

**Board Meeting:**February 8<sup>th</sup>, 2012 3pm to 8pm

Meeting: AADK Board Meeting

Date and Time: 08.02.12. 15.00 – 20.00

Present: Trine Pertou Mach (TPM), Karen Jørgensen (KJØ), Arvid Aagaard Jensen (AAJ), Dines Justesen (DCJ), Tea Fromholt (TFR), Nis Benn (NVB), Kirsten Bruun (KBR), Amalie Bosdatter (ABO), Hans Beksgaard (HBE), Steen Folke (SFO), Christian Ulrich (alternate #2 CUL)

From the Secretariat: Frans Mikael Jansen (FMJ), Birte Hald (BHA), Kirsten Devantier (KID), Mette Marie Yde (MMY) for agenda point 4, Helene Ellemann-Jensen (HEJ) for agenda point 3, Kirsten Hjørnholm Sørensen (KID) for agenda point 6, and Lea Sofia Simonsen (LSS)

From ActionAid International: David Archer (DAR)

Absent: Nana Alsted Gerstrøm, Mads Madsen (alternate 1) and Elsebeth Krogh

Minute-taker: Lea Sofia Simonsen

Meeting was held in Danish and English.

**Agenda:**

1. **Welcome and approval of the agenda**
2. **Approval of minutes from the board meeting on 15.12.11**
3. **Orientation from the AADK Strategy Drafting Group: Discussion of Feedback from the AADK Open Membership Strategy Day (January 28<sup>th</sup>)**
4. **Evaluation of Recycle for Development**
5. **Follow up on INTRAC evaluation**
6. **Orientation on Rio +20 policy and campaign**
7. **New Development strategy and law**
8. **Parliamentary Revision Terms of Reference**
9. **Any Other Business**

**1. Welcome and approval of the agenda**

Chairwoman Trine Pertou Mach welcomed the board to the meeting, noting that the meeting would be primarily focused on two areas:

- Follow up on the AADK Strategy Day at the end of January, and discussion on the proposed framework for the new AADK strategy.
- Evaluation of the Recycle for Development programme

Both of these agenda points require a focused board mandate to the Secretariat for a direction for the subsequent administrative and strategic processes. In terms of agenda point 3, this board mandate will also serve to provide direction for the AADK strategy group. Due to the absence of the current AAI board representative, Helen McEachern, AAI was represented by David Archer, the Head of Programme Development for the AAI Secretariat. David Archer has further been appointed to take the role as AAI representative to the AADK Board in 2012, pending the approval of the AAI International Board.

After a series of introductions, TPM called the meeting to order and asked if there were any proposed alterations to the agenda.

**% The board approved the agenda without alteration.**

**2. Approval of minutes from the board meeting on 15.12.11**

**% The board approved the minutes without alteration.**

**3. Orientation from the AADK Strategy Drafting Group: Discussion of Feedback from the AADK Open Membership Strategy Day (January 28<sup>th</sup>)**

TPM informed the board that this agenda point would be focused on two main elements:

1. Feedback from the AADK members from the open membership strategy day on January 28<sup>th</sup>
2. Board mandate on the Strategy Drafting Group's proposed Table of Contents for the upcoming AADK strategy

TPM reminded the board that this was their opportunity to respond and influence the proposed path forward for the strategy – i.e. the strategic areas for focus - proposed by the strategy drafting group. With this discussion, the board would provide the strategy drafting group with a political mandate for their further work, in terms of determining the format and focus of the coming draft strategy, which would be presented to AADK members at the Annual Council Day on March 25<sup>th</sup> for commentary and discussion.

The secretariat will produce the sub-strategies to run parallel with the strategy, with foundation in the mandate and prioritisations provided by the strategy drafting group and the board.

Discussion of Open Membership Strategy Day, January 28<sup>th</sup>

On behalf of the strategy drafting group (SDG), TPM reflected that the membership meeting had been quite productive and filled with positive energy. However, an emerging question was, why had there been so minimal participation from AADK membership? While there is some debate regarding whether or not this limited participation is enough to provide a legitimate mandate for the strategy drafting group and board to act upon in the strategy development process, it was agreed that this lack of overwhelming participation from the general membership could indicate that there are no significant points of conflict in this strategy process. As such, there is no expectation for greater conflict or clashes in the debates in the remaining strategy development process.

Board mandate on the Strategy Drafting Group's proposed Table of Contents

TPM presented the Table of Contents produced by the SDG, which indicates a proposed format for the coming strategy as well as provides an indication of the larger strategic questions which are meant to be included and focused on within the strategy. As a parallel exercise to reviewing and commenting on the proposed table of contents, TPM also asked the board to undertake a little exercise, indicating how they would wish AADK to be seen and what it would be identified with 6 years forward.

Overall, the board was in agreement on what they wish AADK to be known for in 2018: *Social movements/change, thinking globally and acting locally, political clout and voice. To be understood through the arena of democracy and governance, and working through the avenue of the capacity building of people and organisations.*

Table of Contents

TPM noted that this was the time for the board to discuss the direction and scope of the strategy, as well as to illuminate perspectives on any subjects relevant to the strategy development process. TPM also noted that the board has already provided a framework for the strategy; through the acceptance of the conclusions from the INTRAC evaluation, the focus on AADK fundraising and the prioritisation on financial stability and through the approval of the "We are ActionAid" 7-point framework in May of 2011.

Board discussion

AADK and the private sector: a discussion was opened as to the possibilities for increased collaboration between AADK and the private sector. The discussion alluded to the fact that, while AADK is always open for collaboration with the private sector (dependant of their stated objectives as an organisation and the possibility for progressive action), there are many questions regarding the political compromises this would entail of the organisation. For many major industries, AADK's critical voice and progressive political agenda can be seen as too unpredictable for major collaboration. As such, AADK would be required to adopt a different political profile to ensure this type of collaboration on a large scale. For instance, corporations are targeted in political campaigns such as tax justice.

A possibility would be to make a strategic choice and work with social entrepreneurship/social economy. This would go hand in hand with the AADK comparative advantage in capacity building and training, allowing AADK to pursue various areas to enhance sustainability.

A concern issued however, is that AADK needs to ensure that it does not dilute its work by opening up more and more areas of work and activity. This strategy should provide a focus to AADK's agenda and activities, to ensure impact in its work.

% The board is in agreement that AADK should never compromise its political profile, but that progressive partnerships could come into play.

Volunteers and Activism: the discussion focused on the need to distinguish between political activism and volunteerism.

- Activism is political and should be associated with our campaign work
- Volunteers support the organisation and its work – but should not and must not be assumed to be a part of the political activism and campaign work.

Additionally, the discussion of being more focused and aware of the limited resources available to the organisation was broached again.

% The board is in agreement that AADK must formulate its political messages and base its campaigns within this framework, rather than being a vehicle for politically minded youth to formulate their own campaigns and political interests. This does not mean narrowing activities within AADK or centralising all activities within the Secretariat – rather, this means focusing the areas for political activism and interest; providing specific opportunities for change.

% The board is in agreement that AADK must formulate a strategy with a focus on retainment of volunteers, of political activists with a focus on fewer but better campaigns. In order to develop this sub-strategy, AADK must determine who their target group is. The board believes that AADK must ensure an appeal for those who feel marginalised in Denmark as well as internationally.

Programme work in Denmark: The concept of developing programme work within the border of Denmark is a controversial one. There is much agreement that the issues addressing the global South may increasingly become relevant in European society, however there is not agreement on whether or not AADK is the organisation that should be addressing these burgeoning challenges within the Danish borders. There was some discussion regarding the comparative advantages that AADK provides from its programme experience in the global South which could be targeted in Denmark, such as the capacity building of partners, social movements and so forth. This could be a possible avenue for Northern activities in the future. David Archer noted that ActionAid International has avoided discussing the question of national programmes in the North, but that there are already grey areas regarding this type of work in terms of the Global Campaigns. NVB argued that it was important to realise that, while capacity building could be used to combat rising Danish inequality, that the AADK name and brand is not related to Danish inequality, and there is a need to maintain a strong political brand as an organisation. However, AADK could supply expertise to support others in national programmes.

% The board is in agreement that there is an opening for programme support at the national level, but that no specific framework or time line should be placed on this concept.

Fundraising: The board as a whole is in agreement that this strategy needs to have a strong focus on fundraising and stability of financing. As such, DAR reminded the board that institutional funding, such as that provided by our framework agreement with Danida is highly vulnerable. While AAI greatly applauds our relationship with Danida, cases such as the overnight removal of Dutch institutional subsidies, illustrate the fragility of the survival of the organisation without substantial self-financing. As such, DAR wanted to note that sponsorship<sup>1</sup> is a fundraising asset, particularly for an organisation of AADK's reputation and established domestic name-recognition.

% **Overall board mandate to the strategy drafting group:**

---

<sup>1</sup> Sponsorship fundraising does not only allude to child sponsorship, rather to an acceptance of alternative methods of creating fundraising products to sell to the Danish public.

- **Overall: AADK is a political organisation, both nationally and globally. It has a focus on democracy/governance and social change, and believes in working through the capacity development of people and organisations. However, capacity development must be seen as a means, not an end in and of itself.**
- **There is an opening for programme support at the national level in the future, but no specific framework or time line should be placed on this concept.**
- **AADK needs to find channels of financial support, other than the Danida framework, to ensure sustainability. However, no decision on the question of sponsorship options.**
- **AADK volunteers and activists are two different categories for the organisation, and a sub-strategy needs to be developed to reflect their proper categorisation and to ensure their retention.**

#### 4. Recycling for Development

Mette Marie Yde presented the recent review of the Recycling for Development programme, which AADK administrates on behalf of Danida. Within this review, 4 future scenarios for the programme are presented<sup>2</sup>. Based off of this presentation and deliberations regarding the programme's position within AADK in light of its new strategy, the board was asked to provide a mandate for AADK senior leadership. This mandate would serve to inform the SLT's negotiations with Danida regarding the future administration of the Recycling for Development programme.

##### Board discussion

In the ensuing discussion, several issues were raised in regards of RfD. First of all, there was a general recognition of the good work that people who have made use of RfD grants have done since the instigation of the programme. Recognition was especially due because of the proven potential of the mode of work to engage a wide range of people across Danish society to participate in development work in a very down-to-earth manner.

However, the issue was raised about whether or not the arrangement is part of an outdated way of doing development work, based on an unsustainable donor-recipient-approach. AADK's work with 'mellemfølelighed' has developed in many ways away from this approach. SFO contested that the programme is in line with the "theory of change" that is the backbone of the ActionAid International Strategy, *Peoples Action To End Poverty*. SFO argued that the overarching theory of change is based on empowering people to change their own communities and essentially moving away from the donor-recipient paradigm. NVB raised the issue that, although AADK has always sympathized with the project, RfD has actually never been part of the AADK strategy, since it primarily was an initiative which AADK was meant to host for Danida. Additionally, NVB emphasized that AADK had been happy to host the programme during its entire history.

Many appreciative remarks were made about RfD, but there was an overall consensus that RfD could not reasonably be an integral part of the coming strategy; the main reason being that it would not be in line with the theory of change chosen to achieve our objectives. The board was highly approving of the commitment of the partners who utilise the RfD programme, but on an overall level did not feel that this programme would, in the future, fit with the coming AADK strategy and focuses. Moreover, the Board felt that AADK would not be the right organisation to engage with reforming the RfD programme, as suggested by the review.

- % **The board is thus of the opinion, that AADK should phase out the administration of the RfD programme during the coming strategy period (2012-2018), as it does not see AADK as the relevant host for the programme in the medium to long term. The strategy to be presented to the Extraordinary Council Meeting on June 2nd will therefore not include a continuation of RfD.**
- **AADK has the responsibility to ensure a responsible phase-out of the administration of the programme, and therefore has the mandate to offer, as a very minimum, to continue to administer the programme until the end of 2013.**
  - **The board gave a mandate to the Senior Leadership Team to present this decision to Danida in the on-going dialogue regarding the administration of the programme. Additionally, the SLT was mandated to make it very clear to Danida that AADK would in any case ensure a responsible phase-out of the administration of the programme, and therefore, as a very minimum, continue to administer the programme until the end of 2013.**
  - **During the coming year(s) AADK – including RfD while it is still hosted by AADK – will be ready to actively contribute to any further development of the programme and to the identification of relevant future hosting options for the programme. AADK will not actively relinquish its host role before another hosting solution has been found.**
  - **This recommendation will be presented to the AADK Council at the Extraordinary Council Meeting in June, for discussion and final approval**

#### 5. Follow Up on INTRAC evaluation

The board discussed the final evaluation by INTRAC and its conclusions and recommendations.

Overall, the board found the work to be very thorough, inclusive and complex and welcomed the professional approach of INTRAC throughout the process. The board was satisfied not only with the process but also with the final reports and their conclusions.

Most importantly, the evaluation concluded that the number of decisive, and at times difficult, strategic decisions taken by AADK over the last 4-6 years had been the right ones, and that the operational changes made - due to these decisions - were implemented successfully.

<sup>2</sup> The presentation can be made available upon request.

The recommendations and conclusions provide a rather unique base of support to the current process of developing a new 6 years strategy for AADK.

Among the important elements of the evaluation are:

- The 'validation' of the overall decision to join AAI and the process of transition
- The relevance and effectiveness of MS/AADK's programmes, i.e. democracy focus, T4C and P4C
- The potential of and for AADK in AAI
- The conclusion that a continued focus around two programme approaches (as to deliver MS' core competence in governance), namely connecting people and strengthening capacity of civil society in the south, is where MS/AADK has its strongest potential.
- The highlights of challenges ahead

**% The board approved the final INTRAC evaluation and its official feedback.**

**% The board agreed to discuss the follow up on the "Governance" report, at the next board meeting. If needed, the board would also discuss any of the other Follow Up formats developed by the Secretariat in response to the INTRAC evaluation.**

## 6. Orientation on Rio+20 policy and campaign

Kirsten Hjørnholm Sørensen (KIS) presented the broad AADK campaign platform targeting the Rio+20 summit in 2012, as well as the more targeted political advocacy work for this area chosen by AADK. In-depth versions of the campaign platform and advocacy focuses can be provided upon request.

KIS informed the board that two specific opportunities arose with the Rio+20 summit, specifically the concept of sustainable development combines different agendas. The environmental and the economical agendas are involved, as are the local, national and international levels of policy. Therefore, there is a board spectrum of choices and focuses in the Rio+20 summit, which all affect the policy choices.

The Tour de Future campaign platform is AADK's broad political campaign within Denmark, which has the main premise of raising awareness of Rio+20 in Denmark. The campaign is three-pronged in its focus and should be broad enough to appeal on the national level for awareness raising and understanding:

- Hunger and Agriculture: including aspects of AAI HungerFREE campaign
- Climate and Energy: i.e. climate debt and mitigation on emissions
- Environmental: Sustainable consumption

In terms of the political advocacy and lobby interests, AADK has primary focus on the following elements, though ready to act on the more processual possibilities for action at the summit, thereby receiving promises on process and implementation:

- Hunger and Food Security: Linking to the AAI strategy and its pursuit of alternatives in development
  - i.e. Climate resilient sustainable agriculture (which is a political ask at the summit).

### Board discussion

FMJ followed up on KIS's comments on focus on the "process asks", such as:

- Subsidy and tax systems
- Global Sustainability goals (updated MDGs)
- Global Sustainability Councils (national Steering Committees)
- Ensuring corporate accountability
- Finance for Sustainable Development

FMJ supported KIS' perspective, that Rio+20 will produce many negative focuses, so it is wise to rally around these "process asks", as they symbolise achievable outcomes for the summit.

The board was in overall agreement with the broad campaign focuses of the Tour De Future campaign and felt that the overall approach to the summit was coherent, well reflected and founded in a strong sustainable agenda. However, the board did inquire why the choice had been made to implement a broad campaign rather than a single campaign focus, such as under COP15 and the Climate Debt Agents.

KIS ensured the board that the broad campaign was to ensure a political awareness and interest in Rio+20 in Denmark, and that as the summit period came closer and the broader popularly founded campaign drew to a close, AADK in close collaboration with AAI, would follow a protocol of sharp messaging regarding food security and agriculture at a coherent policy level.

% The board was in favour of the campaign and appreciative of the orientation.

**% The board would follow up on this campaign process at their strategic weekend retreat in March.**

## 7. New Development strategy and law

FMJ informed the board of the on-going process that AADK is participating in, through the NGO Forum, to influence the new AADK development strategy and law proposal. It was noted that this process and strategy development marks an abrupt contrast from the previous closed development strategy process in 2010. Though there is a very tight deadline for both of these processes, the process is exceedingly transparent and invites dialogue from interested stakeholders.

Danida has established 4 external reference groups, to provide expert knowledge and feedback for the strategy development process:

- Rights, good governance and democracy
- Sustainable production and livelihoods
- Green transition
- Stability and protection in fragile and conflict affected areas

FMJ has been included in the reference group on rights, good governance and democracy. This process also signifies a shift in the development paradigm of this new development strategy, to a focus on the rights based approach to development.

Overall, the strategy corresponds well with the objectives of AADK and AAI, in terms of focus on agriculture (small-scale and female focus), green growth agenda and the Rights-Based Approach to development. The compromise in this strategy process, is the maintenance of the sub-strategies from the previous development strategy. Therefore, though the paradigm for development is changed in the strategy, the soft sub-strategies are maintained. This could indicate the space for future discussion and negotiation with Danida.

Additionally, FMJ oriented the board of the proposal to reform the “framework” law for development, i.e. the structure of the collaboration organs for development practice and aid: Danida, the Board for International Development Cooperation and the Council for International Development Cooperation. The new proposal would disband the Council and Board, and instead put in place a “Forum” structure for discussion and dialogue.

The majority of development organisations, AADK included, feel that the board previously gave a joint ownership to the discussion of development assistance as well as offered an external stakeholder and monitoring function regarding the Ministry’s bureaucracy.

% The hearing phase is at the end of March, and the Parliament will deliberate on these processes in May.

## 8. Parliamentary Revision Terms of Reference

Arvid Aagaard (AAJ) presented the board with a terms of reference for the Parliamentary Revision committee, which had been developed by the Council Contact Group with a mandate from the Council.<sup>3</sup> AAJ informed the board that the chairmanship supported the pilot establishment of this Parliamentary Revision committee, and believed that a general mandate should be given to commence the establishment. The TOR can be provided upon request.

### Board discussion

The board agreed with the general mandate supported by the chairmanship, and felt that it would be very productive to establish a Parliamentary Revision committee on a pilot basis. As such, the board felt that the TOR should become more generalised, as it should be the role of the pilot Parliamentary Revision committee to further elaborate its role.

**% The board approved the mandate to establish a Parliamentary Revision, and approved the more generalised pilot TOR developed by the chairmanship. The following mandate is approved:**

- **The Council Contact Group will nominate 2 candidates plus a Finance and Audit Committee to sit on the committee. In its pilot phase, the CCG has elected the candidates, but if this committee becomes permanent, the selection process will be altered to CCG nomination and board approval.**
- **The pilot Parliamentary Revision committee will be comprised of Ulla Strøbech (Council member), Nils Wiese (Council member) and Jens Erik Torp (Finance and Audit Committee member).**

## 9. Any Other Business

- The board will be participating in the Strategy Drafting Group’s strategic weekend, with an extraordinary board meeting on Sunday, March 4<sup>th</sup> from 3pm to 6pm.
- The TOR for the AAI Peer Review of ActionAid Denmark was provided for orientation: the Peer Review will be on-going from February 22<sup>nd</sup> to 24<sup>th</sup>.
- The AAUK board exchange visit, discussed during the Internal Governance Review in August 2011, will be postponed to the 2012-2013 board year due to the high level of important strategy processes on-going in the organisation throughout this board year.

---

<sup>3</sup> Council decision at the 2011 Annual Council Meeting.