

## MINUTES OF THE 18th EM - VIRTUAL (EXTENSION OF 16th and 17th EMs) II SESSION

September 5, 2023, 5:00 pm Rome time

Participants:

**Austria:** Roswitha Wutscher, Gabriele Schrumpf (GS)

**Belgium and Luxemburg:** Charlotte de Vos (CDV), Marie-Jeanne Laurent

**Cyprus:** Lena Nicolaou (LN)

**Finland:** Raija Partanen (RP), Eve Pylkkänen

**France (F.A.M.A.T.):** Marianne von Knorring, Catherine Refabert (CR), Isabelle Cheval (IC), Isabelle Lobadowsky,

**Germany:** Renate Thost-Stetzler,

**Greece:** Gianna Gravia-Kalyva, Rozmari Nikolakopoulou, Sissy Avgerinou (SA)

**Italy:** Donatella Maestri, Donatella Nicolich (DN), Daniela Soderi, Luisa Vinciguerra (LV)

**Sweden:** Gertie Stenkula, Agneta Larsson

**Switzerland:** Marlis Chanton, Rosita Geiger

**The Netherlands:** Joke Emmelkamp (JE), Susanne Mettelkamp Beetz

**Turkey:** Gulgun Dolunay

The Agenda was as follows:

1. Observations on the guidelines for submission of an amendment to a proposal or motion at Convention 2024
2. Amendments
3. Choice of the 4 mentors who, in addition to the founders Luisa Vinciguerra and Catherine Refabert, will support the organization of the following EMs for 3 consecutive years – from Convention to Convention
4. Host country for the next EM
5. Presentation of a draft website for the European Meetings e-Library
6. Inner Wheel and the UN
7. Answer organizing Team European Rally Berlin: Edda Biermann
8. District 222 Alasia's response
9. Miscellaneous

Donatella Maestri NR Italy welcomed all the participants and apologized for being unable to attend the previous meeting in July.

DN started the meeting by giving the floor to Luisa Vinciguerra for the first item on the Agenda.

### **Observations on the guidelines for submission of an amendment to a proposal or motion at Convention 2024**

LV: for the first time, a guideline was drafted regarding submitting amendments to the Proposals and General Motion published in the booklet. The function of an amendment is severely restricted. The amendment cannot negate the proposal and cannot include new material in it. Proposals' words, sentences, and paragraphs can be deleted, and new wording can be added to make the original proposal more acceptable to the voting delegates.

But, the amendment is a more or less extensive change to a text, especially a normative one, and it can be additional, suppressive, replacement, or modifying a proposal. Until the 18th Convention, each GB, IIW included, submitted amendments of all kinds as long as they were valid and improve the proposal, as the Constitution does not dictate limits. LV observed that:

1. There is a progressive limitation in the number of proposals accepted despite the correctness
2. There are interventions by the CC on the proposals, changing their original meaning

3. The proposer or the seconder cannot amend their proposals.

The reasons mentioned above point to a drift that does not respect the Constitution as a guideline modifies the Constitution.

CR thanked LV for having summed up so well the problems arising in the drafting of amendments. She observed that one is not motivated to propose amendments with these guidelines.

GS reported having trouble putting an amendment she wanted to submit in the template and thinks we are losing democracy.

LV added that if new additions are not allowed in the amendments, one can only reword it; this is the District Committee's duty for administrative checking and suitability of wording.

JE wondered if the IIV GB is expected to dictate rules for amending proposals.

RP asked if the CC has the right to make such changes.

LV said that if you examine the evolution of the role of the CC over the years, you observe that it has changed a lot in the last ones. Moreover, the Constitution does not clarify the CC, CCC, and EC duties. CR: last year, we did tremendous work in the EM analyzing the whole Constitution to find the parts that we thought needed to be changed or improved, and out of 45 proposals, only twelve were accepted.

### **Amendments**

LV introduced her thoughts about proposal 10 that the CC changed, preventing the possibility of being a member of more IWC. She pointed out that Rotary has recently allowed membership in more clubs worldwide. This opportunity created enormous possibilities for services, cooperation, and club collaboration. The proposal in the booklet allows only one e-club inside a district, which is very reductive. Renate asked if the CC explained as to why the proposal was changed.

LV replied that her club was not directly informed.

LV presented the amendment to Proposal 10, which IWC Chateroux will propose and IWC Trieste second.

CR: if the amendment is admitted, we all must support it because it significantly improves our Association, especially in Europe, where the membership is declining and few young members join IW.

GS proposed to meet again after the publication of the final Agenda to discuss it and decide who will speak in favor of the proposals or amendments. She asked if DN would be willing to organize such a meeting.

DN replied that she had no problem organizing a Zoom meeting in January after IWD.

GS has prepared an amendment to proposal 14, which she presented in the last meeting. IWC of Trieste will second it. DN explained that, even if it is not required, she will also inform the District Committee in the meeting on September 23 of the two amendments.

RP asked about the proposal of raising the capitation fee, remarking that it would be a big problem for Finland, and asked Charlotte if she had the opportunity to speak with Sissel. CDV replied that she hasn't because she prefers to talk at the Convention. Charlotte regrets that of all the work done last year by the European Proposal Group, only a few were accepted and, in some cases, changed. The most innovative proposals that could have brought real change and progress in the Association were not accepted.

Marianne said preparing well for discussing proposals and amendments at the Convention is necessary. CDV replied that this requires getting together before the Convention, focusing only on the most important proposals, and working like one team.

IC asked if a proposer or a seconder does not go to the Convention, is the proposal or the amendment still valid? CDV replied that according to the Constitution, any member nominated by a voting delegate can present the proposal or the amendment.

**Choice of the 4 mentors who, in addition to the founders Luisa Vinciguerra and Catherine Refabert, will support the organization of the following EMs for 3 consecutive years – from Convention to Convention**

DN: in the last meeting, we agreed to choose, according to the proposal of GS 4 mentors, to support the organization of the following 3 EMs. Are there any availabilities? DN suggested Charlotte and Gaby.

GS suggested Sissy and Joke because they are experienced, having attended many EMs.

In the end, five names were proposed: Gaby, Charlotte, Sissy, Joke, and Donatella. GS suggested that the participants will write to Donatella indicating their preferences.

SA suggested that five members can be nominated if no others are interested in the job for this time.

**Host country for the next EM**

DN asked if there was any country candidate for hosting the 19EM in September 2024.

CR asked, whereas in the past, there had been an EM in the year of the Convention.

DN replied that in September 2024, it would be another IW Year – 2024-25.

Gulgun said that Turkey would be happy to host the EM.

GS, according to the idea put forward in the July meeting – NDC could also host an EM -asked the Budapest club to host the EM. GS invited all, on behalf of the Budapest club, to the next EM meeting. The Budapest club will only organize the venue while the mentors and founders prepare the business sessions. GS added that there are 4 clubs in Hungary – they are not interested in establishing a District at the moment, but it would be nice to show them what they miss!

CR suggested that two small countries can organize the EM together.

In the end, it was decided that as for the mentors, DN will collect the choices.

RP reminded everyone that the next rally will be in Finland, but it has to be decided which country is hosting the following one. She suggested including this item in the Agenda of the next meeting.

**Presentation of a draft website for the European Meetings e-Library**

Dn introduced a draft website she created to collect all the documents regarding the European Meetings, the Rallies, and other material.

CDV in Rimini proposed the creation of a user-friendly website with regular updates.

This website should include different sections:

Map of European countries with links to websites / social media

Documents from the European Rally

Documents from the European Meeting of National Representatives

European Projects – Women for Europe : The role of IW

Cross borders meetings

E-Library

E-training basic modules

DN tried to build a draft EU website using Google Sites, which allows creating and editing websites without requiring coding knowledge or other web design skills.

Google Sites can be a workable solution if you want a free way to build a straightforward website.

For now, the website is only visible to everyone as far as the structure is concerned. To access and download the documents, authorization must be requested from DN because the documents are located on her drive. Everyone can access the documents without authorization using Google Workspace, which, however, entails a payment.

DN added that the website is still in progress, and she awaits inputs and documents from everyone.

She will share it with all interested people to allow them to see and download all the documents.

GS and LV offered to share all the missing documents from the previous EM.

## Inner Wheel and the UN

GS presented a report about Inner Wheel and the UN.

The United Nations was founded in 1945 to foster the international understanding of countries and to avoid wars. GS briefly explained the Charter of the UN. The Headquarter is located in NEW YORK; the other 4 places are VIENNA, GENEVA, and NAIROBI. The UN-System consists of 6 Main Institutions and many other institutions. The 6 main Institutions are:

The General Assembly, The Council of Security, The Economy and Social Council (ECOSOC), The Trusteeship Council, The International Court of Laws, The Office of Administration and the Secretary.

International Inner Wheel has an observing status in ECOSOC. ECOSOC fosters economic and social cooperation to get stability and prosperity to guarantee peaceful living between countries. ECOSOC has 54 member Countries and promotes working together in Culture, Health, Education, and Realizing Human Rights. It has expert commissions, a UN Human Rights Commission, A women and Population Commission, and a Coordination of special UN Topics.

ECOSOC is the only possibility for NGOs to work together with the UN. Until 2014, more than 4000 NGOs had consultative status at the UN.

There are 3 different possibilities of Consultative Status but no right to vote.

1. The first status is for NGOs who can support the ECOSOC. They can participate in Meetings, have the right to suggest the Agenda, and bring in topics in written and spoken ways – 142 NGOs.
2. Organizations with a special consultative status – this is the largest group – 2926 NGOs. They have a small spectrum of competence and few rights. They must send reports about their activities to the UN. Rotary is a member here.
3. They are only allowed to attend Meetings in their own activity space – no right to suggest any topics for the Agenda – 977 NGOs – IIW is here.

The original suggestion that IIW should apply to the United Nations for consultative status came in 1970 from a Board Member of the Philippines, Mrs Legarda. Two years later, the ECOSOC confirmed the admittance of the Inner Wheel on the Roster of Organization section.

Hinke Sunderman (IWC Wien-Nord-Ost) and Karoline Frauenlob (IWC München Europea) prepared a report for the EC-Meeting in June 1989 with the topics Introduction, Guidelines for the UN work, recommendations, Policy Matters, and Notes.

In the early 80thies, the first IIW UN Delegate was Jeanne Germain, an IWC Grenoble/France member in Geneva. In 1985, after the foundation of the two clubs in Vienna, UN Delegates were appointed in Vienna too. 1989, there were Myra Voves and Sallie Miller in NEW YORK, Aline Guerin in GENEVA and Hinke Sunderman, Annie Polsterer, Marie-Luise Lamezan-Salins and Karoline Frauenlob in VIENNA. Hinke Sunderman was the CO-ORDINATOR of the UN Delegates. At that time, the IIW Past President was responsible for the UN-Matters.

In consultation with the IIW President, the Co-Ordinator determines the number of years a representative is appointed for and advises the IIW President on replacements or appointments of representatives. She forwards reports to the IIW President (see. Guidelines for UN-Delegates at the UN Centers) with copies to the IIW admin of HQ and statements and draft statements to the IIW President for approval. She distributes reports and approved statements to all representatives.

The IIW representatives join the relevant NGO Committees and pay annual fees, attend sessions of the UN bodies on the chosen subjects 3-times a year (before every EC Meeting), prepare reports on meetings of NGO Committees and sessions of UN bodies, forward these reports to the Co-Ordinator and send statements or draft statements to the Co-Ordinator.

The IIW PP appoints the IIW UN Delegates and ensures that each will be accredited to the respective UN Center. The IIW PP also appoints the Co-Ordinator. The IIW PP gives the time limits for the reports at the beginning of her year.

Expenses: For the IW years 1988/89 and 1989/1990, stationary, postage, and membership fees to the NGO committees will be paid by IIW. The IIW Executive Committee approves the expense accounts of the representatives and arranges for payment by the IIW treasurer.

The topics are Human Rights, Rights of Children, Conditions of Women, Family, Elderly People, and Drugs.

We have nothing in our Constitution about the function of IW UN Delegates. There is nowhere mention of the necessary skills for the job, the procedure for how to apply, when to apply, and where to apply. How long a term should be?

We currently have three representatives in New York, three in Vienna, and one in Geneva.

It is also the question if the countries of the 3 cities in which we have UN Delegates should/could have a right to be involved (this was a remark of Switzerland at the EM in Münster).

Last year, we prepared a proposal to insert a paragraph regarding the UN representatives in the Constitution:

PAGE 19 – UN DELEGATES

Add at Page 19 after Global Media Manager

UN Delegates – Geneva, New York, Vienna

-Qualification:

She must be fluent in English language. She must not serve at the same time at any other function at any IW-Level -Nomination:

A Non districted Club and any District Committee may nominate a suitable qualified member for the office of UN-Delegate -Voting:

The Un-Delegates are elected during the Governing Body Meeting before the Convention by the whole International Governing Body.

-Tenure of Office:

They are elected for a term of 3 consecutive years from Convention to Convention. They might be re-elected for a maximum of 3 Periods total (9 years). They serve from July 1 after a Convention till 30th. June after next Convention.

-Expenses:

Expenses incurred in carrying out the work of their duty shall be refunded up to 1000 Pounds for each Delegate.

Motivation:

We have a membership of more than 100.00 members and 7 Un-Delegates position in total. In former days some UN-Delegates served more than 30 years, other members didn't apply for it not to be unkind to those in the chair. But especially for young women it could be very attractive. It is a very important function; therefore, it should be for 3 years from Convention till Convention. If there is no other nomination, the term can be prolonged for a maximum of 3 times (9 years).

Proposer: NGB Denmark

The CCC did not accept the proposal with the following motivation:

The Proposal for UN representatives does not consider that the IW year runs from July to June, whereas the UN year runs from January to December. The provision of a fixed amount of expenses was also a cause for concern in that access to New York by UN representative(s) is likely to exceed the sum provided in the proposed rule.

CDV specified the following: the UN representatives are in the care of the Vice President. The expenses they incur are usually not refunded, and the UN delegates' nomination was at her time on the board meeting's agenda.

CDV: as more and more meetings are held virtually, more members should be interested in being appointed as UN delegates and should ask the clubs for availability.

GS for young people could be very attractive to be nominated for UN delegate, and they should be elected like all other positions in IW.

LV: the proposal about UN delegates was good, and she doesn't understand why it was rejected. The work of the UN delegates has no follow-up in the clubs. LV asked Charlotte if it would be possible to change the status of the IIW UN delegates into that of the Rotary's.

After attending UN meetings in New York, CDV realized that the IIW delegates had the lowest status and tried to upgrade it. However, the problem was that IIW in England is registered as an Administrative company, and it prevented a higher level as IIW is no NGO even if it is considered as such. She tried to change the status of IIW, but the risk was to lose everything.

### **Answer organizing Team European Rally Berlin: Edda Biermann**

DN: I assume you all received the letter of Edda Biermann (on behalf of the organizing Committee), forwarded by Christine Altona in response to the note prepared during the meeting in Cyprus. They claim they involved a lot of resources and effort to organize the Rally and that each participant knew from the beginning that any surplus would be used for social projects. Edda is surprised and disappointed by our letter. She adds that most participants voted during the Rally for a project for which the money should go. She ends her letter by reasserting that the funds will be transferred to the account of a non-profit development association, which they will establish by 30.09.2023, with the funding purpose "Women and technical skills."

CDV: the problem is the considerable amount of the sum left.

GS: this is a very nice business, and it should be said very clearly in advance that the Rally had charity purposes. She complained that they didn't inform all the participants about the projects they wanted to support and didn't ask the participants to be part of the choice. We will not receive the money back, but the process is incorrect.

### **District 222 Alasia's response**

DN reported receiving a letter from District 222 Chairman Akile H. Kader. Lena didn't get it, and Donatella forwarded it.

In a few words, they trace the history of clubs in northern Cyprus dating back to 2000 and claim that they have always worked within the founding principles of the IW. They also point out that there is no need to bring politics into our Association and reiterate that their clubs and the District have been formed in compliance with the rules of IIW's Constitution.

LN remarked that the letter was not addressed to anybody – it had only the subject heading and was not sent to District 96. While agreeing that IW is not sectarian or party political, etc., the point remains that Turkey in 1974 did something to Cyprus. The situation has not been resolved so far, and there have been discussions all these years trying to bring unity to Cyprus. Since 1973, a district has existed in Cyprus (D96), and the ladies of the northern part of Cyprus were asked to join it to unite the island's people and, according to what IIW states, i.e., friendship and not politics.

The petition sent to IIW was not intended to reinforce the division or to confront the political situation. The letter stressed that D96 would have liked the Turkish Cypriot clubs to become part of D96.

In 2008, the D96 Chairman and Dina Constantinides visited the clubs in Northern Cyprus and met their members, asking them to join the existing District, but to no avail. Instead, a new District was formed in 2021 without prior consultation with District 96, and against the rules of IIW - if there is already a District, there should be a consultation between all the clubs of the District.

So, if we want to Shine a Light (IIW year 2023-24 theme), shouldn't we start shining a light on this divided island by joining the two parts? Think about it!

DN said that a beautiful opportunity to work together was lost and that IIW should promote collaboration between the island's two parts as Rotary did, having only one District.

CDV remarked that there is also a wrong constitutional interpretation, as IIW states that the former should have been divided to create a new District.

Having exhausted all the topics on the agenda, DN thanked everyone for participating in the meeting, hoping everyone found it interesting and fruitful.

Attachments: Letter by the Berlin Rally organizers

Letter by D222