinators and some hosts. He received 75

responses indicating a broad range of activities which Servas members are involved in which can be categorized as:

1. individual peace with friends, family, etc.
2. host-traveller relationships promoting peace through shared interaction
3. community activities for peace – eg. Churches, homeless people, AIDS outreach, and sometimes with the UN

Hilda Burer attend UN in Switzerland US Servas attends UN in NYC

- Eva Meggeneder (Austria) mentions that a Servas Austria member attends the UN in Vienna.

**Comments regarding EXCO reports:**

- Gerald Hoelscher (Germany) asks why certain things agreed at the SI Thailand conference 2001 were not done.
  1. Why was there not an annual financial activity report?
  2. Why wasn't SI properly registered?
  3. Why wasn't the list of funded SI conference delegates published 8 months in advance of the conference?
- Roger Martin (President) replies that EXCO did their best but didn't manage it. They are sorry.
- Annie Kamperveen (Netherlands Antilles) says that in order to have peace in Servas, we need to implement it personally. We need to forgive and have peace in our hearts.
- Moderator Graham Warwick initiated a discussion on approving all reports together or individually.
- Gerald Hoelscher (Germany) wants to hear all reports first, including those from the area coordinators and various committees before voting for approval.
- Penny Pattison (Canada) suggests that we vote on all reports presented so far.
- Chris Patterson (New Zealand) points out that we vote to receive the reports and not on issues raised in them.

**Vote to approve reports:** the results: Yes 44, No 1, Abstain 5

- Roger thanks Graham for moderating so far. Julie Dotsch is welcomed as moderator.
- Julie gives some suggestions:

1. Share microphone
2. Allow everyone to speak
3. Be aware of different styles of language (confrontational versus cooperative). Try to use a positive style.
4. Flip chart ("parking lot") to write ideas that come up that aren't necessarily relevant to the topic being discussed but which we can come back to later.

**3.2 Area Coordinator reports.** Full written reports were included with conference papers.

- Africa Anglophone: Denys Whitehead (AC) comments that communication is difficult. Mail rarely gets a response. Phones are very expensive. Only 4 National Secretaries have their own computers. Others use hotmail and internet cafes which is not always reliable.
- South East Asia: Frank Berauer (AC) recommends that SE Asia has an area meeting every year. Frank now lives in Germany, so he suggests that the area coordinator live in the area and another one will be chosen.
- Europe and Near East: Jo Verwimp (AC) says that Europe now has 42 updated host lists and only one not updated (Georgia)

**Tuesday 20 July session 4: 11.30** Moderated by Julie Dotsch Start 11:40 am

**4.1 Area Coordinator reports** continued

- South America: Anita Kalbermann (AC). She says she had worked hard and tried to accomplish all that needed to be done. Unfortunately it was not possible to do everything. No statistics were given but she emphasized the true spirit of Servas. She names two accomplishments in terms of peace building: one is several projects that will be continued in South America; the other is a contest in several South American countries on how the young people see the role of Servas in terms of peace. The winner from Argentina is present.
- South-West Asia: M.B. Adikaram AC— is not present but submitted written report.
- Pacifica: Michael Johnson (AC Pacifica) who reports from the area coordinators meeting that most NS want the role of area coordinator to continue.

Some ACs have similar issues. ACs met on 17 July and discussed roles, responsibilities and support among ACs. Written report was submitted (Addendum.....) He also asks whether ACs are worth keeping and asks the GA to decide so. His recommendation would be to continue with ACs as they can help, explain and make contact. Even though well-developed countries may not need ACs, smaller countries benefit from their activities. Pacifica used 306 Euros for the meeting. A statement concerning the Pacifica Area meeting was read

by Penny Pattison (Canada). It says that a meeting was held on 18 July 2004, and the delegates were unanimous in the opinion that the 3-year experiment with Pacifica was not a success and that Pacifica Area as such be discontinued.

- Central America: Gilberto Arita (AC) reports that Servas works fine in 5 Latin countries: Mexico, Costa Rica, Honduras, Panama, Guatemala. See his written report. He has personally visited many hosts in those countries and three secretaries of those countries are present. Nicaragua and San Salvador are not working as well, even though people are positive about Servas, the National Secretary did not respond. 2 Servas members of Honduras were able to visit Canada, supported by Canada.

- Africa-Francophone – No written report was submitted from Mourad El Kaddiri

As an addition to the Anglo-African report, Susan Evans (Zimbabwe) thanks Servas for bringing her here and tells GA that life in Zimbabwe is difficult for people living there. It is a beautiful country inspite of the problems. More visitors are welcome.

- Far East Asia: Masahiro Nishiyama (Japan) gives a report for Far East Asia. He gives some statistics: Korea now has 220 hosts, Japan has 300, China 15, Taiwan 7, Mongolia 0. At the 3rd FEA conference in Kushu there were 17 members present. The merger/integration of South East Asia was discussed. In 2003 the national secretaries of Korea and Japan went to Mongolia to establish Servas without success. Several presentations were given at colleges and community centers but no results were achieved. In August 2003 he attended the SE Asia conference and discussed the merger but the proposal has not yet been accepted. The reason for Korea's increase of hosts from 67 to 220 is that some teachers of social studies experienced Servas in Israel, published reports in Korea which was a huge success. Next year will be the 4th area conference in Hong Kong and they will invite as many people as possible from SE Asia. Moderator requested the written report which is submitted. Copies are made available.

- Tiurlan Sitompul (Indonesia) requests a correction on the SE Asian report before vote on AC reports is taken. Mullai had gone to Kuala Lumpur in help of a blind person, not as stated to go shopping. She also informs the GA that ServasIndonesia@hotmail.com is now operational.

- The moderator reminds the assembly to stay on topic. Several conflict items were brought up but referred to the "parking lot" (Peru/Exco, Frank/Germany, India, clarification on voting)

**Vote on accepting reports:** the result: For: 46, Against: 1, Abstain: 3

- Moderator announces the next section as:

1. Announcements,
2. Minute Corrections and
3. Time Schedule Changes.

Need to figure out how to move Agenda items to other areas in order to facilitate discussions before people have to vote.

4.2 UN Reports The UN report of Geneva is given by Hilde Burer, who is the UN representative in Geneva. As an NGO at the UN, Servas is concerned with human rights issues. Servas members are encouraged to contact her for more information and human rights issues meetings. The General UN report New York was given by Gary Sealey. Servas is one of 3000 NGOs at the UN. Its consultative status opens it up to all of society. SI has consultative status with the UN since the Rio conference 11 years ago, thousands have been added but Servas pre-dates those. Servas has participated in various summit events on information, health, world hunger and sustainable development. Some of the goals of the World Millennium Summit were to reduce slum dwellers by 100 million, schooling for all children, reducing AIDS, etc. Workshops to be held will elaborate on those issues. These items are useful in Servas contacts. Servas members can inform themselves further via the Internet. Hilda added that there are 4 people active with UN issues in Geneva. Written reports from Geneva, Vienna and New York were submitted.

Reports as submitted are voted on. For: 47, Against: 0, Abstain: 2, Absent: 1

4.3 SI News report Report on Servas International News was presented by Sharon Belden (SI News editor). Written report was submitted. Sharon thanked EXCO, especially Frits and Gin. She thinks that ACs are very important in distribution and translation. She regrets delays in distribution, especially in notifying of events. She will work with the next editor and hopes that the French and Spanish editions of the newsletter will continue. There are currently 8000 editions published in English, 1600 in French and 1800 in Spanish. Technical problems prevented the 2003 edition to be published on the Internet. Frits brought a CD he just got from the printer of the SI News to the conference which can be used to put it on the web (given to Guido) The report was voted on. For: 49, Against: 0, Abstain: 1

4.4 SI Archivist report The SI Archivist report was given by Frits in absence of Antonie Fried. Antonie has been very active in Servas through many years. She knew many people in Servas so she was able to write many interesting articles about the people in Servas from the beginning. Frits thanks on behalf of many people Antonie for her work. Gerald Hoelscher (Germany) says that he will report this to Antonie and that there is a youth project planned for upgrading the archive to electronic format. It was voted to accept the report. For: 49, Against: 0, Abstain: 1

4.5 Job Description and Statutes Committee report. No report was submitted.

- Frits Stuurman (General Secretary) says that the committee did not work. No vote was taken.

**4.6 Correction to the minutes of the Audit Committee report at the Thailand conference** A motion is brought up by the GA to correct the minutes of the Audit Committee report at the Thailand conference. An issue was whether there were financial recommendations (as written there) or guidelines. After prolonged discussions, the matter was **voted on and defeated**. For: 7, Against: 10, Abstain: 33.

- The Moderator makes several announcements.

There may be agenda items which need to be rescheduled.

- Frits suggests moving the financial guideline workshops to 16:30 on Thursday. Rami pointed out that two important workshops are scheduled at the same time. After more discussion on revising the schedule, **a vote was called for to leave the rest of the workshop schedule as it is**. For: 41, Against: 0, Abstain: 7 Absent: 2.

- Anne Greenhough (Youth Project Coordinator) announces that 12 young people are present. Others were not able to come. She gives more information on youth activities. Three more workshops are scheduled for the next few days. The last night party scheduled for Saturday needs input, submissions to Pablo.

- Frank announces the schedule for the hospitality workshop at Tuesday at 9 pm.

- Amir Levy (ICT) points out that:

1. photos are collected, bulletins will be send to all absentees and encouraged participants to take advantage of computer lessons.
2. Peace corner (blue display) can use input.

- Frits Stuurman (General Secretary) points out that several people have not paid their fee yet, and aks them to see Gin.

# Minutes of the Conference in Barcelona, Spain, July 2004

## page 3

---

***Thursday 22 July***

---

Visiting day to the surroundings of Barcelona

# Minutes of the Conference in Barcelona, Spain, July 2004

## page 4

---

### Thursday 22 July session 5: 9.30

#### Picture taking in the court.

- We start with the Servas song.
- Anita Kalbermann of Uruguay and Laura Ragucci agree to translate.
- Initial translation not successful so Anita suggested she type translation into computer and the words put onto screen for Spanish speakers.
  - Suggestion adopted.

#### Session moderated by Julie Dotsch

#### General announcements

- Announcement that the delegates from Croatia and Hungary left.
- Julie Dotsch appealed to all delegates and observers to remember what builds peace and what destroys peace and asked that negative comments about absent people not to be made as they were not there to defend themselves. The focus should be on the positive and building peace.
- Asbjørg Høyvik Hidle (Norway) asks to try to make the atmosphere a bit more Servas-like
  - Count of delegates – 48

**5.1 Accept proposal Statute changes for being put on agenda only** Roger Martin (President) suggests to accept the item be included on the agenda so item 3.1.5 (statute changes) can be discussed. Item 14a on the timetable. Vote: The result: Yes 47, No 0, Abstain 1

#### **5.2 SI Structure Proposals** Item 14b.

- Mary Jane Mikuriya (USA) proposes that the item be delayed so it can be fully discussed in conjunction with other items relating to statute changes and placed on the agenda at an appropriate time.
- Michael Johnson (AC Pacifica) supports delay.
- David Chai (Malaysia) points out that there may not be time to discuss the item as program so full. He feels that the USA, France and Germany's proposal should not be discussed as these countries had frozen their financial contributions to Servas International.
- Eva Meggeneder (Austria) suggests some of the matters be included into some discussions and workshops.



- Roger Martin says nine hours of discussions and workshops had already been held.

### **Motion**

- Mary Jane Mikuriya (USA) proposed that discussion of item be deferred.
  - The results: For: 18, Against (=discuss it now): 23, Abstain: 7.

Motion defeated.

- David Chai (Malaysia) suggests that chair and several attendees from each of the workshops give reports and after reports have been considered, the GA vote on the item.

The workshops were:

1. Workshop on host list distribution.
2. General Assembly Power workshop
3. Stamp fee model workshop.

### **5.3 Workshop on Fee structure**

- Report from Margaret Whitehead (Zambia ) who gave a computer presentation which included four models and workshop participants' views on different models.
- Markus Kappenberger (Audit Com.) made corrections to Audit Committee model and model has been retitled, France/Germany/USA model.
  - We have:
    1. The current model (10 stamps free, 40 stamps CHF 7 per stamp, more stamps CHF 17 per stamp).
    2. France/Germany/USA model (all stamps CHF 7 per stamp, all hosts CHF 1 per host per year, office grant from SI to (all) countries CHF 70 per year): produces about 1/2 the current balance
    3. EXCO model (CHF 8 per stamp X National Income coefficient): produces about the equivalent of the current balance
    4. Australian model: similar to EXCO model.

There is also the "Zambia-model" which basically is the Current model plus: A National Group pays a certain fee for each host list issued, to go to the NG of the host list.

Reactions already given in the workshop: •Many have national host fees, but most do not want to pay host fees to SI •Some feel it is wrong to charge host fees •Well-developed countries do not want to receive office grants •Most want to keep the present structure •Countries with few outgoing travellers should receive funding, for instance from the DFC •Stamp fees should be decided when the budget is produced

- Lindsay Chambers (Australia) withdraws the Australian model as it is similar to EXCO's.
- Comments on models are made by:
  - Turkey,
  - Ireland,
  - Malawi,
  - Romania,
  - EXCO treasurer,
  - Neth. Antillies,
  - Uruguay.

**Break at 11.20**

**Thursday 22 July session 6: 11.30**

**6.3 Workshop on Fee structure continued** Some other countries give their ideas:

- Jana Reikop (Estonia) says that they do not need the office grand, others need it more.
- Abhay Shaha (India) thinks that the second model is not practical to collect money from each host.

Secondly, the hosts will decrease because each year you are asking for money from them.

- The daughter of Susanita Kay (South Africa )says: My mother doesn't want to be here because she feels upset. We are just talking about money. She doesn't want to be here. She wants a more important discussion than just money and stamps.
- Mary Jane Mikuriya (USA)

I need to have the specifics to give a presentation. I understand what the idea is behind it. What is the coefficient of Exco? What does it mean for each country? We need to report back to our countries what the actual fee is.

- Roger Martin (President): Exco is not putting any prestige into this model. It's a suggestion. If you're happy with the model as it is, that's fine. We talked yesterday about administering the Zambia model. The countries that receive travellers, receive money. The countries that send travellers, use money. It would be easy to make a program on the Servas web where each country records how many lists it has issued to which countries. Now it is quite possible, and would give us instant statistics. Who is travelling from where, and where to. This would be a useful tool, and would provide the basis for where the money comes from and where the money goes. This may in the future hold the answer to the stamp fee model, but it needs more work. Margaret would be happy with implementing the model without any consequences for the next three years, so we see how it works. Then we can produce a brilliant fee structure for the next General Assembly.

- Asbjørg Høyvik Hidle (Norway): We have small rich countries, big rich countries, small poor countries, big poor countries, rich living in poor, poor living in rich countries, so we cannot have something totally fair. The Exco model and the other model seem reasonable, but they have come very late, so I think that we should have the current model for another three years, and then in this time we could see the consequences of both models.
- Eva Meggeneder (Austria): The gross national income as per the UN statistics does not really reflect the financial status of the country in terms of Servas. Even a rich country may have a very low income of travellers. But they may be multiplied by the highest coefficient. So it may not match up in a fair way.
- Elena Otegui (Argentina): In the Exco proposal it is difficult to know what the coefficient would be, but we could calculate it by looking at how many travellers you have. I think the current structure of the stamp fees is fair and better for the poor countries; I don't mind paying a bit more if this is good for the poor countries.
- Martha Edith Vasquez-Herrera (Honduras) asks the GA to be alert that "poor" countries should be in our minds when we take a decision.
- Birendra Hada (Nepal): I asked each member to pay one euro ten cents in rupees. I got only a response from two people. The next year I asked people not to pay, and got more response. If you ask to pay hosts fees every year, the time will come that they have to close their doors to the travellers.
- Spain brings up that they think that in that respect the current model is the best model.
- Moderator Julie Dotsch: To keep us on schedule, I am going to try to go back to the fee models that were discussed. We can either look at each model, and vote on each model, or talk about any change at all, and from there go to each model.

The first vote would be – do we agree to change the model in any way?

- Roger Martin (President): This is about the model, not about the numbers. So, the numbers have to be in relation to the budget. So if you say that we will keep the same model that we have now, you can still change the numbers.
- Cesar Baron (Brazil): Who is going to decide the numbers.
- Roger Martin (President): The GA, later.
  - Motion made to keep the current fee model: the result: Yes 38, No 5, Abstain 5.

**6.3 Workshop on Host List distribution** Laura Ragucci (Host List Coordinator): presents the main conclusions/proposals of the workshop: 1. Any lists in the host list storage area should be complete (like the printed ones) and include the local information. 2. Request the Assembly approves the distribution of partial lists, which should be treated the same way as complete lists by travellers. The WHALE would also make it possible to print out only certain parts of the list. 3. Recommend all countries to use the host list storage area and WHALE. We aim to have all Servas host list data on the WHALE by 2007. 4. Pilot project number 1 –

printing centres. The international host list co-ordinator would assist smaller countries to find assistance with larger countries to help with printing and distribution of smaller countries hosts lists. 5. Pilot project number 2 – when sufficient lists are in the host list storage area, one small, one medium and one large countries would pilot do all of the printing for the host lists for their outgoing travellers. 6. Adequate hardware the software controlled by Servas. We need a dedicated server to ensure acceptable response times. This will be done by volunteers when possible, but will also require the use of paid professionals

- Hans Bruckman (The Netherlands):
- Two objections:
  - For countries that produce good hosts lists, there's no need to change it. It is functioning well, so why change it?
  - Secondly, if people are only going to one area, I just send them that part of the book.
- Eva Meggeneder (Austria) We have to ask everybody if they agree that their data is shown on the internet. Before we upload the information, we have to ask each host. Also, right now, we can't print that number of host lists from the web in order to give to travellers. So I would be for keeping and distributing lists as they are, maybe plus having them on the web.
- Susan Evans (Zimbabwe): Some cultural information is not appropriate for the internet.
- Gwyn Grace (Ireland): Two points.:
  - I have to repeat what Poland said. I would have to ask each member if they want to be on the website. Some will say no, and so we will lose hosts.
  - Secondly, if a traveller wants to go to Germany, I give them the list. If I have to print the list, it is a practical problem of time, paper, it weighs half a kilo. Weight of paper is a problem.
- Abhay Shaha (India)I appreciate the efforts taken. Every country should have a computer, a printer and a person who can use these kind of updated things.
- John Dowsett (Britain):
  - We agree very much with what Poland and Ireland have said. We see the same difficulties about getting the permission of hosts, and printing.
  - Having said that, we think that what is being put forward from the workshop is excellent. The pilot proposals make a lot of sense.
  - Thirdly, we have great doubts about the printing off of parts of lists. There are many drawbacks. People from abroad think they want to go to London, Bath, York, Stafford and Edinborough, and never see the hosts in other areas.

- Finally, we think that anybody receiving a host list should receive some standard instructions and guidelines for that country are always included with any printing of lists.
- Cesar Baron (Brazil): I support abolishing the printed host lists. If the future, if you didn't have to print it, it is much more efficient. So it's much, much easier.
- Laura Ragucci (Host List Coordinator): I forgot to say that we established that we didn't want to force any country to put their data. We just strongly encourage countries. You have three years to get their permission. We don't want to lose any hosts. The main problem is distribution costs, and we are just trying to reduce these costs, to make it more efficient. No one is forced to leave their way or producing and distributing host lists. It is a goal and that's all.
- Amir Levy (ICT): Any suggestions that the ICT is providing, they are never compulsory. Sensitive material does not need to be published. Secondly, about web, how many of you when you approach your hosts... it's not shown, it's kept in a very secure area. You can put the data on the web, and mark any hosts that don't want to be on the web, 'active but do not publish'. Still you are gaining eighty percent of the benefits.

The following motions were voted on: 1. Any lists in the host list storage area should be complete, like the printed ones, and include the cultural information. Do you agree?

- The result: Yes 46, No 0, Abstain 1

2. Do you approve the distribution of partial lists, assuming that the partial lists will be treated in the same way as completed lists (partial lists will also therefore have to be accompanied by the cultural information)? \*\*\*\*The result: Yes 44, No 2, Abstain 2. 3. The Assembly recommends that all countries use the host list storage area and WHALE. We aim to have all Servas host list data on the WHALE by 2007.

- Abhay Shaha (India): Who will finance WHALE?
- John Dowsett (Britain): I would like to propose something slightly gentler and a longer time-scale so there is more scope for review.
- Rami Rafaeli (Israel): I would like to answer India's question. Many volunteers are ready to help you.
- The result: Yes 39, No 2, Abstain 7

**4a. Do you approve pilot project number 1 – printing centres.** Larger countries who are willing to help would assist smaller countries with printing and distribution of smaller country host lists. This is the responsibility of the host list co-ordinator.

- Roger Martin (President): We have a number of countries with technology and facilities available to easily print and distribute host lists. These countries could also print the lists of three, four, five, six, smaller countries.

- Laura Ragucci (Host List Coordinator): One clarification, the only difference between the buddy system and this system, is that with this system there may be more than one host list produced by a larger country.
- The result: Yes 43, No 0, Abstain 5.

**4b. Do you approve pilot project number 2** – when sufficient host lists are in the host list storage area, one small, one medium and one large willing country would run a pilot project to produce all lists for their outgoing travellers.

- Asbjørg Høyvik Hidle (Norway): what finances are involved?
- Penny Pattison (Canada): This is taken directly from the US/Germany/France proposal to have the country which is sending the traveller responsible for providing the list to the traveller. So it is for the country that is sending the traveller to have to print every list that the traveller wants. That is the pilot.
- The result: Yes 35, No 0, Abstain 13.

**5b. Do you approve that the computer hardware and software for the Servas website must be adequate and controlled by Servas.** Therefore, we need a dedicated server to be provided to ensure acceptable response times. This will be done by volunteers when possible, but will also require the use of paid professionals.

- Roger Martin (President): I think it is difficult for the Assembly to decide now that we will do this, without understanding the costs involved.
- Penny Pattison (Canada): I disagree with Rodger. If we do not say that we will spend the money, it will not work.
- Gerald Hoelscher (Germany): I support Canada. We are relying too much on two extremely hard working volunteers. What they cannot shoulder should be paid by the organization, that should be mandatory.
- Chris Patterson (New Zealand): I support Canada and Germany. I think it is important.
- Hans Bruckman (The Netherlands): I would like to know numbers, how much money would be involved?
- Penny Pattison (Canada): This should not be taken as fact, but Guido and I have agreed on about ten thousand euros to get it set up, and about six thousand euros per year to keep it running. These are very rough estimates. That includes a person to help set up the server. But it does not include special support. So maybe we should allow ten thousand euros a year to allow for that.
- Vote to approve the money:
- The result: Yes 40, No 1, Abstain 7.

**Session is closed.**

# Minutes of the Conference in Barcelona, Spain, July 2004

## page 5

---

### Friday 23 July session 7: 9.30

Session moderated by Julie Dotsch and Graham Warwick for first item.

- We sing the Servas song.

#### General announcements

- Announcement that Tanveer Gooddo will now be the delegate for Pakistan.
  - Count of delegates – 48

**7.1 Two more workshop reports to be considered and voted on.** ITEM 4b. Graham Warwick (Canada) reports on workshop on Administration of Servas International. There is no written report.

- Mullai Pathy (Singapore) felt comments at workshop were not helpful.
- David Chai (Malaysia) complimented the report but felt it had no real conclusion to vote on. He says we should not be afraid of change but at present the proposed structure needs more work and other models need to be considered.
- Lindsay Chambers (Australia) is not convinced the proposed structure allows for adequate communication between boards.
- Frits Stuurman (General Secretary) felt that there would be a lot more bureaucracy in communication between all NGs. If 6 boards bring their reports to 100 National Groups (this is the “General Assembly” of which 60 give a reaction) there are already 360 reactions to be dealt with.

**A report of four pages (three proposals)** came out of the workshop on Power of the General Assembly and is presented by Chris Patterson (New Zealand). He says that while much of the original report was included in the proposal he felt the amended report was more acceptable and believed it could be implemented without changes to the statutes of SERVAS. The paper has three parts with three resolutions to be voted on.

- He addressed:
- Item one...
  - Member Group Voting Proposals:
  - Comments were made by Malaysia, Austria, Italy, India, Singapore, Rumania, Switzerland, Argentina, Germany, Britain, Nepal, USA, Canada, Australia, France.
  - Discussion became so bogged down it was proposed a coffee break take place and the paper be further discovered and discussed after the break.

**Meeting breaks for coffee at 11.10am.**

## **Friday 23 July session 8: 11.30**

**Start 11:45**

- Graham Warwick, moderator
- Roger Martin (President) says –on an encouraging note – that over half the participants had spoken so far at the conference.

### **8.1 Continuing the discussion of the Member Group Voting Proposal**

- Moderator Graham Warwick says that we have discussed the proposal for 2 hours already. Since we had so many critical things that we had to do, he asks if the first page could be put to a vote.
- Penny Pattison (Canada) referred to the statutes, section 6 saying that only delegates attending the assembly can vote. Therefore, this part of the proposal (page 2) will not comply with the statutes.
- Eva Dzierzawska (Poland) says that the results of the votes should be published so that we know how each country voted.
- Abhay Shaha (India) wants changes to the proposal – suggests 40 percent.
- Metta Marklund (Sweden) – is uncertain about what the vote is about.
- Roger Martin (President ) says that the present statutes were the result of six years of work by several people and additionally many hours at the conference in Guatemala, and suggested that we vote as to whether we want to change the statutes.
- Mary Jane Mikuriya (USA) Quoted statutes section 4, GA, No. 2. This proposal will not involve statutes changes, but just consultation of GA members during the 3 year term of office. She noted that some resolutions were carried with just 8 votes because of so many people abstaining.
- Moderator Graham Warwick suggested that we postpone the proposal to a later time and go on to the DFC report.
- Chris Patterson (New Zealand) raised a point of order that the decision (to postpone or not) should be the responsibility of the GA.
- Moderator Graham Warwick asked who would like to continue working with this now.
  - A majority voted in favour.
- Penny Pattison (Canada) suggested that we hear other reports in order to have a break from the discussion.
- Amir Levy (ICT): Whenever there is controversy, we postpone it. Everything is postponed until the last day. We must deal with it now.
- Jacqueline Spaak (France) Query about the percentage of people who can vote on the proposal.



- Chris Patterson (New Zealand) proposed 3 changes
  - 
  - 1.1 NG changed to “member groups”
  - Replace “present” with “eligibility to vote” if they are “in attendance in person” at GA
  - 1.3 Change at least one fifth to two fifths

Add after the last paragraph “Results of the voting to be published with a record of how member groups voted.”

- Sheldon Weeks (Botswana) Maybe it should be called a cybernetic assembly?
- Roger Martin (President) says that the statutes say that you can request a secret vote.
- Michael Johnson (AC Pacifica) says that 50% may result in a tie so we should change it.
- Jan Degrauwe (Denmark) asks for an explanation between national groups and member groups.
- Chris Patterson explained.
- Roger Martin (President) is concerned that we are deciding without proviso for a secret ballot being put in.

Voting in favour of accepting proposal so far (pages 1 & 2):

- 
- The result: Yes 37, No 6, Abstain 5, Not voting 1.
- Chris Patterson (New Zealand) Proposed for the GA to decide that items 2 & 3 (pages 3 & 4) be the first proposals to be voted on in 9 months time. Therefore, motion was withdrawn.
- Eva Meggeneder (Austria) We need to vote on the next 2 pages now as it determines the future of Servas and how we elect. Can the delegates come at 15.00 today?
- Moderator Graham Warwick says that we should meet from 3 to 4 pm today.
- There is a general consensus that this is okay.
- Gerald Hoelscher (Germany) It is good to postpone this voting for the annual member group vote so we can concentrate on the more important things.
- Michael Johnson (AC Pacifica) praises Chris for withdrawing the motion in order for us to deal with the remaining 49 items.
  - 
  - Motion - Those who wish to defer pages 3 & 4 until later, by e-mail vote.
  - The result: Yes 31, No 12, Abstain 5.

**8.2 DFC Report** Motion – Can we accept the DFC report as written without a presentation? Vote. The results: Yes 37, No 0, Abstain 11.

### **8.3 Nomination Committee Report**

- Dafni Gilad (Nom. Com.) says that the potential candidates' names are on the web.
- Participants want a paper copy so while it is printed, we go on to the Appeals Committee report.
- Claudio Pacchiera (Italy): If the new structure passes, he is only applying for host list coordinator, not all the 3 things he is written down for. Will there be a chance to make a presentation to the GA in person?

**8.4 Appeals committee Report** Can we accept the Appeals Committee report as written without a presentation?

- Mullai Pathy (Singapore) would like to know about how the Appeal Committee deals with conflict within Servas? \*\*Gerald Hoelscher (Germany) agrees with Singapore.
- Penny Pattison (Canada) agrees and says that she would like to hear if there are omissions in the report.
  - Motion – All those in favour of accepting the appeals committee report as printed?
  - The result: Yes 18, No 16, Abstain 13, Not voted 1.
- Mary Jane Mikuriya (USA) wants to know who the appeals committee reports to?
- Don Fawcett (Appeals Com.) says that it reports to the President and General Secretary and EXCO.
- Don Fawcett says that Servas Peru was asked to allow the expelled members to rejoin. The expelled members would be willing to do that in a spirit of cooperation. But there were no answers from Peru.

### **Nominations Committee Report continued**

- Dafni Gilad (Nom. Com.) says that Jamie Syer has withdrawn as candidate for SINews editor.
- Mullai Pathy (Singapore) says that, according to SI GA Thailand, convenor chairs were to be decided within the committee so it is not correct to vote on them.
- Abhay Shaha (India) Is there any criteria for SI nominations?
- Dafni Gilad (Nom. Com.) Criteria for SI are: nominee must be member for 2 years and be involved in the organization.
- Gerald Hoelscher (Germany): We must decide as to whether we allow further nominations now or not?
- Florencio Gomez (Venezuela) Keep nominations open.

- Roger Martin (President) says that the Nominations Committee, as recommended by the Thailand GA, had set March 30 as deadline, but as of then, there were not sufficient nominations, so it was extended by the Nominations Committee to 31 May.
- Abhay Shaha (India) Did nominations come through national office or directly to Dafi? Dafi Gilad confirmed that they went directly to her.
- Penny Pattison (Canada) Youth should vote for the youth coordinator.
- Mullai Pathy (Singapore) Although we call it a nominations committee, the decisions have been made by one person, therefore, it shouldn't be accepted.
- Anne Greenhough (Youth Project Coordinator) says that she was appointed by EXCO and is uncertain as to whether to apply again as there is a candidate from Canada. She is uncertain as to whether her position is elected or appointed.
- Gerald Hoelscher (Germany) suggested that we leave the list open to other candidates.
- Michael Johnson (AC Pacifica) says that 4 members of the nomination committee had dropped out, so Dafi carried on doing the job by herself. If the nomination committee had followed the deadlines, there would be no or 1 candidate only for a lot of positions. The GA gave Dafi a round of applause for carrying on by herself.
- Penny Pattison (Canada) We have not decided as to the structure of EXCO, so how can we vote?
  - Vote as to whether we keep the nominations open?
  - The results: Yes 20, No 19, Abstain 8, No vote: 1.
- Eva Meggeneder (Austria): I voted in favour because I think that we can not vote before we know the EXCO structure.
- Bibendra Pradhananga (Vice-President): Why are you scrapping the nomination's committee nominations if they are doing their job as you voted for in Thailand GA?
- Penny Pattison (Canada) We cannot vote if we don't know the structure.
  - Accepting the nominations committee report
  - The results: Yes 40, No 1, Abstain 4, No voted 3.

## **Friday 23 July session 9: 15.00**

**Julie Dotsch, moderator Count of delegates – 45**

**9.1 Reports Audit Committee and Treasurers Financial Reports** Audit Committee Report – presented by Markus Kappenburger. He shows some results of the work and what was prepared for the GA.

- Financial Report – presented by Gin Kudor, SI Treasurer. She says that in fact the only real problem she faced was that Germany, France and USA did not pay the stamp fees.

- Chris Patterson (New Zealand) Were there expenses that the Audit Committee worried about that occurred during the period prior to Thailand?
- Penny Pattison (Canada) Markus and Gin, how are you going to resolve those questions?

Both stated that it would be great to meet in Barcelona.

- Masahiro Nishiyama (Japan) Why didn't the US, France & Germany pay your dues?
- Jacqueline Spaak (France) That decision was taken in a democratic process in Dec. 2003 in France since we had no financial statements for 2001 and 2002. When the accounts are clear and given to the external audit, we will pay.
- Gerald Hoelscher (Germany) How many times did the audit committee ask the treasurer for the information? When did you ask her for the internal audit?
- Markus Kappenberger (Audit Com.) says that there were problems regarding the handover and technical problems regarding computer programs. In late 2002, two members of the audit committee met with Gin at the Poland Summer University to work on the accounts. In April 2004, the Audit Committee requested more accounts information. There were further reminders.
- Annie Kamperveen (Netherlands Antilles) Everyone could see that there was a change in the accounts since the beginning to the end. I applaud the treasurer and I hope that we can give her a standing ovation. Everyone clapped to show their appreciation.
- Amir Levy (ICT) says that we need to give the same applause to the audit committee who also worked very hard. Everyone clapped to show their appreciation.
- Rami Rafaeli (Israel) Why are there expenses for the Servas conference since we pay our own expenses while here?
- Gin Kudor (Treasurer) Funding of delegates, officers and organization team, (expenses, meals, accommodations, travels, etc.)
- John Dowsett (Britain) asked for explanations from US & Germany as to why they didn't pay their fees
- Mary Jane Mikuriya (USA:)US Servas Board are freezing the fees until all financial irregularities are cleared up. The reason for this is to get the attention of EXCO and to support EXCO in doing their job.
- Gerald Hoelscher (Germany) – German travellers are declining, therefore there is less income. Projects are needed to increase Servas Germany's income. Therefore, German Servas members are

asking where does the money go. Stamps are the biggest item but 50% of the money goes to the SI conference. Financial reports for 2001 and 2002 were not published. The money is put in an account when the conditions set out by SI GA Thailand are carried out.

- Chris Patterson (New Zealand) asks, what is the amount budgeted for conferences? 75,000 CHF was budgeted for Guatemala and Thailand. Is this the same amount as was budgeted for this conference?
- Roger Martin (President) replies, "70,000 CHF". Roger offered to give EXCO's explanations to Audit Committee's allegations. The GA indicated no at this time.
- Jenny Hoare (Australia) Australia would like to move that it be noted in the minutes that 3 countries, USA, France, & Germany chose to withhold their payments of stamp fees to EXCO. This should not be seen as a precedent for National Groups who have a disagreement with EXCO.
- Elena Otegui (Argentina) Did the US, France and Germany receive their stamps?
- Roger Martin (President) says that Germany received only 150 stamps and were told that the rest would be given upon payment.
- USA & France received their stamps since they were sent out in November and they had not told EXCO that they were going to withhold their stamp fees.
- Eva Meggeneder (Austria) If we all reacted like this, there would be nothing in the account, nor stamps.
- Susanne Thestrup (Denmark) We don't agree with not paying the stamp fee. What are German travelers doing now?
- Jacqueline Spaak (France) We did not enjoy making these decisions at our board. SI did not suffer because we did not pay our fees. She gave her apologies if any member could not attend this conference because of it.
- Mullai Pathy (Singapore) Everyone and EXCO had a chance to respond to the Audit Committee and they did not. Why do we forgive incompetence and punish those who do their job? She received funding this year to come to conference and she will not account for it, as leadership must lead by example.
- Hans Bruckman (The Netherlands) After we accept this report, everyone will pay their fees and we will all be friends again.
- Abhay Shaha (India) He wanted the spirit of Servas to prevail and for everyone to pay up.
- Ömer Özkan (Turkey) I agree with India. I am missing my German travellers. Please don't do this to Servas.
- Gerald Hoelscher (Germany) We received stamps from US, France, Israel, and Pakistan so that our travellers are not punished.

- 
- Vote in favour of accepting Audit Committee report.
- The result: Yes 33, No 1, Abstain 11.
- 
- Vote in favour of accepting Gin's financial report:
- Yes 31, No 3, Abstain 10, Not voted 1.
  
- Chris Patterson (New Zealand) says that according to our statutes, we must accept Servas International external audit accounts and auditor's reports.
- Markus Kappenberger (Audit Com.) says that he needs access to the external audit.
  
- Gin Kudor (Treasurer) says that they had previously received 2001 & 2002. On Monday morning, all delegates received 2003 report as well as the report of the external auditor.
- 
- Vote on: are we ready to make the vote on the external auditor's report?
- The results: Yes 21, No 16, Abstain 7.
  
- Roger Martin (President) quotes the statutes. Discussion.
- Penny Pattison (Canada) would like the Audit Committee and Gin, the treasurer, to meet regardless of the results of this.
- Mary Jane Mikuriya (USA) asked if the future treasurer would make efforts to collect moneys due.
- David Chai(Malaysia) says that accepting the accounts doesn't mean that Gin and the Audit Committee can't meet.
- Annie Kamperveen (Netherlands Antilles) It is natural to have conflicts. Please keep the spirit of Servas peace and solve our problems.
- Jan Degrauwe (Denmark) The theme of this conference is trust and solidarity, so let's trust that they will meet after.
- Gerald Hoelscher (Germany) If we are here in peace, and if we vote on these accounts now, all the work of the Audit Committee is a slap in the face. As it is now, we must report to our members that the GA accepted unclear books which would escalate the conflict.
- Hans Bruckman (The Netherlands) How much money is unclear?
- Markus Kappenberger (Audit Com.) We don't know as we haven't seen the books.
- Chris Patterson (New Zealand) tries to withdraw his motion. It was not accepted.
- Vote in favour of accepting the external audit and external financial report?
- The result: Yes 18, No 11, Abstain 15.

- Mullai Pathy (Singapore) wanted it recorded in the minutes that she voted no.
- NZ and France wanted it recorded in the minutes that they abstained.
- Roger Martin (President) announced that EXCO would answer any questions at 9 pm tonight.

He also says that Gin is amenable to a meeting with the Audit Committee provided that it is open to everyone.

- Markus Kappenberger (Audit Com.) says that because the GA had already approved the external audit, then it would be a waste of time for the Audit Committee to do an internal audit.

# Minutes of the Conference in Barcelona, Spain, July 2004

## page 6

---

### **Saturday 24 July session 10: 9.00**

We start with the Servas song. Julie Dotsch moderator Gerald Hoelscher (Germany) explains that Markus Kappenberger had left the Conference early today to seek medical attention. Gerald said he had felt badly treated during this Conference, particularly due to the way that Roger Martin and others had arranged the Conference.

Moderator Julie Dotch commented that there had been a rough start to the Conference but many people had tried to resolve issues and things were gradually improving. She explained how the revised timetable of agenda items had been drawn up. A group of 7 people (Roger and Frits from Exco, Julie and Graham as moderators, Eva Meggeneder from Austria, Jacqueline Spaak from France and Mario Burlando from Italy) looked at the remaining agenda items and independently graded them in order of importance from a to c, with points allocated. Related items were grouped together and the revised timetable finally compiled. (addendum.....) For the structure models, it is suggested that the model proposed by France, Germany, USA be considered first, followed by the model from the workshop group chaired by Chris Patterson (NZ), and then finally the current model. Other agenda items could be added at the end according to time available.

The ICT group says that their report will affect the election process so they had asked that it be presented first on the agenda today.

Sharon Beldon (SI News Editor) strongly recommended that Spanish and French editions of SI News continue to be published. She would like a vote on this before the end of the Conference.

Annie Kamperveen (Netherlands Antilles) says that she did not know any of the candidates standing for election. Julie says that there would be presentations about the candidates before election for each post.

John Dowsett (Britain) asked what had happened to the nominations procedure as discussed yesterday. Moderator Julie Dotsch replied that Graham will take over as chair for the elections and present the candidates, giving a full list of nominations, but first we needed to vote on the revised agenda timetable.

Amir Levy (ICT) explained that the agenda time for their report was moved from Monday to today, but the group needed to know what its mandate was so he urged the GA to vote to hear the report first today. Vote on having the ICT report as the first item: the results: Yes 45, No 0, Abstain 2.

Frits Stuurman (General Secretary) explains that the delegates from Japan and South Africa have had to leave the Conference. Count of delegates - 47

While the ICT group sets up its presentation, Moderator Julie Dotsch explains that she had not fully answered John Dowsett's question about nominations. It was still possible to take nominations from the floor. She also



reminded the GA that we had not considered items on the “parking lot” - SI News and how to resolve conflicts. She suggested including them on the agenda after the elections.

Vote on having “parking lot” items added to the agenda: The results: Yes 43, No 0, Abstain 4  
Vote on the revised agenda timetable: The results: Yes 44, No 0, Abstain 3.

10.1 ICT Report (Written report included with pre-Conference papers) Amir Levy (ICT) explains that the ICT Group was first convened in Thailand and had now been operating for 3 years. It would like to be responsible to the GA and not to Exco. It welcomed help from anyone - it was not necessary to be a computer genius! The ICT is often caught in the middle of “disagreements” when it was not clear what was wanted. ICT existed to advise on technical aspects, not to make decisions on content. Amir explained that the ICT group has a high degree of integrity, and that it does not read or act upon e-mails which are sent to the servas.org address for forwarding to the correct recipient.

Some Servas members are worried about security on internet/e-mail. The ICT group needs to have a clear mandate from the GA on what is wanted.

Moderator Julie Dotsch warmly thanks the ICT group for all its hard work. There was loud applause and a standing ovation. She asks if the GA is ready to vote on the ICT report recommendations. Discussion follows which included the following comments:

David Chai (Malaysia) asked why the ICT group did not want to be responsible to Exco, if it was voted in by a majority of the GA? The ICT group wanted to be a 3-person committee and be independent of Exco. It seemed to be planning on the “S3” structure when it had not yet been voted on. Amir Levy (ICT) replies that the ICT group had submitted its proposals many months ago; it had come to its own decisions which were not related to “S3” structure. It wished to be independent of Exco. Sean O'Fearghail (Ireland) felt that the overall mandate should come from the GA but that other decisions which needed to be made during the 3 years between conferences should be referred to Exco (unless there was a distance vote for member countries). Claudio Pacchiega (Italy) shared the concerns of David (Malaysia) and felt that the structure should be decided before voting on the ICT proposal. Dag Eirik Eikeland (Norway) felt that if the ICT acted independently from Exco then it may lead to conflicts similar to those that have happened. Guido Bienhaus (ICT) says that they have already had to take political decisions and have consulted with Exco but that mainly they should be responsible to the GA. Amir Levy (ICT) says that there had been no problems so far but they wished to be independent like other committees. Hans Bruckman (Netherlands) felt that ICT should be independent on technical aspects where possible, with its own budget, but otherwise should refer to Exco. Changxian Yi (China) asked what was the purpose of Exco if all committees were independent? Marijke Batenburg (New Zealand) congratulated the ICT team on their tremendous work. She wished to accept their report, then after elections make amendments as needed. Amir Levy (ICT) says that ICT wished to serve Servas like everyone else, its members did not wish to be officers but they did wish to be independent of Exco. Guido Bienhaus (ICT) says that it was nothing new,

that ICT had been working like this for the past 3 years, and had made decisions as needed if they were for the benefit of Servas. They have acted in a responsible way.

Vote to accept the ICT report The result: Yes 47, No 0, Abstain 0 Are ready to vote now on ICT recommendations The result: Yes 35, No 9, Abstain 3 Vote to accept ICT recommendations The result: Yes 31, No 9, Abstain 7.

Edith Vasquez-Herrera (Honduras) commented that she had found the WHALE lessons very helpful and encouraged others to take advantage of them.

10.2 The 3 different Servas structures/models. Mullai Pathy (Singapore) felt that delegates needed more information particularly on the model ('S3') proposed by France, Germany and USA. Not many had attended the workshop on SI structure and administration which related to this. Moderator Julie Dotsch introduces all 3 models: (i) the S3 model (ii) the workshop model which was developed by Chris Patterson (NZ), Chris Jones (Canada), and Claudio Pacchiega (Italy) and others following the workshop on 'power of the GA' (iii) the current structure

S3 proposal (i) was presented by Gerald Hoelscher (Germany) (see pre-conference mailing for full presentation).

The purpose is to make the organisation of Servas run more efficiently with less bureaucracy as all volunteers have constraints on their time. The GA meets 3-yearly with annual voting by distance (eg e-mail) as agreed earlier in this GA. There is therefore a need for clearly-defined groups to manage different aspects of Servas. Administration should be as lean as possible otherwise volunteers will not come forward to carry out the tasks.

Gerald Hoelscher (Germany) listed the tasks/proposed boards: 1. Host List Improvement Board to oversee the production of up-to-date and accurate host lists 2. Development Board to investigate and coordinate various development projects, manage and allocate funding, and supervise their undertaking 3. Appeals Board to actively address and handle conflicts satisfactorily within Servas starting with mediation 4. Audit Board to supervise finances and to collect receipts for reimbursement so that the organisation maintains credibility and respect 5. ICT Board as just agreed by the GA All the Boards would have a budget to work with, and the coordination of these Boards would be managed by an Exco of only 3 members. Six members would not be necessary as the work would already be covered by the various Boards.

Claudio Pacchiega (Italy) commented that we did not vote to set up the ICT Board, only to accept their recommendations. Moderator Julie Dotsch asked that delegates withhold questions until all proposals had been presented.

The second proposed model (ii) was presented by Chris Patterson (New Zealand) (see attached proposal in full).

Chris Patterson (New Zealand) outlined the differences between models (i) and (ii). These are mainly between the tightly-run boards of the S3 model (i) and this workshop model (ii) which allows for more consultation. Other points are covered in parts 2 and 3 of this proposal. This model (ii) does not involve any change in the SI statutes. If this model (ii) is accepted, Chris would include the ICT committee with the other committees listed in 3.2, so that it would be bound by the same reporting requirements.

Moderator Julie Dotsch wished to make sure that everyone was clear on what was proposed. Sheldon Weeks (Botswana) raised two points. He felt that the Audit Committee should never have financial control; the word 'supervision' should be removed from their mandate. Secondly, Sheldon understood that the S3 model (i) does not intend to abolish Area Coordinators but to replace them with something different. We should hear a presentation about this. Sheldon also suggested that the problems between the Audit Committee and Gin (Treasurer) arose because they did not meet in Budapest to work through the accounts, presumably because of the problem of distance.

David Chai (Malaysia) says that there was a long workshop on the structure. No one in the workshop knew of a non-profit organisation which had such a structure as that proposed in S3. David suggested keeping the current structure but looking seriously at the new structure proposed by NZ, Canada, Italy and others (the (ii) model) ready for full discussion at the next Conference.

Simone Dragoi (Romania) shared Sheldon's concerns about Area Coordinators. She felt they carried out a crucial role in Servas activity, particularly in local coordination and project networking.

Alex Dali (Audit Com.) responded to Sheldon's points. He says that the Audit Committee does not control finance; its role is to supervise finance and check that expenditure is according to budget. The Audit Committee asked for a meeting with Gin in Budapest but it did not happen. They had met with her at the Summer University in Poland in 2003 which was positive with good cooperation.

Moderator Julie Dotsch asked for comments and questions to be restricted to structure/models.

Mullai Pathy (Singapore) responded to David Chai's (Malaysia) comments saying that no conclusions had been reached at the structure workshop, and that there was still the third model (current structure) to consider. Regarding Area Coordinators - their roles of mediation, resolution, and project management are precisely addressed by the S3 proposal, could be covered by different boards.

Chris Patterson (New Zealand) says that the model (ii), paragraph 3.7 focused on the importance of Area Coordinators. Many of the difficulties in SI could be avoided if there was more input from National Groups through discussion and liaison between conferences. The Boards proposed by S3, (model (i)) would have quite different roles from Area Coordinators.

Gerald Hoelscher (Germany) uses 2 slides to compare the different models. With S3 there would be only 18 people to be coordinated, whereas model (ii) would have 44 and the current structure (iii) has 40. When there

are more people to be coordinated there is more possibility for conflicts and less efficiency. Financial comparisons show the differing proportions to be spent on projects S3 model (i) 47% of budget on projects Workshop model (ii) 5% of budget on projects Current model (iii) 5% of budget on projects

Chris Patterson (New Zealand) thanked the S3 group for putting together these slides but pointed out that less people does not always mean better. 18 people would be doing the work carried out by 40 or 44. If more people are involved it would encourage wider participation and they would gain international experience. As there is a surplus of income there is no major incentive to cut costs, but ways of reducing costs could be debated. Travel for Area Coordinators to attend meetings is included in the Exco budget but perhaps there should be more focus on local projects and meetings.

Penny Pattison (Canada) asked where SI News fitted into the S3 budget proposal? Has the workshop which produced model (ii) had legal advice to ensure that it does not involve a change in Statutes? Gerald Hoelscher (Germany) replies that SI News would be included with projects or that it would be published online. Chris Patterson (NZ) replies that no, they had not had legal advice but that all parts of the workshop proposal, model (ii), appeared to fall within current Statutes which enabled the GA to make decisions on how SI operates.

Rami Rafaeli (Israel) says that he felt it essential to vote first on the number of persons in Exco, then to follow with the vote on the structure. Exco should be the leading group of SI. Would we only want 3 Exco members under any structure?

Chris Patterson (NZ) agrees that the size of Exco is a key decision. He suggests that the GA vote on keeping Exco as in the existing Statutes. If the vote is not carried then the GA needs to consider other aspects of structure and Statutes too. If the vote is carried then Exco remains the same.

Vote to keep the current structure of Exco: The result: Yes 26, No 12, Abstain 8 The motion was carried. Exco keeps its current structure of 6 members.

Penny Pattison (Canada) asks if Germany, France, USA wished to alter their proposal, the S3 model (i) to have 6 Exco members. Gerald Hoelscher (Germany) replies that no, the proposed model is defeated.

Chris Patterson (New Zealand) clarifies with Gerald that the S3 proposal was now withdrawn. There are now 2 models to vote on: the workshop model (ii) or the current model (iii).

Vote in favour of the new workshop model (ii): The result: Yes 17, No 18, Abstain 11. The motion was defeated. The current model (iii) therefore continues.

Moderator Julie Dotsch suggested that perhaps some of the structure suggestions could be considered ready for the next Conference. Eva Meggeneder (Austria) felt that the proposal from France, Germany and USA (the S3 model (i)) should also be included in this as there were many excellent points. There was general agreement that the close vote indicated there should be changes and that Exco should look at all suggestions.

10.3 Abolishing the office of Area Coordinator Is a vote necessary about abolishing the Area Coordinator office? The answer is NO! Applause, we keep the office of Area Coordinator.

Jacqueline Spaak (France) commented that at the beginning of the Conference she and others felt rejected but thanks to the organisation they now felt reconciled and included, and that we could all work together towards a consensus.

Michael Johnson (AC Pacifica) says that the purpose of coming early to the Conference was to allow time for discussion of proposed changes but time constraints prevented this. This should be remembered when the next Conference takes place.

Saturday 24 July session 11: 11.30

Gerald Hoelscher (Germany) discovered he had no right to speak on behalf of Servas US+France; he spoke on behalf of Servas Germany when talking about S3 proposals being defeated.

Moderator Graham Warwick: We are now approaching the nominations

11.1 Nominations and elections A committee shall make notes: Helga Smith, Judith Benneth, Margaret, Chris Jones: flip chart & projector to show nominations of Exco

President: Bibendra, Rob van Bavel, Geoff Maltby -no further nominations from the floor

Vice President: Bibendra, John Kinene Hopekins, Gurdev Singh, Chandrashekhar Pardeshi, Claudio Pacchiega -no further nominations from the floor

Treasurer: Jane Giffould, Dhruba Lall, Ömer Özkan nomination from the floor Gin nomination from the floor -no further nominations from the floor

General Secretary: Geoff Maltby, Honora Clemens -no further nominations from the floor

Host List Coordinator: John Kinene Hopekins, Claudio Pacchiega -no further nominations from the floor

Peace Secretary: Mahipala Banda Adikaram, Chandrashekhar, Gary Sealey, Abhay Shaha, Miroslaw Wasilewski -no further nominations from the floor

All nominations closed for Exco positions.

Opportunity for the nominees to make a presentation. Time is critical, no more than 3 minutes! (experience with subject, in Exco, availability in terms of time) Decided in discussion that the only people who have a right to present are the people here in person

11.2 Presentation of Exco candidates and elections

Nominees for the position of president:

Bibendra: Servas member for 18 years; has been host list coordinator, nat sec, area coordinator and was elected vice president in Thailand. His purpose is to work for Servas; if he is elected, his whole effort would be to have less conflict, less misunderstanding, make it more peaceful. Geoff and Rob are not there; Guido Bienhaus (ICT) we have a dvd presentation of Geoff who has been really active and is helping with the ict etc. - dvd show agreed. When looking and listening to the dvd presentation the audience is as quiet as a mouse. It is decided to be fair to all candidates it is necessary to read out a piece from their presentations Particulars of Rob van Bavel are brought on the screen; The letter is read out by Graham)

Vote for the position of president (47 ballot papers are distributed and taken after vote)

Nominees for the position of vice president: Bibendra: wanted to add that this is his 4th conference (Australia, Guatemala, Thailand, Barcelona) Gurdev Singh: joined Servas in 1988; this is his 3rd Conference; has attended two regional Conferences (Nepal, Singapore); attended almost all national conferences; highlighted the need for having area coordinators, has made several suggestions; we have very little interaction between the various levels of Servas (eg meetings between Exco and Area Coordinators ...); he wants to bring about greater interaction Chandrashekhar Pardeshi: letter read out by Graham John Kinene Hopekins: letter read out by Graham. Denys (area coordinator for John Kinene who cannot be here because he was refused a visa): John Kinene is a great organiser and has raised a lot of money for Servas in Africa but has no experience outside his own country

Results of the election for the President: 8 votes for Bibendra, 34 votes for Geoff, elected president, 5 votes for Rob.

That leaves one nominee for General Secretary: Honora Clemens deemed elected

Ballots distributed for the election of the Vice President.

Nominees for the position of Treasurer: Dhruva Pradhan: letter read out by Graham Jane Giffould: letter read out by Graham Ömer Özkan: difficult decision for me; computer engineer, good with numbers; dealing with international accounts, working for hspc bank - financial department; has relations to bank (makes technical things easier) Gin: a lot already could be heard about and from her; now she knows what to do and how to do it; will need more help for the future than in the past

Michael Johnson (AC Pacifica) question Is it possible for a person voting for himself? --- yes - secret ballot

Results of the election for the Vice-President: 23 votes for Bibendra elected VP, 4 votes for Chandrashekhar, 12 votes for Gurdev, 6 votes for John, 2 spoiled ballots.

Nominees for position of Host List Coordinator: John Kinene Hopekins: letter has already been read Claudio Pacchiaga: Servas member for about 20 years; profession: computer programmer; helping Servas Italy since 1998 (host list coordinator and deputy in Italy); was member of ICT until a short time ago (quit because of personal problems); sees lists not as number, but as people who he can help. Question Eva Meggeneder

(Austria): there have been rumours that he is also working on the website of the Hospitality Club - can he assure there won't be a clash of interests? Claudio: knows that in Servas, issue of computers is delicate; Servas has specifics that have to be handled; Hospitality club is a similar organisation; some other Servas members are also members of HC; he is not serving any organisation, he is helping organisations.

Eva Meggeneder (Austria) the question was how this would effect your work with Servas? Claudio: It will not effect my work.

Results of the election for the Treasurer: 0 votes for Dhruba, 4 votes for Jane, 21 votes for Ömer, 20 votes for Gin, 2 spoiled ballots. No clear majority (you must get more than half the votes) - another vote between Ömer and Gin. Ballot papers issued

Chris Patterson (New Zealand): Claudio, would you be prepared to renounce the contact with the Hospitality Club if you work for Servas? Mullai Pathy (Singapore): this is not an issue about personal membership; HC has a history of transferring data over. Jacqueline Spaak (France): what about the pilot project about the HC Roger has spoken about? Mary Jane Mikuriya (USA): we could have a non-disclosure guarantee Claudio could sign (to keep our lists secret). Claudio Pacchiega (Italy): agrees that non-disclosure guarantee is important; thinks that decisions should be made by the Exco, not persons alone.

Results of the second election for the Treasurer: 24 votes for Ömer elected Treasurer, 21 votes for Gin, 2 spoiled ballots.

Nominees for position of Peace Secretary: Abhay Shaha: Buddha and Gandhi were walking the streets of peace for the world; peace secretary should work hard for peace; working with Servas to develop Servas; when he met Gary, he found he too is strong enough to work for peace; I will be the first person to congratulate him if he is elected. Gary Sealey: got a lot of encouragement here (outgoing peace secr., outgoing Exco,...); when he started working on the peace file in Servas, he was curious that there is not a lot of sharing going on in the peace activities - encourages transparency and more participation on the national level; brief summary of background (worked for government; in the last ten years he worked with NGOs); learned here that it would be useful to make some changes in how we treat peace within Servas: key peace messages (essentially the 8 development goals); peace in Servas is not just a peace secretary - it is all of us! So I want to establish a stronger peace network within Servas, work with the national secretaries to establish "peace action plans"; "peace starter kit" for no national groups; need for a more explicit peace budget at an international level in Servas. Would like to encourage more people to participate in the UN activity.

Results of the election for the Host List Coordinator: 25 votes for Claudio, elected HLC, 7 votes for John, 15 spoiled ballots.

Three more nominees for Peace Secretary: Mirosław Wasilewski: letter read out by Ewa (Poland) Mahipala Adikaram: letter read out by Graham Chandrashekar Pardeshi: letter read out earlier by Graham

Elections for Peace Secretary; ballots are passed out

Results of the election for the Peace secretary: 7 votes for Abhay, 0 votes for Chandrashekhar, 36 votes for Gary, elected Peace Secretary, 7 votes for Miroslaw, 1 vote for Mahipala, 1 spoiled ballot.

Roger Martin (President): before we hand over, there are some people who need special thanks: Daniele Passalacqua who has moderated Servasnet; Jaqueline from France for establishing the Francophone Africa area; Geoff for a very clean handover of the host list coordinators job to Laura; Vibeke for her help and advice on cultural matters; Ann Greenough for her work coordinating youth work in the time before she was appointed Youth Coordinator. Roger expressed his wishes for the GA's attitude to the new Exco in the form of a prayer:

You have a new Exco; rejoice and be thankful. Treat them with kindness, for they are giving up a part of their lives for you. Give them encouragement frequently - even when they disappoint you - for they will appreciate it, and will be moved on to new heights of achievement. And forgive their small failings, for they are no less human than you or I. Take good care of them, and Servas will grow and prosper. And look forward to seeing them together at the next crossroads, where and whenever that may be.

Saturday 24 July session 12: 15.00

Graham Warwick, moderator

#### 12.1 Election SI News editor Nominations for SI newsletter editor: VOTES

Jane Giffould -Britain 19 Jonathan Coutts-Zawadzki - Canada 1 John Kinene Hopekins, Uganda 2 Kinya Tsuge - Japan 3 Laxmi Amatya - Nepal 15

Graham had previously read the letter from Jane Giffould and Kinya Tsuge. Penny Pattison (Canada) says that Jonathan had applied for newsletter editor and youth delegate. Denys Whitehead had spoken earlier about John Kinene Hopekins. Laxmi's letter was read earlier.

The winner didn't receive over half the votes, so there was a re-vote between Jane Giffould and Laxmi Amatya.

Results: 24 votes for Jane Giffould, 17 votes for Laxmi Amatya. Jane Giffould is the new editor of SI news.

12.2 Vote about SI News in Spanish and French Sharon Belden, previous SI News editor, had previously moved that the SI News continue to be published in French and Spanish, as well as English. Vote: The results: Yes 38, No 0, Abstain 4

12.3 Addition to member group voting process Chris Patterson (New Zealand): moves that "Matters for consideration by the member group voting process may be raised with EXCO by Member Groups and Servas committees. The text of any resulting agenda item shall be drafted by the proposer in consultation with EXCO". Vote to approve this addition: The result: Yes 39, No 2, Abstain 2.



12.4 About Appointment of Area Coordinators Marijke Batenburg (New Zealand) Motion: that “Area coordinators, where practical, be appointed by EXCO on the joint recommendation of the national groups in the area”.

Discussion Frits Stuurman (General Secretary): In the last Exco period, National Groups chose their Area Coordinator if possible and EXCO appointed the chosen AC. According to the statutes Exco appoints, but we endorsed that the area chose their own candidate. Mary Jane Mikuriya (USA) All areas and countries are different and some don't need area coordinators. Area Coordinators should be chosen depending on the need in the countries and areas. Laura Ragucci (Host List Coordinator): It is not always possible to elect an Area Coordinator. For example in East Africa there would not be a candidate and no National Groups to choose from. Martha Edith Vasquez-Herrera (Honduras) Can't speak for all people in Central America as they are not here. An election should be organised by the current AC Abhay Shaha (India) Should there be time limit to nominate area coordinators? Annie Kamperveen (Netherlands Antilles) In the Caribbean we need an AC Mullai Pathy (Singapore) Singapore had sent in a recommendation. She finds it difficult to find out how GA wants to use its time. Eva Meggeneder (Austria) Can't find it in the statutes. If GA doesn't elect, EXCO can appoint? Cesar Baron (Brazil) We need clear rules from EXCO. Right now, we don't know how to act. Mullai Pathy (Singapore) Servas doesn't follow regulations and procedures. When decisions were made, there were no minutes. Singapore had a problem and it was brushed aside. Moderator Julie Dotsch From someone who has worked on the statutes, I must first learn of the will of GA. Then, if necessary we can change the statutes after. Frits Stuurman (General Secretary) EXCO follows the will of the area. Anita Kalbermann (AC South America) We were going to decide on our area coordinator here by vote. However, the problem is “who is qualified to vote”? Penny Pattison (Canada) Clarification re: member groups and countries. Member groups means that they have 10 members. David Chai (Malaysia): SE Asia had a meeting 2 days ago and chose an area coordinator. Can the new EXCO say no, we won't appoint the AC although the majority voted her in? Mullai Pathy (Singapore) Countries were supposed to send in proposals 6 months ago. Servas Singapore sent in a proposal and it is not on the agenda. New topics should not be addressed as then we go round in circles. Moderator Julie Dotch clarified that this was not a new item. Penny Pattison (Canada) We agreed on this. This doesn't need to be resolved now. Let's leave this as other things need more time.

Are we ready to vote on Marijkes motion “Area coordinators, where practical, be appointed by EXCO on the joint recommendation of the national groups in the area”? The result: Yes 26, No 4, Abstain 14  
Vote on the motion itself: The result: Yes 27, No 3, Abstain 14

Carmen Mora (Costa Rica) Would like to set a deadline for countries to send their recommendations. Martha Edith Vasquez-Herrera (Honduras) Can we meet after this meeting? Anita Kalbermann (AC South America) explains it in Spanish. Cesar Baron (Brazil) It is not clear how all this will happen. Who is in charge of this? Moderator Julie Dotsch says that this is a procedural position and EXCO should decide on this. EXCO will make a timeline for all countries to decide on their area coordinator. Annie Kamperveen (Netherlands Antilles)

The Caribbean speaks English, French and Spanish. We have been neglected. Moderator Julie Dotsch requested that you write your concerns to EXCO soon.

12.5 Should an auditor be elected by GA or appointed by EXCO? Roger Martin (President) The way that it has been handled for the last 2 terms of EXCO is Exco hired a professional auditor. Penny Pattison (Canada) moved that GA decide that EXCO will engage a paid professional external auditor. Vote on this: The result: Yes 36, No 3, Abstain 5

12.6 Nominations Committee discussion Mary Jane Mikuriya (USA) Nomination committee should be elected by the GA, screen candidates and should be independent. Dafi Gilad (Nom. Com.) says that the candidates so far for the nominations committee are Dafi Gilad and Frits Stuurman

12.7 A professional bookkeeper will be engaged to keep the accounts if SI Penny Pattison (Canada) Canada came up with this motion. Mullai Pathy (Singapore) Standards are different in different countries. Who will decide what standards? Sean O'Feaghail (Ireland) I don't see any purpose in hiring a bookkeeper. We have just elected a treasurer to do this. Gerald Hoelscher (Germany) Where do we get the money for this? Gin Kudor (Treasurer) Our proposed budget doesn't include this. If the next treasurer doesn't have this knowledge, then we will need to hire a bookkeeper. David Chai (Malaysia) Does our new bookkeeper (Omar) think that we need a bookkeeper?

# Minutes of the Conference in Barcelona, Spain, July 2004

## page 7

---

Ömer Özkan (Turkey) I think we don't need a bookkeeper. I have knowledge on computers and programming. I do not need it.

Demelza Lewis (Malawi) Bookkeeper does the day to day things. It requires lots of time.

Penny Pattison (Canada) withdraws motion since the present treasurer doesn't feel the need for a bookkeeper.

Jacqueline Spaak (France) says good-bye as she has to leave and another person is taking her place.

### 12.8 Committee & committee chair selection discussion

Mullai Pathy (Singapore) In Thailand, several independent committees were established and given the right to replace members who resigned. We must go back on what was decided in Thailand. Otherwise, it is totally illogical.

Alex Dali (Audit Com.) endorses Mullai. Says that the independent committees chose their own chair. If they don't do that, they are no longer independent.

Roger Martin (President) It is the right of the GA to set up any committee and determine how they operate.

Penny Pattison (Canada) moved that the members of the DFC, audit & nominations be elected at GA and then, they chose their chair. Eva Meggeneder (Austria) Appointed or elected?

David Chai (Malaysia) These committees were elected in Thailand. GA should vote to continue or not these committees and members or committees.

Bibendra Pradhananga (Vice-President)– GA has the authority to do as it wishes.

Mullai Pathy (Singapore) All committees should have the same rules. ICT appointed a new chair. We have been sabotaged by those who don't know the procedures.

Coffee break

### 12.9 Adopt a budget and decide upon fees

Elizabeth Sebestyen (Canada) presents the results of the workshop Budget 2005-2007. Other committee members are Alex Dali, Gyongyver Kudor, Jan Degrauwe.

SI is in a healthy financial position.

Version A of presented budget is a compromise among the 3 members.

Version B is Audit Committee's version of the budget presented by Alex. Alex says that it cuts administration. Area Coordinators' budget is set at zero. Alex says that development should be a priority of all countries.

Laura Ragucci (Host List Coordinator) says that we have 9 area coordinators rather than 7. She is not happy with the fact that there is no budget for ACs in version B.

Hans Bruckman (The Netherlands) suggests that we only discuss the version A because B is not acceptable.

Mary Jane Mikuriya (USA) Are yearly budgets for 1 year or can the total be used when appropriate?

John Dowsett (Britain) Has a high level of reserves (high level of keeping). Money should be put into projects or development work.

Michael Johnson (AC Pacifica) wonders how to proceed with AC Pacifica. Penny Pattison (Canada) Canada's motion to change Pacifica's area.

Mullai Pathy (Singapore) Very few ACs spent their money. Others spent little. ICT was right on budget. DFC had no budget and absorbed their expenses. It is necessary to commit yourself to the ideals. Don't give money out like candy. The DFC didn't get a chance to present their report. This whole conference was set up to be a failure.

Claudio Pacchiega (Italy) ICT budget: is this enough money since it has been reduced? Guido Bienhaus (ICT) Yes, we have been consulted and we can work with this.

Sean O'Fearghail (Ireland) Is the Audit Committee budget based on the rejected US, France & German proposal? Alex Dali says no.

Sean O'Fearghail (Ireland) Where is the SI news? Elizabeth & Gin say that it is in printing.

Marijke Batenburg (New Zealand) Does the money direct go to the area coordinator or does he have to show a plan?

Alex Dali (Audit Com.) Presently, there is no formal procedure to transfer this money to the new coordinator. I believe that the (outgoing) officer should immediately transfer this money to SI account.

Marijke Batenburg (New Zealand) There should be a formal application before the money is handed over.

Elizabeth Sebestyen (Canada) We will be presenting financial guidelines.

Rami Rafaeli (Israel) We should learn from the last executive who are here. EXCO, which of these versions is possible to manage the organization?

Gin Kudor (Treasurer) Version B does not allow EXCO to meet yearly.

Simone Dragoi (Romania) What does development concretely mean? To which extent are the regional level or individual countries involved? For information infrastructure maintenance, it might be too much to have it done yearly? A parallel budget detailed development plan should have been presented as well.

Elizabeth Sebestyen (Canada) Development is not the responsibility of this committee.

That is up to EXCO or others to decide. Version B puts the area coordinators money into the development fund. Some countries like Canada & Australia donate to the development fund.

Abhay Shaha (India) Version B puts a good amount of money into projects. I want to see money for area coordinators and for projects.

Anne Greenhough (Youth Project Coordinator) says she is concerned that the new EXCO needs some freedom of movement to make their own priorities. This budget seems very restrictive. She is concerned that there is no leeway for EXCO. She would like the backing of the assembly that EXCO can directly fund projects. ie. Youth, who are the future of Servas. More emphasis on youth, the future of Servas. Seeking support for this.

Florencio Gomez (Venezuela) I disagree with reducing Exco so much. EXCO needs to meet yearly and this restricts EXCO and especially their annual meetings.

Moderator Julie Dotsch says that even if you don't agree, we need to vote in order to give direction to EXCO. Are we ready to vote about the two versions?

The result: Yes 32, No 5, Abstain 5 Not voted 1.

Vote on adopting one of the two versions:

The result: Version A 27, Version B 10, Abstain 6.

#### 12.10 Determine which committees are to exist for the coming term of office

Penny Pattison (Canada) moves that the GA keeps all current committees, elect nominations committee, and they can handle gathering names for other committees. EXCO can use the new system to have elections for all other committees.

Mullai Pathy (Singapore) Thailand GA gave DFC committee to cover youth. In Thailand, it was decided that the development committee included the youth committee. This has been confused because EXCO has appointed a youth coordinator without giving her a budget. The DFC has given money to youth. I sense a feeling that this GA would like all those committees rolled back. I would like to give up all responsibilities for the DFC because there has been no discussion about it.

Eva Meggeneder (Austria) says that many of us don't know the process of motions.

Gin Kudor (Treasurer) states that the statutes state that committees end their term no more than 3 months after GA. Therefore, we have soon no committees at all.

Bibendra Pradhananga (Vice-President) says that he thought that the youth coordinator was elected at Thailand conference.

Amir Levy (ICT) We discuss the same things at every conference. If committees are working well, let's continue.

Anne Greenhough (Youth Project Coordinator) I was national secretary of GB at Thailand. There is a general feeling that the youth project should now be at the centre of Servas, not a sideline. We don't want to lose the enthusiasm of the youth present here. I need to know whether I need to be elected or not? Please let me know.

Frank Berauer (AC South East Asia) Let us make these decisions now.

Marijke Batenburg (New Zealand) Statutes say we vote for 6 to 25 members but not committees.

Michael Johnson (AC Pacifica) I would appreciate having the vote now. However, it could be done remotely if need be.

Gerald Hoelscher (Germany) says that he would like it recorded that he has been observing the procedures here. Ann Greenough does not have speaking rights. Other formal procedures have not been followed.

Anne Greenhough (Youth Project Coordinator) says that she did have speaking rights, as does all the other appointed committees, eg. ICT. We need a bit of flexibility here (applause).

Vote on Canada's motion of electing the Nomination Committee now.

The result: Yes 38, No 1, Abstain 2

Permission to destroy the ballots given.

12.11 Nominations committee elections

Moderator Graham Warwick asks for nominations for the Nomination Committee:

Frits Stuurman, Netherlands –

Anita Kabberman, Uruguay –

Dafi Gilad, Canada –

Nominations closed after Graham asked for further nominations 3 times. The above is the new Nomination Committee.

Chris Patterson (New Zealand) says that, before we leave, it is essential to get

1. Signatures of signing authority.
2. Delegating to EXCO to appoint the committees that have not been elected using new election process. They must be elected at a GA or elected in the new way.

Gin Kudor (Treasurer) says that it was recommended that the president and treasurer be the signing authorities. Amir Levy (ICT) says that it is essential for GA to elect the committees now.

Motion the GA directs EXCO to appoint the people who are elected by the email or mail vote to the positions they were elected to (committees). Vote.

The result: Yes 37, No 2, Abstain 5

Gerald Hoelscher (Germany) wants it recorded that Servas Germany voted no.

## 12.12 Youth proposal

Moderator Julie Dotsch says that the youth has spent a long time on a proposal. The proposal has been circulated. Anne Greenhough (Youth Project Coordinator) says that EP stands for experienced person. YP stands for young person. Propose a youth forum, a communication channel to fit under peace secretary or vice-president.

Ann Greenough, GB and Pablo Chufeni, Argentina would like to put themselves forward as EP and YP. Laura Ragucci, also from Argentina would be mentor.

Gerald Hoelscher (Germany) says that he has a formal complaint that he would like it recorded that it is not fair that things are thrown at us at the last minute. Long working committees have not had a chance to report, but ad hoc, last minute proposals have.

Anita Kalbermann (AC South America) says that the youth project has been very successful in this conference and that the candidates are here now.

Abhay Shaha (India) says that the ICT budget is 25% but it is important to support youth

Mullai Pathy (Singapore) wants to remove the sentence that Singapore was positive, from the report.

Anne Greenhough (Youth Project Coordinator) explains that the person concerned was not Mullai, but Diane Petersen from Singapore, Josh's grandmother.

David Chai (Malaysia) Youth are future Servas hosts. Go for it! Allow them 5 minutes.

Cesar Baron (Brazil) No doubt youth is important but we must follow the rules.

Are we ready to vote on the youth proposal/model?

The result: Yes 37, No 2, Abstain 3.

Vote in favour of youth model:

The result: Yes 35, No 1, Abstain 7.

Penny Pattison (Canada) Does the approved report include the appointment of Ann Greenough & Pablo Chufeni?

Moderator Julie Dotsch: Answer: Yes it does.

Mireille Charles (France) wants it mentioned in the minutes that "Servas France needs to answer questions from their national GA. Therefore, Servas France would like to ask for a vote to allow the Audit Committee to check the bookkeeping 2001/2002/2003 with the former treasurer in order to have transparency of the accounts". But this is not coming up for discussion now.

Because of time restrictions, Moderator Julie Dotsch closes the meeting at 7:15 pm.

Julie and Graham received a standing ovation for moderating the meetings.

Frits Stuurman

General Secretary of Exco 2001

With many thanks to all helpers for making drafts.



# Audit Committee presentation

---

During his presentation, Markus pointed out that :

## Responsibility of the Audit Committee

- The members of the Audit committee are elected by the GA
- The Audit committee received a mandate from the GA and is therefore independent.
- Based on the GA 2001 decision, the role of the Audit committee is to make internal auditing of SI expenses, supervision, analysis, interpretation, and advice to EXCO 2001-2004, as well as ongoing monitoring of actual-to-budget interim financial statements

## Internal Auditing finding

- Under the review of the bookkeeping 2001, the Audit committee found that 10525 CHF are missing from the bookkeeping 2001
- Many accounts of former servas officers are incorrect
- Some expenses from one EXCO 2001-2004 member (CHF 879, 95) could not be found.
- The Audit committee has rejected officially the external audit report showing many important errors
- The credibility of the certified external auditor has been put into question
- The financial statement 2001 is incorrect
- The financial statement 2002 is incorrect
- The financial statement 2003 was not received
- Travel Funding Process for the GA – the Application rules not respected by EXCO 2001-2004

## Difficulties

- The internal audit of the accounts 2001 were blocked by EXCO 2001-2004
- The internal audit of the accounts 2002 were blocked by EXCO 2001-2004
- Gin refused to collaborate with the Audit committee
- Our legitimate questions about the accounts were not answered by Gin, the Treasurer
- Our 12 official complaints to the Appeals committee have not been replied – these complaints are related to mainly on unclear financial accounts, breach of the statutes of Servas International, breach of the GA decisions. The Appeals committee has refused to address these complaints made against EXCO 2001-2004
- EXCO 2001-2004 has blocked the Audit committee of any funding for our office expenses

The Audit committee has proposed to four workshops : 1. Complete review of the bookkeeping with Gin, the SI Treasurer [refused by EXCO 2001-2004] 2. Review of the financial guidelines distributed in the last 6 months to

all NGs [accepted but the result could not be presented for a vote] 3. Presentation of several stamp Fee Model [blocked by Roger Martin during his own workshop] 4. A training session on bookkeeping, especially for the SI Treasurer and all NSs. [blocked by EXCO 2001-2004]

Markus finished his presentation with the following sentence :

The Road to Trust and Solidarity passes by Teaming, Open Dialogue, Clear Accounts and Transparency.

[|Powerpoint presentation of the final reports of the Audit Committee 2001-2004 \(section Final reports of the Audit Committee 2001-2004 item number 2\)](#)