IFOR INTERNATIONAL FELLOWSHIP OF RECONCILIATION

INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL

November 4th-11th 2018

Zafferana Etnea, Italy

MINUTES

Compiled by David Mumford and Zaira Zafarana.

Minutes takers: Jacob Carlbacker and David Mumford.

Proof readers: Samya Korff and Christian Renoux.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTION OF PARTICIPANTS 3
2. COUNCIL APPOINTMENTS 5
3. ICOM AND SECRETARIAT REPORT 2014-2018 5
4. FINANCIAL REPORT 7
5. BGAS REPORTS 8
6. REPORTS FROM IFOR UN REPRESENTATIVES 9
7. IFOR WORKING GROUP REPORT: 11
8. REFLECTIONS ON FUTURE PLANS: 13
9. ADOPTION OF MINUTES 13
10. CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS 13
11. ELECTION OF INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEE, IFOR PRESIDENT AND VICE- PRESIDENT 15
12. COUNCIL RESOLUTIONS AND ACCEPTANCE OF NEW BRANCHES 20
13. REPRESENTATIVE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE ELECTION 21
14. COUNCIL WORKING GROUPS REPORTS AND DECISIONS 21
15. APPOINTMENT OF THE STICHTING 24
16. APPOINTMENT OF THE FINANCIAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE 24
17. COUNCIL EVALUATION 25
18. CONCLUSION 25

Attachment A, message from Adolfo Perez Esquivel

Attachment B, UNOG report by Derek Brett

Attachment C, UNESCO report by Maria Antonietta Malleo

Attachment D, IFOR structure working group report

Attachment E, Summary of Constitutional amendment proposals

- ➢ Council decision
- ● Council suggestion
- ● Specific point raised in discussion
- ❖ Inspirational thought

SUNDAY NOVEMBER 4TH

---

1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTION OF PARTICIPANTS

Peter Cousins, as acting vice president, welcomed those attending.

❖ Makios Phiri from Zimbabwe gave the inspirational address.

Branches (with number of votes)

1. AKKAPKA (1): Tess Ramiro
2. ANANDO –became a branch on Friday- (1): Emdad Moslem, Manir Mihai
3. BASTOB (1): Jahanara Hasan
4. FIEFA (1): Patrick Rakotondranaly
5. FOR Austria (1): Pete Haemmerle, Lucia Haemmerle
6. FOR England and Scotland (2): David Mumford, Denis Beaumont, Diko Blacking
7. FOR Germany (1): Samya Korff, Veronica Geue, Leah Hablitzel,
8. FOR India (1): Matthew George, Suseela George
9. FOR Japan (1): Tatsushi Nozoye, Kiyoshi Mito, Kyoko Iitaka
10. FOR Sweden (1): Charlotte Sjostrom Becker, Jacob Carlbacker
11. FOR Switzerland (1): Ueli Wildberger, Flavia Klausberger
12. FOR USA (3): Chrissy Stonebraker-Martinez, Matt Meyer, Emma Jordan-Simpson
13. FOR Zambia (1): Tyson Mumbi, Ignatius Mukunto
14. FOR Zimbabwe (1): Makios Phiri, Akadim Chikandamina
15. Kerk en Vrede (1): Jose Sparborth
16. MIR Congo-Brazaville (1): Florian Nakoundila, Jacques Poaty, Jean-Pierre Massamba
17. MIR France (1): Christian Renoux
18. MIR Italy (1): Zaira Zafarana
19. MIR Togo –became a branch on Friday- (1): Yawo Kakpo Senyeebia
20. ONAD (1): Angelina Ban, Light Wilson Aganwa
21. SERPAJ (1): Blas Garcia Noriega

Groups

MIR Togo -group till Friday-: Yawo Kakpo Senyeebia
BOCS: Beata Szabo

Affiliates

Anando –affiliate till Friday-: Maniruzzaman Miah and Emdad Moslem

Doopsgezinde Wereldwerk: Roel Meihuizen
Muslim Peace Fellowship: Rabia Harris and Sherly Fabre
Uganda Peace & Development Foundation: Richard Okwera

ICOM & Stichting
Peter Cousins (ICOM)
Volker Grotefeld (Stichting)

UN Representatives
Derek Brett (UN Geneva)
Pete Haemmerle (UN Vienna)
Maria Antonietta Malleo (UNESCO Paris)
Michel Monod (UN Geneva)
Christian Renoux (UNESCO Paris)
Zaira Zafarana (UN Geneva)

Staff
Roel Meihuizen
Iskra Ramirez

Individuals in attendance
Geoff Bart (USA)
Juliane Baumgarten (Germany)
Aaron Goggans (USA)
Julia Grotefeld (Germany)
Max Hesse (USA)
Lucas Johnson (USA)
Doaa Mohamed (Egypt)
Kozo Nozoye (Japan)
Junior Nzita (RDC)
Mirjam Stahl (Germany)
France Wildberger (Switzerland)

Interpreters
Juliane Baumgarten
Silvia Benedetti
Renato Camarda
Peter Cousins
Michele D'Agata
Christian Renoux
Ueli Wilberger

2. COUNCIL APPOINTMENTS

Council Coordinating Committee (CCC)

The chair and vice-chair of the Council were Zaira Zafarana and Akadim Chikandamina, as already nominated by ICOM.

- Denis Beaumont, Veronica Geue and Derek Brett, nominated by the ICOM for membership of the Council Coordinating Committee, were ratified by Council.
- Kyoko Iitaka, Jean-Pierre Massamba and Blas Garcia were appointed by Council as members of the CCC.

Minutes taker

David Mumford volunteered to be the minutes taker.
The official proof readers for the minutes were Christian Renoux and Samya Korff.

MONDAY NOVEMBER 5TH

- Lucia Haemmerle gave the inspirational talk.

- Council accepted the agenda and timetable proposed by the Council Coordinating Committee.

Council Nominations Committee (CNC)

The chair and vice-chair of the CNC were Matt Meyer and Jacques Poaty, as already nominated by ICOM.

- Council approved the following four people as branch representatives on the Nominations Committee: Angelina Ban, Diko Blacking, Matthew George and Ueli Wilberger.

3. ICOM AND SECRETARIAT REPORT 2014-2018

Lucas Johnson informed that there was no written report from ICOM (the President was not present at Council), neither from Secretariat because of pressure of work.

He reported on the sale of the premises in Alkmaar and the settlement of the costs of Council 2014 and the 100th anniversary celebrations in Constance. The secretariat was then based in Utrecht and shared an office with Kerk en Vrede until 2016.

He reported on the meeting of ICOM in Utrecht in 2015 and the selection of four major areas of work:

1. Establishing stability and sustainability for IFOR

2. Effective coordination and organization
3. Growth and diversity
4. Convening and enhancing

Work with the United Nations was emphasized. Independent project work by the secretariat was downgraded and programmes were only undertaken in partnership with a BGA. A major aim was to attract core funding for IFOR.

The presence of volunteer interns Iskra and Annelies increased the capacity of the secretariat.

Peter Cousins continued the report from the standpoint of ICOM. ICOM was concerned about global north branches declining in numbers. Peter Cousins said that they wished to look again at the overlap between faith and pacifism and to rejuvenate member numbers in the branches. ICOM also wished to re-engage with the BGAs in Asia and Africa. Their plan was for the first year (2015) to be focused on establishing a secure base in Europe, 2016 would emphasize Africa and 2017 Asia, with a Council in 2018.

Ignatius Mukunto and Jean-Pierre Massamba reported that a plan for Africa was adopted in 2015 with a view to improving the coordination of the BGAs in Africa. This did not happen. There were difficulties of communication and these were exacerbated by the effective non- involvement of IFOR governance with the resignation of the vice-president and the absence of the president. It was hoped to hold the 2018 Council in Africa. In consultation with the African branches it was decided that this was not technically possible. It was hoped that meeting at the 2018 Council would reinvigorate planning and communication in Africa.

Lucas Johnson and Peter Cousins continued the report. Part of Convening and Enhancing was to ensure that the 2018 Council took place. Plans to help finance the Council by holding a conference before Council were not financially successful. The conference itself, on migration, helped raise IFOR's profile and just covered its costs. Council will make a loss of around 20,000 euro.

The Beloved Community Project with Belgium, The Netherlands and Germany was initially successful. However difficulties led to the project ending early and there was no continuing contribution to IFOR's core income.

Communications between ICOM and BGAs did not meet expectations. Internal communication within ICOM was difficult. Tobias Lohse resigned as vice-president in 2016. ICOM took into account the need for improving relations with BGAs, finding someone who could work with the current ICOM and who could strengthen links with Latin America. Peter Cousins was invited to take on the vice-presidency.

Davorka Lovrekovic, the president, became less available during 2017 and 2018 and this resulted in a lack of governance capacity. Jean-Pierre Massamba commented that the Nominations Committee needs to exercise real discernment in choosing the people to carry the work forward. Enthusiasm by itself is not enough. Responsibility is essential and communication between ICOM and BGAs needs to be good.

During the discussion the following points were raised:

- The maintenance of IFOR work at the United Nations, the establishment of an office within the World Council of Churches and the work done by all UN representatives had been sustained by the work of the secretariat and the grants gained.
- The secretariat had remodeled the website and made a start on organizing the database.
- The Beloved Community Project, even though IFOR's involvement terminated early, was well worthwhile.
- Lucas had visited the South Sudan and his work had enabled IFOR to continue to exist there.
- It is time to take stock and to go forward in forgiveness and hope.

Chair of Council, Zaira Zafarana, expressed gratitude to Lucas for the valuable work undertaken in the past 4 years, notwithstanding the difficulties described.

4. FINANCIAL REPORT

Matt Meyer -chair of the Financial Advisory Committee- on behalf of Stacey Mitchell, IFOR treasurer, presented the Report which showed that IFOR would face a deficit of around 35,000 euro as at the end of 2018. There is nothing in reserves. In addition IFOR had spent 60,000 euro which was the principal of the Freeman Trust money, the interest of which is to pay for interns and young people. IFOR would need to continue to have interns and should also make some provision for replacing the capital. The expenditure on UN work on conscientious objection in Geneva was funded by a three-year grant from the Joseph Rowntree Foundation. The grant ends in March 2019. It will need a 5,000 euro contribution from IFOR general funds for the period January to March 2019.

IFOR's deficit had arisen from the difficulty in raising funds to pay for Council bursaries and lower than budgeted income from donations and grants. BGAs income had not risen significantly. It was noted that nearly half the BGAs had made no contribution in the last four years and that some of these had received bursaries to attend the 2018 Council. The conference on Migration preceding the Council did not make a surplus.

Points raised in questions:

- How often were the IFOR books audited: they are examined at the end of every year and the results are on the IFOR website.

- Who monitors the budget: it is the responsibility of the International Committee and financial reports are also sent to the Stichting.
- What is the role of the Financial Advisory Committee: it is to assist the treasurer, not to oversee the finances.
- What is the role of Stichting: it is the legal body that enables IFOR to be based in The Netherlands.

Council considered what steps could be taken and the following were suggested:

- An appeal to BGAs to pay any outstanding dues by the end of the year; there has been a strong appeal to all BGAs to make a contribution for 2018.
- BGAs could appeal to their individual members to contribute to IFOR or they could allow their membership lists to be used for a direct appeal from IFOR.
- Approach IFOR connected bodies for grants.
- Ask BGAs for one off additional gift.
- Ask BGAs for a loan.
- IFOR could apply to grant making trusts to fund work that is being done in Iraq; those doing the work would then work as volunteers and gift the money to IFOR.
- Crowdfunding was suggested and FOR Austria suggested ways of doing this.
- Council needs to continue to brainstorm on this subject.
- There was a promise of a legacy which would cover more than half of the deficit, but the timing was uncertain.

5. BGAs Reports

BGA reports are not included in the minutes but are available on the IFOR website. This minutes just note where some of the reports occurred.

Reports were received from FOR Zimbabwe and FOR India.

TUESDAY NOVEMBER 6TH

❖ Denis Beaumont gave the inspirational introduction.

A message of support and solidarity was received from Adolfo Perez Esquivel and SERPAJ.

Voting cards were distributed among voting representatives. The process of consensus decision making at Council was explained.

6. REPORTS FROM IFOR UN REPRESENTATIVES

Lucas presented the work of the representatives and the overall development. One of the highlights in IFOR during the last four-year period is the increased capacity to coordinate the UN representation due to the dedicated liaison officer Anna Stikkers, coordinating and communicating between representatives. Anna worked up to 2016. Mark Johnson has concluded his work as representative. If we want continued climate issue representation this position should be filled. Junior was acknowledged as the UN General Secretary volunteer ambassador for the #childnotsoldier campaign. He collaborated with IFOR UN reps.

Pete Hämmerle, UN rep in Vienna

Regarding nuclear disarmament:

- NGO Committee on Peace have regular meetings, inviting diplomats, missions and NGOs for exchanging concerns.
- Significant outreach project for disarmament and non-proliferation partnership with UN office for disarmament, producing videos on institutions involved. 4 videos on NGOs (general, nuclear weapons, small arms and light weapons, and peace building).
- 2014 3rd International Conference on the humanitarian consequences of nuclear weapons in Vienna, co-organized with Austrian Ministry of Foreign Affairs and International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons (ICAN). IFOR participated with branch representatives, an important step towards the treaty on abolition approved by UN General Assembly on July 7th, 2017.
- ICAN was awarded the Nobel peace prize. IFOR is formally a member of ICAN since early 2017.
- Attracting and involving youth as invitees to discussions and presentations in the UN committees.

Lucas Johnson about UN New York (representatives not present)

- John Kim monitors the Security Council. Whenever resolutions for military actions are put before the Council, he organizes an IFOR response approved by IC/president and distributed to Security Council delegates.
- Mark Johnson participates in events on moral action on climate change.
- Patricia Ackerman focuses on issues on gender and violence. IFOR had not before clearly addressed the issues of violence because of sexual orientation and gender identity, so this has been a welcome development.

In 2016 UN designated an expert on the topic. This was opposed especially by some religious actors in ECOSOC with often dehumanizing language. IFOR moved to propose a sort of Do No Harm agreement, engaging groups understanding the difference in opinion, still as people of faith opposing the violence against people. Patricia launched *Ethics of Reciprocity Project* with external funding. She gathered people of faith from 14 countries aiming to “re-humanize” the issue and the people concerned. A

successful event of which IFOR should be proud. Right now there is uncertainty if or how this work will continue. This is partly because the funding may run out - this depends on an event in Cape Town and partly on whether IFOR want to continue to be a partner.

Derek Brett, UN Main rep in Geneva

Written report from Derek is attached to the minutes. Regarding Conscientious Objection to military service:

- Conscientious Objection to military service is the only part of IFOR's Geneva work with external funding, connected to the UN Human Rights Committee on Civil and Political rights and the Human Rights Council (HRC). IFOR has also made submissions to the Universal Periodic Review process.
- Bringing activists to Geneva.
- Interaction with the Special Rapporteur on Freedom of Religion as well as the Working Group on Arbitrary Detention.

Michel Monod, UN rep in Geneva

- Working Group on the Right to Peace proposed a declaration on the Right to enjoy Peace, adopted by HRC and later by UN General Assembly.
- Working Group on Nuclear Disarmament, conferences on humanitarian consequences, which later led to the adoption of the treaty on the abolition of nuclear weapons.

Zaira Zafarana, UN rep in Geneva

- Networking with other NGOs.
- Collaborating with BGAs, offering more opportunities to be involved in the UN work.
- Facilitating the flow of information internally and externally; increasing the use of IFOR website and IFOR Fb page.
- Coordinating Geneva UN work.

Christian Renoux , UN rep at UNESCO in Paris

PowerPoint presentations available upon request (christian.renoux@ifor.org).

- General conference of UNESCO every two years.
- NGO conference every two years. - International forums.
- Since 2016 the UN officially celebrates each year the International Day of Nonviolence, with for example an Ahimsa lecture held at UNESCO.

[not present John Kim, Patricia Ackerman, Mark Johnson, Hans Ulrich Gerber]

Question raised:

How do we make this vital and important work, accessible useful and relevant to BGAs and individual members? How has this been thought of by the team?

- Dedicated liaison coordinator made improvements to the efficiency and external communications

- Zaira has started to work reaching out to branches, whenever a review (UPR) for a state was happening, to ask for input from the local branch.
- The Secretariat doesn't have to do the work but only a certain amount of it.
- Reporting back on the work is often difficult because there is always a new task at hand and a lack of human resource, but IFOR representatives are trying to put information on the website so that it can be more accessible.

Points made:

- If we want the representation to be effective, we need to think about the need for coordination and communication.
- We acknowledge that some of the work is done in a personal capacity, and thank the representatives for that, especially concerning the current state of IFOR finances. It would be desirable to give financial support to cover at least some of the expenses incurred by representatives.

Maria Antonietta Malleo, UN Main rep at UNESCO in Paris

A written report is attached to the minutes.

- The concept of cultural violence was being accepted by UNESCO.
- She had spoken at the last UNESCO plenary session.
- She encouraged BGAs to establish contact with their national UNESCO commissions.

In discussion the following queries were raised:

- Who decides the IFOR position on issues: usually the president.
- Is there duplication between UN representatives: usually not as different UN centers tackle different issues but there is some overlap and a sort of coordination and an email group for IFOR UN representatives would be useful.

7. IFOR WORKING GROUP REPORT:

Pete Haemmerle introduced the report on behalf of the IFOR Working Group which has been established at 2014 Council. The WG has worked a lot throughout its mandate preparing the survey which was distributed to all BGAs; the results have been analyzed and proposals and recommendation have been formulated and included in a detailed report. This process provided an opportunity for deep reflections on IFOR structure and vision. The report has been sent out to all BGAs early in the year and is attached to these minutes.

Initial open discussion:

David Mumford stated that IFOR should primarily be a fellowship, not an NGO. IFOR's major problems had been personal rather than structural. Not in favor of amalgamating groups and affiliates. Groups were composed of individuals committed to spiritually based nonviolence and could grow into branches. Affiliates were often NGO's that did not have a full commitment both to nonviolence and to a

faith/spiritual basis for their work but who nonetheless wished to be associated with IFOR. He also wished to retain the RCC. The function of ICOM was decision making between Councils and managing the work of IFOR. RCC members should know and be known by the BGAs in their region and be channels of communication between their region and IFOR. A larger ICOM would make internal ICOM communication more difficult.

Samya Korff pointed out that there was a clear structural dimension to IFOR's problems, and it was not just an issue of personnel.

Council then proceeded to take votes on each of the working group recommendations.

Decisions:

- Recommendation 1.1 was approved by Council;
- Considering the responses to point 1, it was recommended the in-depth exploration of the concept of 'fellowship' and what responsibilities would be required of IFOR individual members in order to work in unity and cooperation with each other. Council will create the working group to take this forward.
- Recommendation 1.4 was approved by Council; it was also recommended that the BGAs be encouraged to engage in a renewal process within their own memberships to consider what they want to receive from, and give to, an international structure working on their behalf and what is needed for them to better involve themselves with IFOR on the international level. Council delegates are asked to take this forward with their own BGAs.
- Recommendation 2.3 on wider attendance at meetings was withdrawn.
- Council agreed to set up another working group to look at communications (recommendations 2.1, 2.2, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 4.1, 4.3).

BGA reports were received from Kerk en Vrede and from ONAD.

WEDNESDAY NOVEMBER 7TH

❖ Council opened with an inspirational presentation from Pete Haemmerle, including video- interview with Hildegard Goss-Mayr and reading about the first IFOR meeting in Bilthoven in 1919.

FOR Austria will be hosting a conference in 2019 to celebrate the 100th anniversary of IFOR and the 150th anniversary of Gandhi's birth.

FOR Sweden will also be organizing a major event for the 100th anniversary.

The report from FOR Austria was presented.

8. Reflections on Future Plans:

Jean-Pierre Massamba emphasized that love of neighbor was central to IFOR and that all have to show that their beliefs and actions are congruent. All need to work together and share their experiences.

Lucas Johnson reflected on the shortage of capacity both with staff and with committee members who are acting in a voluntary capacity. 2014 Council established a working group on Communication which never met. He identified a need for clearer expectations of the secretariat, while recognizing that the role of the secretariat will be defined by ICOM from year to year. He said that IFOR itself does not have a mission statement. IFOR needs to support the work at the United Nations in the next quadrennial. He welcomed the regional activity and coordination in Latin America and Europe.

Peter Cousins said that ICOM had listened and tried to synthesize all the BGAs contributions and proposals.

Matthew George said that regional work was important and cited SERPAJ. He noted the two models for support for IFOR's UN work – one at Geneva where IFOR took the lead in sourcing funding and one in New York where the local representative took the lead. He asked for more specific IFOR input into UN representation. He pointed out that BGA's did not need RCC regional representatives in order to communicate with the secretariat and that much could be achieved by bilateral links between BGAs.

Patrick Rakotondranaly said that many branches were still working on the follow up to the Decade for Peace and Nonviolence and there is still collaboration with UNESCO. He would value documentary support for branches to help them celebrate IFOR's 100th anniversary and the 150th anniversary of Gandhi's death.

9. Adoption of Minutes

- The minutes of the 2014 Council were formally adopted. It was subsequently noted that FOR Scotland had been in attendance as had Volker Grotefeld from the Stichting.

10. Constitutional Amendments

The chair of the Council invited Lucia Haemmerle and Samya Korff, who volunteered to help with this agenda item, to facilitate the discussion and the consensus process on amendments and resolutions. The list of amendments presented at Council is attached to the minutes.

As to Representative Consultative Committee, 3 amendments were proposed, two to abolish the RCC and one to retain and strengthen the RCC.

MIR Italia proposed a merger between RCC and the ICOM. The RCC link with regions and branches was valued but at present the RCC did not function effectively everywhere and ICOM presented as well some weaknesses, therefore it could be worth to maximize human resources.

FOR Austria also proposed the abolition of the RCC and looked in another amendment to an enlarged ICOM.

ICOM's amendment wanted to retain the RCC and make it work. Peter Cousins, proposing the amendment, said that the RCC had not lived up to its potential. ICOM had a governance role; RCC more a consultative and communication role together with specific constitutional responsibilities such as Council venue. A larger ICOM would lead to more logistical problems in organizing meetings. The role of the vice-president would be strengthened by being given specific responsibility to convene RCC meetings.

Points made in the discussion:

- Why was it necessary to change the constitution at all?
- if those who had worked with the constitutional structure felt it was an obstruction, then the constitution needed changing
- SERPAJ would like to see the RCC continue and for it to work with the ICOM and be used as a consultative body. How can it work better? RCC not really used effectively in 2014- 2018.
- FOR England and Scotland supported the ICOM amendment. Regional RCC members could be a good additional link between BGAs in their region and between BGAs and the secretariat.
- If RCC is abolished, who will effectively take on their constitutional tasks?

Decisions:

- In Consensus the MIR Italia amendment (1.1) fell.
  The following was agreed by consensus:
- Both 1.3 and 1.2 were withdrawn due to lack of consensus. There will be no change in the constitution on this issue. As a Council we can give direction to ICOM about how to move forward with making regional representation and coordination an actuality.
- Support Africa in creating a regional vision for peace.
- Communicating that vision to the rest of the fellowship
- The council recommends that the vice president convenes a conversation with the RCC about their role and their task. The outcome for the convening is to proposal a new role for the RCC. This council can also make a recommendation as to the role and task of the RCC to that convening. A proposal can be brought to the next council for approval.
- The proposals about increasing the size of ICOM and about the regional method of selection (1.4 and 1.5) were withdrawn.

No one was present from MONAR-Benin to propose amendment 1.6. Christian Renoux was asked to email MONAR-Benin to ask further about their intentions.

- ➢ Proposal 1.7 was withdrawn.
- ➢ Proposal 1.8 was agreed by consensus. Section 8 of the constitution is thus deleted and replaced with:
  8. *The ICOM shall be responsible for establishing (if necessary) an appropriate legal body to enable the Secretariat to function in the country in which it is based.*

-Discussion and decisions continued on Friday, p. 17-

11. ELECTION OF INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEE, IFOR PRESIDENT AND VICE- PRESIDENT

The chair of the Nominations Committee, Matt Mayer, together with his colleagues, explained the work undertaken and introduced to the Council the proposed slate:

President: Lotta Sjostrom Becker (Sweden)
Vice-President: Peter Cousins (UK)
Treasurer: Christian Renoux (France)
Beena Sebastian (India), Light Wilson Aganwa (South Sudan)
Blas Garcia Noriega (Colombia)
Ignatius Kabale Mukunto (Zambia)

During the discussion several comments were raised:

- Low number of women among candidates and therefore among proposed members of ICOM.
- Main leadership roles assigned to people from the same regional area.
- Need to have more people to take part in the selection process of IFOR leadership.
- Questioning the reasons of such a limited number of candidates; IFOR should reflect on the causes.

- ➢ The proposed slate was rejected.

-Discussion and decisions continued on Friday, p. 16-

THURSDAY NOVEMBER 8TH

Council participants spent the entire day visiting in the morning Comiso where there is the "Verde Vigna" land bought by peace activists and organizations such as MIR Italy in the early '80s to oppose the enlargement of the local military base, now converted to a civil airport.
IFOR members have been welcomed by refugees at the migrants' center Accoglienza Casmenea project and a small delegation visited at the nearby Peace Pagoda with Morishita monk.
In the afternoon the Council participants held a nonviolent action standing in a circle of silence in Niscemi main square, together with local activists, to express solidarity to the local struggle against the militarization of the territory and against the MUOS. Banners and signs specially prepared for the occasion, peace flags, non-violence flags and no-Muos flags where used.
On the way back to Zafferana Etnea participants were shown the outside of the Sigonella US base.

FRIDAY NOVEMBER 9TH

❖ Emma Jordan-Simpson gave the inspirational introduction.

Our visit yesterday to St. John the Baptist's Hospitality Center gave me pause. In the images of the video they showed us, I saw young men who could be my sons. I kept thinking about their mothers. "How can we not see ourselves as interwoven and interconnected?" In a few weeks, millions of people of my faith tradition, Christianity, will celebrate the birth of a baby. And we will once again prove ourselves to be such hypocrites in this celebration. We will forget that this baby's parents -- Mary and Joseph -- had a reason to flee. And our president will still send armed military to the border to protect us from unarmed families, mothers and fathers with their children.

Awakened by a dream (which had to be the kind of nightmare that sits on your chest like a ton of bricks, insisting you wake up just so you can breathe), Joseph and Mary do what people have done in every place where terror has reigned. They ran away from home.

I want to share with you as meditation a few excerpts from Warsan Shire's poem entitled "Home". She is a British woman born in Kenya to Somali parents. I'm happy to email you the poem in its entirety, but these excerpts capture some of what it must mean to leave your familiar - to walk, to run with everything in you just for your life. I wish that I had been present for the conference on migration. I am grateful that we were able to visit the hospitality center yesterday. I am heartbroken that even so, the young men we met yesterday who greeted us with such hospitality may one day be the men who sleep on the streets in Catania. Because, people don't run away from home because they need job training. They run away from home because "home won't let them stay," Shire says.

Let us pray and work that all who are running from the terror in their own familiarity find a better refuge than what we have already imagined as fitting. May all who stand privileged on the shores

of "safe places" give up our bloody trust in guns, drones and weaponized hate, and run as quickly as we can to the unfamiliar. Let's run until our days end in the Beloved Community.

11. ELECTION OF INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEE, IFOR PRESIDENT AND VICE- PRESIDENT -CONT.-

The Chair of the NC and the Chair of Council explained to the delegates that the comments made during the previous report of NC lead to a deepen reflection and exchange afterword.
Emma Jordan-Simpson who took part in the exchange was invited to share with the Council:

"First, we commend the nominating committee, not only for the work they have done to prepare this slate of officers for our consideration, but also for the willingness to listen and to engage a group of us with such openness.

It was noted by all that the slate of officers nominated were all excellent considerations. The questions raised in no way reflected questions of their competence or fitness for service, but rather how our commitments to equity are expressed in our leadership. The face of IFOR matters to us and the world.

The Nominating Committee shared with us the process for receiving nominations from Branches; for vetting those nominations, and the issues that were considered as candidates were reviewed. It was a lengthy and deep discussion characterized by transparency and creative thinking.

We asked the committee to reconvene themselves to consider the richness of our shared discussion, and to explore the feasibility of a few options. We noted that we should not shy away from the hard conversations, we should not avoid the uncomfortable subjects in Fellowship. If we had not pursued these questions with the Nominating Committee, we may not have had the opportunity to name the structural issues, the assumptions and the considerations that we now suspect serve as barriers to rich, broad and consistent participation from women, young people, and members of the Global South in the IFOR Council. Many of us in attendance at this meeting made commitments to work together and to do our part to address these structural issues and the assumptions that affect not just the election of officers to the ICOM, but basic participation in the IFOR council quadrennial meetings."

The chair of NC presented the new proposed slate:

President: Lotta Sjostrom Becker (Sweden)
Co-Vice-President: Peter Cousins (UK)
Co-Vice-President: Blas Garcia Noriega (Colombia)
Treasurer: Christian Renoux (France)
Ignatius Mukunto (Zambia)
Beena Sebastian (India)
Light Wilson Aganwa (South Sudan)

The floor was then given to Suseela George before checking consensus:

"The branches need to nominate candidates to the International Committee based on their own

assessments of their nominees- their competence and commitment to give time and thought to IFOR if selected and have communication skills.

It is from such a list of nominees that the Nominations Committee choose a panel of seven which is placed before the Council for approval as the International Committee.

Yes it is important to have balances of all kinds including age, gender, region .... in the International Committee.

But we have to keep in mind that at the end of the day only people with commitment and necessary skills can ensure efficient functioning of IFOR.

I consider this slate which is presented as having both the competence and other balances within the proposed names in the Nomination Committee.

Considering the urgency and due to time constraints we have to be decisive to have this constitutional body in place to ensure IFOR to be robust and alive."

- ➢ The new proposed slate was accepted by consensus and Council did thank the NC for the hard work.

It was highlighted the process undertaken to reach out consensus on the new ICOM members nomination and especially the effort to listen to each other, the courage and patience to pause and look for alternatives and mutual understanding. This was a learning experience to be treasured as to create a shared path to eventually reach consensus in very sensitive issues, taking responsibilities for the needs of the fellowship and the weak elements which needs to be strengthened.

During the discussion it was pointed out:

- The need for greater diversity.
- The Nominations Committee had to work with the nominations available. Only two women had been nominated. This limited the diversity of the recommended slate.
- The process and procedures of the nomination arrangements should be deepened so that branches are encouraged to make more and wider nominations.
- There should be a solidarity fund to enable all branches (especially those from the global south) to be represented.
- Ignatius Mukunto was willing to take on a particular concern for Africa.

- ➢ Jean-Pierre Massamba reported that the African BGAs had consensus that the IFOR Africa programme should be conducted by the two African representatives to the RCC.

A concern was raised that not all Council participants had had sight of the Council 2018 Process Document. The document had been circulated to all BGAs.

- ➢ The issue of how to ensure that all participants were aware of all important Council documents was referred to the Communications working group.

10. CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS -CONT.-

Proposal 1.9 by ICOM highlighted that IFOR has been working with representatives at the UN missions in Geneva, New York, Vienna and Paris for some time. This proposal seeks to consolidate their status from a constitutional point of view, and it consists of an addition to the Constitution: "IFOR may appoint representatives to the United Nations and other international or regional organizations. Such representatives shall be approved by Council or International Committee and shall be responsible to the International Committee."

- This amendment was agreed by consensus.

Proposal 1.10 presented by FOR India was revised: "BGA's must have a mechanism which enables concerns of their nations or regions to be taken through the IFOR representatives and its allied bodies."

- This proposal was agreed by consensus.
- It was suggested that a functioning mechanism to ensure this would be to have one ICOM member specifically tasked with liaison with BGAs and IFOR representatives.

During the discussion the following points were made:

- The Procedures and Guidelines need amendment to set out some criteria for selection of IFOR representatives, including criteria on diversity.
- It was desirable that IFOR representatives were adequately compensated for their work.
- Some points were commended to ICOM for inclusion in section 7 of procedural guidelines: that one ICOM member be specifically tasked with liaison between BGAs and the UN and other representatives
- As to proposal 1.11 presented by FOR Austria, it was agreed by consensus to add a further clause 5.3: "The International Committee will report regularly about its activities and decisions to the IFOR branches, groups and affiliates." The other amendments under 1.11 were withdrawn.

Proposal 1.12 presented by FOR India stated that 'Section 5 of the Procedural Guidelines and Practices be amended to declare regions to be a formal structure of IFOR.'
FOR India recommended that regions would be mandated to raise resources with the assistance of the secretariat for programmes of a transnational or regional character. A percentage of the funds so raised should go to support the secretariat. FOR Sweden and FOR England and Scotland considered the change was unnecessary as section 5 already provided for IFOR regions. They stood aside and did not block consensus.

- The proposal was agreed by the Council.

FOR Austria withdrew their proposal 1.13 to reduce the number of IFOR membership categories. They asked the ICOM to examine IFOR membership categories and that the topic be on the agenda for the

next Council. FOR Austria aimed for an increasing membership and considered that the complicated procedure for becoming an IFOR member was off-putting.

As to the proposal presented by MONAR-Benin it became clear that what was thought to be an amendment was in fact a correction of the language. Monar-Benin had one observation which was an object of their concern. The IFOR constitution speaks of the IFOR Foundation without specifying the role which this structure plays.

12. COUNCIL RESOLUTIONS AND ACCEPTANCE OF NEW BRANCHES

1. Resolution proposed by FOR England and Scotland:
This Council resolves that the support of the Fellowship be a major priority for IFOR's work. It further resolved that all enquiries and applications for membership be considered a priority and processed promptly.

Denis Beaumont noted that there had been significant delays in processing membership. He cited the position of ANANDO whose application had been before IFOR for 8 years. Together with Zaira Zafarana reported also the situation of MIR Togo. David Mumford said that there were a significant number of applications for individual membership that had not been processed and another organization in Bangladesh whose application for membership was not before Council.
Jean-Pierre Massamba and Peter Cousins apologized on behalf of the ICOM for the delays.

- Council agreed the FOR England and Scotland resolution by consensus.
- Council resolved to accept ANANDO as a branch.
- Council resolved to accept MIR Togo as a branch.

2. Resolution proposed by FOR England and Scotland:
This Council resolves that it shall be the responsibility of the incoming ICOM to ensure that:
a/ minutes of ICOM and RCC meetings are distributed to branches, groups and affiliates within one month of the meeting.
b/ the annual accounts and annual budgets are circulated to the branches [, groups and affiliates].

- Council agreed this resolution by consensus after having added 'groups and affiliates' after branches.

3. Resolution proposed by FOR England and Scotland:
This Council welcomes the United Nations Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons. It congratulates those governments who have signed up to the Treaty and asks BGA's in those countries to communicate their approval for this step. It calls on those governments which have not signed up to do so and asks BGA's in those countries to continue to press their governments to become signatories.

- Council agreed this resolution by consensus.

4. Resolution proposed by FOR England and Scotland.

Council welcomes IFOR's links with Pax Christi International and the Dicastery for Promoting Integral Human Development and the co-operation between BGA's and relevant Pax Christi branches [and national Commissions for Justice and Peace].

Council welcomes the moves within the Roman Catholic Church towards reclaiming gospel nonviolence. It welcomes its clear opposition to capital punishment and the Vatican becoming a signatory of the United Nations Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons.

Council expresses its hope that an encyclical on nonviolence may be produced within the next two years.

- Council agreed this resolution by consensus after having added references to Commissions of Justice and Peace.

5. FOR India proposed a resolution on youth:

The Fellowship of Reconciliation India proposes to Council the affirmation of support and funding to Youth Programmes through regional structures and the international secretariat.

- Council agreed this proposal by consensus.

-Discussion and decisions continued on Saturday, p.23-

SATURDAY NOVEMBER 10TH

❖ The inspirational introduction was given by Blas Garcia Noriega.

13. Representative Consultative Committee Election

- The delegates divided in regional groups elected the RCC.
  Africa: Jean-Pierre Massamba from Congo Brazaville, Makrios Phiri from Zimbabwe
  Americas: Gustavo Cabrera from Colombia, Chrissy Stonebreaker-Martinez from U.S.
  Europe: Denis Beaumont from UK, Mirjam Stahl from Germany
  Asia: Manir Miah from Bangladesh, Kyoko Iitaka from Japan.

14. Council Working Groups Reports and Decisions

- The Council decided to address specific issues in working groups which gathered for an entire session and then reported in the plenary presenting possible recommendations.

1. Constitution Working Group:

It was proposed the establishment of a long-term working group to look at the constitution, the Procedural Guidelines and Practices and the Council Process document.

- ➢ Council agreed by consensus on the proposal presented. Denis Beaumont and Jacob Carlbacker are the contact persons.

2. UN Working Group

Zaira Zafarana and Veronica Geue presented to the Council the results of the exchange within the WG which started from the participants interests on UN work:

- get a better understanding of possible work within UN system;
- provide opportunities for BGAs to engage at UN on particular issues (such as Bangladesh Rohingya refugee camps);
- strengthen collaboration between UN reps and BGAs.

The discussion deepened on the issue of communication and proposals were listed:

- Articles and news on IFOR website and Fb page. - Webinars for those interested to learn more about UN work and living far away; specific ones could also provide insights for interested BGAs and others could be thematic ones.
- Regular updates to the fellowship by email, informing on initiatives. - Coordinated communication among UN reps.

The WG highlighted the importance of coordination and harmonization of UN work.

1. The WG endorsed the appeal from FOR Japan calling for the implementation of the Right to Peace as adopted at the UN General Assembly in 2016 and proposed the planning of specific events to be held at the UN both in Geneva and New York.

- ➢ Council agreed this endorsement by consensus and asked ICOM and all BGAs to promote this concern.

2. The group proposed that Zaira Zafarana should continue her work and coordinate the IFOR UN activity facilitating the exchange among reps and the collaboration between UN representatives and BGAs.

- ➢ The question of an appointment was remitted to ICOM.

3. The group reported the willingness of Chrissy Stonebreaker- Martinez and Sherly Fabre to be new UN reps in New York. It was noted that there are 5 places and so far, only 2 representatives active in New York.

- ➢ Council agreed to support these nominations. The WG decided not to be an on going WG but rather to actually engage into the work inviting all BGAs to join in.

3. Overcoming barriers WG

This group proposed the establishment of a working group to focus on the effort to broaden the range of BGA membership and representation at Council with especial emphasis on the global south, women

and young people and the formation of the next generation of IFOR's global witnesses. The group would examine the barriers to full participation and make recommendations to ICOM for the next Council.

- ➢ Council agreed to establish this working group.
  Emma Jordan-Simpson and Samya Korff are the contact persons.

4. Four-year plans WG

This group made recommendations to the wider Fellowship that did not require consensus decisions.

- IFOR and BGA's should take advantage of the 100 years anniversary of IFOR in 2019. Anniversary events in Austria (September), Germany (October) and Sweden (November) should be supported.
- Peace theology should be explored, and each faith tradition should examine what within their tradition makes for peace and reconciliation. Some BGA's are already working on this. Pax Christ could be involved. [Michel Monod commented that IFOR's spiritual basis went beyond being purely faith based.]
- People should share their experiences and knowledge within the international fellowship.
- Branch twinning between global south and global north branches should be encouraged.
- There should be a newsletter or website that encourages sharing of news and information. Videos could be used and perhaps a three-monthly indexed publication.
- There should be concrete entry points for younger people to access spiritually based nonviolence.

5. Africa WG

The Working Group on Africa will work to implement the IFOR Africa Plan. This implementation will be coordinated by the two African Representatives at the RCC, in conjunction with the International Committee. In addition to training and education activities, the Africa WG will also work to revive former BGAs in the Africa Region that are no longer active, increase the number of African BGAs, follow up on all pending membership applications and accelerate their processes and strengthen and improve cooperation between BGA across the Africa Region. The African BGAs will be encouraged to jointly support the Pan-African Non-Violence and the Peacebuilding Network on the Region.

The Working Group will organize more meetings in Africa and will work to ensure that the next IFOR Council is held in Africa. The Working Group on Africa will work to promote the empowerment of women, including ensuring that there is an increase in the number of women in Africa at the next Council. In addition, as part of the exchanges within IFOR, it is desirable that representatives of African BGAs participate in the meeting that will take place in Colombia in May 2019.

- ➢ Council agreed by consensus that the Africa WG should continue. Jean-Pierre Massamba and Patrick Rakotondranaly are the contact persons.

6. Council Press Release WG

The chair of the Council informed that the WG drafted a text which will be finalized by the end of the Council. The final press release is available at this link.

SERPAJ presented its reported.

15. APPOINTMENT OF THE STICHTING

- ➢ Council agreed to delegate the selection of Stichting board members to the International Committee.

16. APPOINTMENT OF THE FINANCIAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

David Mumford made a presentation on the Financial Advisory Committee (FAC) and the reason it was instated at last Council, to support the treasurer in funding and financial work.
Lotta Sjöström-Becker (IFOR President) informed that the Executive Committee (ExCom) had just talked about this and presented a proposal for a new mission of the FAC:
The IFOR Financial Advisory Committee shall be made up of a small group of individuals associated with the IFOR BGAs and/or relating directly to the Secretariat, responsible for supporting the Treasurer and ExCom with matters of IFOR income and expenses. With membership selected by ICOM, FAC's work is to help analyze the reasons for income/expense rises and declines, to help with raising funds, and to help in the maintaining of a balanced annual budget. FAC is to be a working advisory body, with no direct oversight responsibilities. It shall meet on a quarterly basis, or as determined necessary by IFOR Treasurer, President, or International Coordinator.

- ➢ Council agreed on the FAC mission statement as proposed by ExCom.
- The 2018-2022 members of FAC shall be elected by ICOM; Council suggested to be Matt Meyer (Committee Chair), Christian Renoux (Treasurer), Nozoe Tatsushi and/or Kyoko Iitaka (Japan FOR), a representative of SweFOR to be determined, David Mumford (FOR England & Scotland), Johan Stonkhorst (Netherlands).

12. COUNCIL RESOLUTIONS -CONT.-

6. Recommendation proposed by the Structure working group:
We also recommend that the BGAs be encouraged to engage in a renewal process within their own memberships to consider what they want to receive from, and give to, an international structure working on their behalf, and what is needed for them to better involve themselves with IFOR on the international level.

- ➢ Council adopted it as a recommendation to ICOM.

7. Recommendation proposed by the Structure working group:
If mediation is needed between conflicting parties, we should turn to our existing resources, for example our elders, as consultant mediators. We recommend that a set of guidelines be available to help in any conflict situations.

- ➢ Council adopted it as recommendation to BGAs.

8. Recommendation proposed by the Structure working group:

In many of the recommendations we saw that there is a problem of lack of communication so we would like to ask ICOM to address this problem and if necessary, to establish a working group with BGA involvement.

- Council adopted it as recommendation to ICOM.

9. Resolution on Cameroon

IFOR Council supports the call for the UN Human Rights Council to establish a fact-finding mission during the 40th session of the UN Human Rights Council, or to initiate a similar international mechanism, to investigate alleged and apparently serious human rights violations and abuses in Cameroon and in particular in the so-called Anglophone region of the country.

- Council agreed by consensus.

10. UN reps. represent IFOR at the UN and are charged with bringing a voice of the IFOR members there. They are directed by ICOM and president to be able to work strategically and effectively.

- Council restated that the International Committee has the mandate to appoint IFOR representatives at the UN and its related bodies.

11. Appeal by FOR Japan to support the nuclear ban and to call governments to ratify the UN Treaty to abolish nuclear weapons and implement it was welcomed and merged in the resolution proposed by FOR England and Scotland on the same issue and adopted by Council.

17. COUNCIL EVALUATION

Emma Jordan-Simpson and Suseela George were invited by the chair of the Council, Zaira Zafarana to lead the evaluation session. Evaluation sheets have been compiled by participants. A full report will be made to ICOM.

18. CONCLUSION

The new ICOM addressed the Council.

A presentation to Zaira Zafarana took place and she was thanked for all the work that she had done to make the Council possible.

Gratitude for the hard work has been expressed to the members of the Council Preparation Committee and to those of the Council Coordinating Committee.

There was also a presentation to the two retiring ICOM members, Jean-Pierre Massamba and Nozoe Tatsushi.

The incoming president outlined the challenges facing IFOR over the next 4 years and the initial priorities of the new ICOM. One would be to set the expectations quite low on the incoming ICOM in order for its members to be able to implement and survive for the next four years. This priority is based on earlier ICOM experiences. The President has the ambition to return to the next council in good spirit and with a smile on her face.

A necessary priority is to take a firm grip on the finances and try to create a solid basic administration and coordination of IFOR. Based on the current financial situation It would not be possible to appoint a replacement for the International Coordinator in the immediate future. Therefore, some of the IC tasks had been shared amongst the ICOM. It would be a working ICOM, maintaining the basic administrative functions of IFOR until enough sustainable funding for hiring an international coordinator will be secured. ICOM will prioritize regular and transparent communication. ICOM would go through the recommendations from Council.

The president invited, in conclusion of the Council, all participants to stand up and join in a string activity where everyone could share inspirational thoughts for the future of the fellowship. The game ended with all participants connected to each other through the string, representing the possible connection and mutual support within a fellowship.

Attachment A

Message from Adolfo Perez Esquivel

Buenos Aires, November 5, 2018

Dear IFOR friends:

Adolfo Pérez Esquivel, Nobel Peace Prize and the National Coordination of SERPAJ Argentina, we want to send you our best wishes for the meeting that is currently taking place.

We welcome the International Public Conference on Migration and the fact that IFOR takes this issue as part of the agenda, which concern and occupy us so much, since it is lived by regions where the most neglected peoples are being violated with hunger and repression , lest by oblivion. That is why we say that "hunger is a crime", because in areas that have very valuable resources such as minerals, oil and more fertile lands; they are the most coveted by capitalism and multinationals to keep accumulation and profit in the hands of a minority group.

In the same way we send our wishes to the Global Network with which we identify, with the principles and values of IFOR and in particular the meeting of the International Council, where surely an international agenda and work program will be decided ; We also promote good resolutions by the International Committee (ICOM).

As a member of IFOR in my capacity as Nobel Peace Prize and together with the National Coordination of SERPAJ Argentina, as we express our approval and see the importance of being present in that space, we also want to appeal to your understanding for the partial participation of Our Network. Unfortunately, it was not the two representatives as planned and only one partner can be present. This is due to internal difficulties since an agenda for our participation could not be reconciled. Therefore, we are not in a position to assume responsibility individually, but collectively. So that any position or responsibility, the SERPAJ Latin America Network will designate the person who will represent us in such an important space.

Without another particular, we say goodbye reiterating our most sincere wishes for success in this meeting.

Receive our greetings of Peace and all that is good.

Attachment B

UNOG report by Derek Brett

Report on UN Geneva activity, By Derek Brett, IFOR Main representative at UN Geneva

1) Conscientious Objection to Military Service ; this is the only part of the work which is funded, hence it has had to take priority.

A grant from the Joseph Rowntree Charitable Trust (JRCT), a Quaker Foundation in the United Kingdom, for the period April 2013 – March 2016, paid through MIR Suisse, was followed by a further three-year grant paid through the International Secretariat. (Three years is the maximum duration of grant which JRCT offers). We are currently in the course of applying for a further three years.

The initial focus of the work was on providing briefings to the UN Human Rights Committee on "military service, conscientious objection, and related issues in those States which are making to it "Periodic Reports" under the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

Since the IFOR Council in Konstanz in 2014 there have been 13 sessions of the Human Rights Committee. To these, IFOR has made submissions on States. In not all States is conscientious objection to military service a major human rights issue, but in the great majority of those where it is we have succeeded in obtaining from the Committee recommendations on the issue in their "concluding observations".

in October 2014
in March 2015
in July 2015
in October 2015
in March 2016
in July 2016
in October 2016
in March 2017
in July 2017
in October 2017
in March 2018
in July 2018

We have also achieved questions in the "Lists of Issues" for States whose reports are yet to come before the Committee; such questions – and the answers given by the State - are usually reflected in the "Concluding observations". These include:

In parallel with the Human Rights Committee, IFOR has made contributions to the

Universal Periodic Review process of the Human Rights Council, in the session. Both aspects have also involved bringing activists to Geneva.

Colombia:
In October 2016 we brought Ana-Maria Rodriguez of the Comision Colombiana de Juristas and Nicolas of ACOOC (the Asociation Collectiva de Objetores y Objetoras de Conciencia, based in Bogota) to the consideration by the Human Rights Committee of Colombia's Periodic Report.
In April 2018 we brought Maricely Parada of ACOOC to the "presession" before the UPR review of Colombia – fortunately we were also able to combine this with an intervention in the Human Rights Council on the report from the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights Office in Colombia (those of us who are based in Geneva can always sign up for two minutes' speaking time, but obviously people from distant places like Colombia need already to be here for another purpose), with meetings with various European branches, and finally being a guest at the annual EUFOR meeting.

Republic of Korea:
In September 2017 we co-ordinated with Tom of Amnesty Korea and Stanley Baek, a Jehovah's Witness lawyer who had represented a number of conscientious objectors and had also served a sentence of imprisonment for his personal objection.

Work on conscientious objection included a provision for Derek Brett, the person with principal responsibility for the project, to be paid half-time at the minimum wage in Geneva. He thus now works on a contract with IFOR. The grant also included a provision for a succession of shorter-term appointments of a training nature – from Summer 2017 to Summer 2018, Martina Lanza was contracted to IFOR, and paid from the JRCT grant, subsequently, until the end of this year, Zaira Zafarana has worked on the same basis. (In both cases they in practice worked from home in Northern Italy, commuting through to Geneva for weeks of major relevant meetings.)

The JRCT grant has also enabled IFOR to share with MIR Switzerland the cost of an office at the Ecumenical Centre in Geneva (the headquarters of the World Council of Churches). This is the first time IFOR has maintained an office at any of the UN centres. It must be stressed that this is the only dedicated funding IFOR receives for its UN work. As it stands, any expansion must be funded out of the general budget.

Cyprus
Eritrea
Greece
Israel
Russia
Tajikistan

2) Human Rights Council, CO resolution, Side events -

Written and Oral Statements
Miscellaneous visitors

Swefor partners introduction 2015

3) Universal Periodic Review Submissions
4) Special Procedures
5) Treaty Bodies
6) Human Right to Peace
7) Miscellaneous – UNHCR, IOM, IPCC
8) EBCO
9) DB misc travels:
    WRI Eastern Mediterranean Meeting, Cyprus 2015?
    Moscow conference December 2015

Attachment C

Report on UNESCO activity, by Maria Antonietta Malleo, IFOR main representative to UNESCO

GENERAL ACTION OF IFOR REPRESENTATION TO UNESCO AND SUMMARY OF LAST ACTIVITIES (2015-2018)

General action:
-Speeches at the UNESCO General Conference Sessions (Plenary and Commissions);
-partecipation and speeches at the Committee of UNESCO Executive Board Sessions on NGOs;
-participation in the biennial International conference of NGOs at UNESCO;
-member of steering committes and working groups for the organisation of international forum promoted by NGOs and the UNESCO-NGOs Liaison Committe, and panelist;
-drawning up of reports and participation in questionnaires of consultation for UNESCO policy development;
- continuing participation to the working groups of NGOs community at UNESCO and networking with other NGOs to improve civil society efficacy at UNESCO in policy-making, advocacy, implementation of action plans, mechanisms of cooperation between NGOs and Member States;
- application for the UNESCO Participation Programme (received 2 grants in the past years), and nominations for UNESCO Prizes.

Main issues:

Lobbying for reconciliation and social transformation through nonviolence and interfaith-intercultural dialogue;

-promotion of cultural diversity, participatory approach and inclusion of minorities and indigenous groups cultures in policy planning to design alternative models of development, expertise in defence and promotion of human rights, gender equality;

-promotion of nonviolence and peace education and of institutionalization of peace education (International Coalition work);

-promotion of policy oriented research and knowledge-sharing on theory and practice of nonviolent conflict resolution and the use of arts in peacebuilding;

-impact of media in education to violence and to nonviolence, and proposals for lines of action.

Last conferences and forums

2015

38th Session of the General conference, UNESCO Headquarter , Paris 3-18 November 2015

Speech of the main representative in the Social and Human Sciences Commission and Culture Commission (on policy oriented researches and knowledge-sharing on theory and practice of nonviolent conflict resolution; support to youth and civil society organisation in MENA region with training on nonviolence, democracy and peacebuiding; rapprochement of cultures through interreligious –intercultural dialogue).

2016

-Sixth UNESCO-NGOs International Forum “From promoting to building Peace with NGOs”, Querétaro (Mexico), 3-4 November 2016.

More than 800 participants from UNESCO’s NGO official partners (representatives from Latin America, Europe, Asia, Africa and North America), academia, government authorities and youth from local high schools and universities.

Preparation and participation of the main representative, speaker in the panel “Arts: a tool for dialogue”, on the role of art in conflict and post-conflict situations.

-International Conference of NGOs, UNESCO Headquarter , Paris, 12-14 December 2016

The contribution of IFOR permitted to have in the final documents of the conference (conclusions and the NGOs contribution for the new UNESCO strategy) an official committment for the “promotion of culture of peace” and for “education for peace and nonviolence” (http://www.ngo-unesco.net/conf2016/Conclusions%20de%20la%20CIONG%202016%20-%20EN%20Final.pdf; http://www.ngo-unesco.net/conf2016/CIONG2016-%20contribution39C5%20EN.pdf).

2017

39th Session of the General conference, UNESCO Headquarter , Paris November 2017

Speech of the IFOR main representative in Plenary (General Policy Debate) and in the Social and Human Science Commissions.

(Main points: institutionalisation of peace and human rights education; knowledge-sharing on theory and practice of nonviolent conflct resolution, including art and peace research, cultural aspects of contemporary violence; widening international trend to the criminalisation of humanitarian action; creation of humanitarian corridors in the refugee and migrants crisis).

2018

-Ninth International Forum of NGOs in official partnership with UNESCO "Another Perspective on Migration" Tunis , 26-27 September 2018, (in partnership by NGOs-UNESCO Liaison Committee and the Arab Institute for Human Rights in the framework of the 70th anniversary of the Universal Declaration on Human Rights.

Preparation and participation of the main representative and IFOR workshop by Patrick Abisemba and Maria Biedrawa on Teaching nonviolence in a refugee camp.

International Seminar on Human Rights, Tunis, 29 September 2018;

Celebration of the International Day of Peace, Tunis, 28 September 2018, contest for schools and children, "Imagine a Drone or a Robot for Peace".

-International Conference of NGOs "Promoting and enhancing the committment and contribution of UNESCO's NGO partenrs", UNESCO Headquarter, Paris, 17-19 December 2018

The contribution of IFOR permitted also to have in the final document of the conference a shared committment on education for nonviolence and peace.

Current activities:

Participation to the working groups on reinforcement of NGOs cooperation with UNESCO, Agenda 2030, and preparation of a new forum on "Global citizenship, nonviolence and peace education" and of a Festival for peace in 2020.

Attachment D

Final Structure Working Group Report - Introduction

IFOR Analysis and Renewal Process

1. History, mandate and objectives of the process/working group (WG)
At IFOR's International Council 2014 in Konstanz the following proposal was made by 7 branches and 1 affiliate and approved by consensus:
"We propose that the IFOR set up a process of careful analysis of the situation and problems that occurred in IFOR during the last 15 years and on this basis revise the structures of IFOR and make proposals for changes accordingly. This can serve as an instrument to strengthen the ownership of the members of IFOR. This process should be led by a "task force/steering group" and be given a limited time frame."

The **working group** formed - consisting of Ana Juanche (SERPAJ AL), Christian Renoux (MIR France), Geraldine Bridges (FOR England), Lili Baxter (FOR USA), Pete Hämmerle (FOR Austria) and Tess Ramiro (AKKAPKA CANV, FOR Philippines) - developed a design for the process of analysis and review and a questionnaire to gather information from IFOR's members (BGAs), and individuals active in IFOR in the past 15 years (in ICOM, RCC; UN reps, staff, Stichting, Personnel Committee, WG).

The general objective of this work was to promote the renewal of IFOR's work on peace, justice and reconciliation through active nonviolence on an international level, based on a review/evaluation process about structural causes for repeated internal crisis situations and conflicts.
Its specific objectives were to develop a process of broad consultation to gather opinions and experiences about structural reasons for repeated internal crisis situations and conflicts in IFOR in the past 15 years and their impact on international and domestic work.
- to develop recommendations for strengthening the organizational basis of IFOR on an international level.

2. Design and timeline of the process:
The WG started in September 2014 and developed a timeline and a questionnaire till the end of the year, which was sent out in January 2015. Till the end of May, 28 answers were received. The results were entered in a database, from which the "Analytical Report" was produced in May 2016. Due to various circumstances the original timetable of the process got delayed significantly, it took the working group much more time than expected to develop the summaries of their findings, formulate their recommendations and finalize this report.

3. The Questionnaire:
The questionnaire was sent out in January 2015 to about 140 email addresses (after some effort to collect them from IFOR's webpage, various lists, personal contacts and internet research). After two

(planned) extensions of deadline, the return rate was 20% (28 questionnaires): 13 branches, 4 affiliates and 11 individuals.
The questionnaire was divided into 4 sections, each asking for the past and current view of IFOR as well as the wishes and expectations on the future:
I. Structure, roles and tasks of all bodies in IFOR
II. Communication on all levels
III. Decision making in IFOR
IV. Conflicts and (non-)resolution of conflicts in IFOR

4. The Final Report
This final report shall be submitted to all members of IFOR (BGA's) as well as to all individuals who have been sent the questionnaire, through the International Committee and Secretariat.

IFOR Working Group -- IFOR Analysis and Renewal Process
SUMMARIES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Section 1: Structure, roles and tasks of all bodies in IFOR
1. Although IFOR is presently seen by respondents as both a Fellowship (defined in the questionnaire as "open concept, a sense of unity") and as an International NGO ("top down approach, centralized") with 30% of respondents for each, respondents envision a shift in priorities in the future towards Fellowship (47%) and away from INGO (10%). The other concepts considered -- Social Movement ("horizontal, action for social change") and Network ("loose association, decentralized") -- remained stable with around 20% each.
2. Two-thirds of respondents see the present overall structure as not serving well the operations and functions of IFOR. This is because the structure is regarded as too complicated and/or inadequate. Only one-third perceive the structure as adequate/working well.
3. When it came to evaluating the relationships between different IFOR constitutional bodies, the rate of answers was very low. This may have been due to the respondents' lack of direct knowledge and involvement in all aspects of IFOR. Relationships were generally perceived to work "well" or "not well" about evenly. The most negative views concerned the relationships between BGAs and other entities: BGAs - ExCom ("94% not working well or at all"), BGAs - RCC (87%) and BGAs - ICOM (66%). These figures indicate that the BGAs' relationships to IFOR's major constitutional bodies are ineffective and in need of repair. ICOM's relations to RCC and Representatives (Reps) are the most positively rated (70%).
4. In regards to the definition and implementation of tasks by IFOR bodies, both past and current, there are few outstanding results. Presently, the roles of Stichting, Reps and Personnel Committee are the most clear, whereas the role of the RCC is the least clear. When reviewing more explicitly the tasks of IFOR bodies as listed in the Constitution, all tasks get a positive rating, but there is less clarity in regards to the tasks expected of the RCC.
5. Looking at possible constitutional changes, several proposals/ideas were put forward regarding the clarification of the roles of ICOM, ExCom, IS/IC, Representatives and RCC (see section 1.15 in the Analytical Report). There were also strong observations regarding restructuring membership and the

simplification of IFOR structures.
6. Looking towards the future and the possible roles played by IFOR bodies at that time, there is a clear wish that BGAs ("100% more or equally important role") and ICOM (76%) would play more important roles. Working Groups, Reps, International Secretariat/International Coordinator (IS/IC), RCC and to some extent ExCom should keep their functions, whereas the roles of Stichting ("60% less important or to be skipped") and the PC (56%) should be less important or omitted altogether.
7. Also seen as affecting the functioning of IFOR was the financial situation of the organization as well as the wide disparity of access to communications technology by members.

Section I - Recommendations
Our recommendations for Section I can be grouped into 3 categories:

1. On the future of IFOR in general:
* Considering the responses to point 1, we recommend the in-depth exploration of the concept of "fellowship" and what responsibilities would be required of IFOR members/BGAs in order to work in unity and cooperation with each other.
* Responses suggest the de-centralization of the work of IFOR at the international level. This is indicated in the desire not to put more work/responsibilities/weight on the Secretariat and ICOM, and that this work should be taken up by BGAs. This should also be explored.
* Even more urgent in a renewal process than structural changes, is the need for clarification of the vision and mission of IFOR on all levels. We, therefore, recommend that a process of participatory discussion be set-up, beginning now until the next Council (and perhaps beyond), with all relevant IFOR stakeholders. This discussion is to be organized by ICOM and IS.
* We also recommend that the BGAs be encouraged to engage in a renewal process within their own memberships to consider what they want to receive from, and give to, an international structure working on their behalf, and what is needed for them to better involve themselves with IFOR on the international level.

2. On a structural level in general:
* Since the present structure is regarded as inadequate and too complicated, we recommend that serious consideration be given to the simplification of IFOR bodies and structure, including: (1) avoiding the duplication of responsibilities, (2) reducing the number of "constitutional bodies" and (3) redistributing their respective tasks to the remaining bodies.
* We also recommend examination of the definition and criteria for membership in IFOR (categories of membership, including individual membership, as well as rights and duties) with regards to simplification and attractiveness.

3. On more specific structural questions:
* Regarding IFOR structures functioning better, and as part of a renewal process, we recommend a thorough review of the IFOR Constitution. In this review, it will not only be necessary to take into

account the comprehensiveness and feasibility of a streamlined model for IFOR bodies and structure, but it will also be necessary to reach clarity regarding who is in charge of which decisions.
* International Committee (ICOM): In order to strengthen the role and functioning of ICOM, we recommend enlarging it to 9-10 members. This would be combined with a nomination process by BGAs that would ensure their strong support of candidates for ICOM. We also recommend the exploration of more frequent and regular communications and meetings of ICOM, including via new media (e.g. Skype, video-streams, etc.). The feasibility of ICOM taking over the tasks of RCC, and perhaps also the Stichting, should be considered.
* Representative Consultative Committee (RCC): We recommend the reconsideration of the structural necessity of an RCC in its present form, and to develop proposals for reform (clarification) or abolition of the RCC.
* Stichting: We recommend the reconsideration of the structural and legal necessity of the "Stichting" in its present form, especially if IFOR wishes to relocate the International Secretariat away from the Netherlands, and its tasks taken over by ICOM.
* Representatives to International Organizations (Reps to IOs): In order to clarify how the IFOR position on various issues is determined -- whether by the ICOM, the IC, or the Reps representing what they think is the sense of IFOR – we recommend that consideration be given to the creation of mandates and directives formulated for IFOR representation in IO's. What IFOR body is to produce these directives has yet to be determined.

Section II: Communication in IFOR on all levels

1. Communication is a key issue in IFOR life, nourishing the network, insuring transparency, disseminating information and providing tools for the BGAs' work. Yet, there is great consensus that communication within IFOR is not satisfactory, especially between BGAs and ICOM/EXCOM, and also at the inter-regional level and between BGAs.
2. Face to face meetings, emails, email newsletters and Skype calls/conferences are the main means of communication available for the BGAs and should be used regularly in the future for IFOR communication.

Section II - Recommendations

1. We recommend that IFOR set up, as its first priority, a strategic plan for effective communication to seriously improve internal communications between all the different actors in IFOR (BGAs, IS, ICOM/EXCOM, etc.).
2. We recommend that IFOR arrive at a solution to the technological and language gaps between the BGAs.
3. We recommend that face-to-face meetings and internet meetings be opened to all members (webinars, Skype meetings, on-line forums and trainings).

Section III: Decision-making in IFOR

1. The most striking result in this section is the lack of transparency in decision-making and communication about decisions. Also, the rate of perceived ability to effectively participate in decision-making is unsatisfactory (50%).
2. There seems to be general satisfaction with the procedures of consensus decision-making and nomination for (s)election of ICOM members. Here, several recommendations for improvement have been made.
3. In regards to responsibility for decisions in the future, a strong(er) role of ICOM in all areas included in the questionnaire seems to be favored, whereas all other bodies were either only mentioned as minor positions or not at all (RCC, WG, Reps).

Section III – Recommendations

1. In regards to better transparency in the decision-making process of IFOR, we recommend that the IFOR Constitution be reviewed in order to reach greater clarity about who is in charge of which decisions.
2. We recommend that clear mechanisms of communication about information on decisions be installed (dissemination of minutes, regular reports by all bodies concerned with decision making, etc.).
3. We recommend that we consider ways for IFOR members (BGAs) to be better involved in decision-making on the international level apart from Council meetings.
4. In regards to consensus decision making on all levels and nomination and (s)election of officers, we recommend (1) the setting-up of clear procedures, (2) better information and preparation of participants in decision-making processes, and (3) following through on the processes agreed upon.
5. We recommend that ICOM play a stronger role in decisions related to personnel, financial and legal matters. This would entail a streamlining of existing structures (especially avoiding "double" responsibilities like presently held by Stichting and the Personell Committee). This would also entail greater clarity in the distribution of roles and tasks (for example between ICOM and RCC).
6. In regards to contents and programmatic work, the involvement of IFOR's members (BGAs) should be reconsidered and strengthened, and the role of the IS, International Representatives and Working Groups should be clearly defined.

Summary Section IV – Conflicts and (non-)resolution of conflicts in IFOR:

1. Although the majority of respondents have been involved in conflicts within IFOR, they did not think the conflicts could have been prevented. Instead, the respondents' concern was with how the conflicts were handled after they had occurred.
2. When a conflict did occur, the majority of respondents felt that it should have been handled where it occurred and not brought to the wider IFOR community.
3. Bringing of a conflict to the broader IFOR community has had a negative impact on members, resulting in disillusionment with IFOR and lack of trust with ICOM. This is especially so because we have "reconciliation" in our name but seem unable to fully achieve it.
4. Conflicts take time, energy and resources away from the BGAs who then feel unsupported and abandoned by IFOR.

Section IV - Recommendations

1. To minimize misunderstandings and rumors and to deal with conflicts in a nonviolent way, it is essential that IFOR make regular and clear communications a priority. Communications should be on all levels: between the ICOM and BGAs, between the Secretariat and BGAs, and between the BGAs themselves.
2. If mediation is needed between conflicting parties, we should turn to our existing resources, for example our elders, as consultant mediators. We recommend that a set of guidelines be available to help in any conflict situations.
3. We need to turn to the internet for regular communications. Regular monthly Skype calls coordinated by the Secretariat or ICOM should be made available to any and all BGAs who wish to participate. Minutes of ICOM meetings need to be sent to all BGAs after each ICOM meeting as well as to all previous ICOM members who desire them. This is to ensure both continuity, involvement and support by those in leadership positions locally and internationally.

Attachment E

Summary of Constitutional amendment proposals

Amendments/ Changes to the constitution

Summary: This category contains amendments and proposed changes concerning the constitution. This includes already worked out changes (Table 1) and general proposals which areas of the constitution needs further changes or proposals without concrete wording for the amendment (Table 2).

Table 1: already worked out changes

Proposed Amendments/Changes	By :	Section
Amendment to reduce the categories of membership in IFOR to 'full members' (branches) and 'affiliate members' In section 2 (International Structure), the introduction to read: The International Fellowship of Reconciliation is composed of branches (full members) and affiliates (associated members) of the organisation. 2.1 no change 2.2 delete clause 2.2 and renumber clause 2.3 as clause 2.2 Amend new clause 2.2 on affiliates to read: Affiliates: An IFOR affiliate is an organisation of people who wish to collaborate with IFOR and who find the IFOR statement of purpose and programme compatible with	FOR Austria	1

their own spirit and programme. An IFOR affiliate will have been formally granted such status by the IFOR Council. Renumber clause 2.4 (individual members) as clause 2.3 *Allowing for any existing organisation to apply for branch/affiliate status should be in the Procedural Guidelines and Practices – no constitutional change would be needed.*		
We propose that the International Fellowship of Reconciliation amend section 5 of the IFOR Constitution Procedural Guidelines and Practices declare the IFOR Region to be a formal structure of the IFOR. The IFOR region will have a Convenor and will be given a budget for travel and communications. Regional meetings will be held at least twice a year and the IFOR region is mandated to raise resources with the assistance of the IFOR secretariat for programs of trans national or regional character. The IFOR shall follow on the requests of region to fundraise and percentage of the funds so raised shall be used to defray costs of the IFOR. The funds so raised shall be used by the region to organize programs for which it was raised with one or more Branch being entrusted and responsible to organize the program. The region's Convenor shall be responsible to ensure that the accounts and reports are submitted to the IFOR. The Convenor of the IFOR Region shall be from the branches. The Regional Convenor shall update the IFOR about activities it proposes to organize. One important task of the IFOR region will be to bring back those branches which have diluted contact with IFOR. The IFOR region shall also develop contact with peace churches and other bodies who have weakened their links with IFOR.[2]	FOR India	Section 5
MIR Italy is then to propose a constitutional amendment to combine ICOM and RCC and have only 1 single body. Therefore, to transfer all RCC tasks to ICOM, erasing article 4 and updating article 5.[3]	MIR Italy	4-5
Structural changes: Simplification of IFOR structure, reducing the number of "constitutional bodies" To abolish the Representative Consultative Council In section 3.3 delete the words '...and the Representative Consultative Committee.' Delete section 4 and renumber subsequent sections In new section 6.4 (old section 7.4) delete the words '...and Representative Consultative Committee.' In new section 10 (old section 11) delete the words '...and the Representative Consultative Committee.'	FOR Austria	7-10
Role of Vice-President of ExCom/ICOM and relation to RCC This proposal seeks to maximise the benefits of the RCC, making use of ExCom and in line with the spirit of the Working Group on IFOR renewal. It consists of an addition to the Constitution:	ICOM	6

Add to Section 6.3 of the Constitution: The tasks of the Vice-President shall include convening meetings of, and being in regular contact with, the Representative Consultative Council, serving as a link between that body and ICOM/ExCom.		
**** International Committee; International Secretariat and Staff: to include the tasks of regular information and communication of B/A into the description of IS (and ICOM)*** *International Committee* In clause 5.2 replace the third sentence (It is composed of.....) with the following: It is composed of between seven and ten members, including the President, Vice-President and Treasurer. To add a further clause (5.3): 5.3 The International Committee will report regularly about its activities and decisions to the IFOR branches and affiliates. To add a further clause (5.4): 5.4 The International Committee has the task of deciding the venue of the next Council, setting general directions for the preparation of that Council and determining the processes to be used during that Council. *Responsibilities of the International Secretariat and Staff* To add a further clause (7.5) to section 7 The International Secretariat and Staff 7.5 The International Secretariat and Staff will report regularly about their activities and decisions to the IFOR branches and affiliates.	FOR Austria	5-7
Structural changes: Simplification of IFOR structure, reducing the number of "constitutional bodies" **Stichting and legal body** (i)To make the membership of the Stichting identical with the membership of the International Committee Delete existing section 8 (Legal Recognition) and replace with the following: The Stichting IFOR (or IFOR Foundation) is the Dutch legal body allowing the organisation to be recognised in and act from the Netherlands. It is also the body legally responsible for the staffing and financing of the International Secretariat. The Stichting IFOR shall be identical with the International Committee of the IFOR (taking into account that one member of ICOM has to be of Dutch nationality). The Stichting is registered at the Chamber of Commerce in Alkmaar, the Netherlands. OR 2b(ii) Delete existing section 8 Legal Recognition and replace with the following: The International Committee shall be responsible for establishing (if necessary) an appropriate legal body to enable the international secretariat to function in the country in which the secretariat is based.	FOR Austria	8
The ICOM shall be responsible for establishing (if necessary) an appropriate legal body to enable the Secretariat to function in the country in which it is based.1 We propose therefore a procedural amendment to modify the process of nomination of ICOM members and therefore to have first a designation of candidates by the Branches, Groups and Affiliates of their respective region, 2 or 3 from each region as preferred, and then the nomination of ICOM members out of those candidates	FOR England/ Scotland	8

designated by all regions, through a Nomination Committee which will take in account competences and availabilities as the current procedure implies.		
Amendments of form and content REGARDING THE CONSTITUTION International Structure 5. The International Committee 5.1- Its members are responsible for translating the directions and recommendations decided upon… 5.2- The International Committee is authorized to fill any vacancy which may occur 6. Executive Committee 6.3- The International Committee chooses … amongst its remit. 7. The International Secretariat 7.4- Field workers may refer to […] groups for help and guidance 10. Amendments Changes made in the constitution must be made by consensus 12. Dissolution The International Fellowship of Reconciliation can be dissolved by decision of the IFOR International Council after a thorough consultation with the member branches, groups and affiliates of the organisation. Translator's note: Most of the amendments here, at least in the version I have, already exist. Only point [6.3] I do not see at all.	Moner Benin	5-12
Constitutional status of IFOR representatives IFOR has been working with representatives at the UN missions in Geneva, New York, Vienna and Paris for some time. This proposal seeks to consolidate their status from a constitutional point of view. It consists of an addition to the Constitution: Addition to Section 9.2: IFOR may appoint representatives to the United Nations and its organisations. Such representatives shall be approved by Council or International Committee, and shall be responsible to the International Committee.	ICOM	9

Table 2 general proposals that are not completely worked out yet/ proposals without concrete wording for amendment

Proposals for further changes	**by**
Review of the Constitution: a process of a complete review of the constitution should be decided upon in order to clarify (new) responsibilities and tasks of all IFOR stakeholders	FOR Austria
Participation of Branches and Affiliates in decision making: A process of better involvement of B/A in decision making in between Councils should be adopted.	FOR Austria
In terms of amendments of content, just one observation which has been the object of our concern. The Constitution speaks of the IFOR Foundation, without	Moner Benin

specifying the role which this structure plays. Would it not be good to dedicate some work to orient those whose knowledge of the subject is not extensive?[3]	
The Fellowship of Reconciliation India proposes to amend the Chapter 7 of the IFOR constitution so that IFOR BGA's, Regions, and working groups will have communication with IFOR's representatives at the United Nations. There is no consultation between the BGA's and the IFOR regarding the IFOR category B consultative status at the ECOSOC and UNESCO. The UN has varied resources which are available and are being used by several NGO's all over the world. The restructuring of the United Nations and the backing which countries have given at the UN General Assembly is an opportunity IFOR and the BGA's must not lose. The IFOR participation at UN must not end with the attendance of IFOR representatives at conferences with themes which are in tune with IFOR's vision statement of nonviolent peace building. The United Nations has several NGO's with consultative status and the NGO's have the access to table the concerns which affect their regions. Non violent conflict management and conflict transformation, women's empowerment and their role as educators for peace, stopping the abuse of children and building the next generation of peace makers, migration and refugees are all on the common agenda of the IFOR and the United Nations. IFOR's volunteer representatives at New York, Geneva, Vienna and Paris need to inform the IFOR about the availability of Resources and the possibilities of raising IFOR BGA's concerns at the UN. The IFOR or the IFOR regional bodies can apply and use the opportunities available for NGO's at the UN.[2]	FOR India
Formal ties with SERPAJ-AL, WRI, WCRP, INEB, PBI, PAX CHRISTI need IFOR's attention. Peace organizations are constantly meeting and reviewing their work and resources. The IFOR Regions can play a major role in establishing close contact and to appraise IFOR about developments at these peace organizations.[2]	FOR India

Notes (further information from the send in documents)

1. FOR England and Scotland proposes the following wording to replace section 8 of the Constitution (about stichting) which we suggested as a response to the working group's option 2:

2. **The Fellowship of Reconciliation India established in the year 1950, a Branch of the International Fellowship of Reconciliation, tables before this Council the following amendments to the Constitution of the IFOR.**

Background:

Our amendments to the IFOR Constitution- Procedural Guidelines and Practices which are placed before the Council are based on:

a. The summaries and recommendations – Final Report of the IFOR Working Group, IFOR Analysis and Renewal Process submitted 2018
b. Constitution and Procedural Guidelines of the IFOR, Document approved by the IFOR International Council, Quito, Ecuador, November 1992
c. The IFOR official website : www.ifor.org and Wikipedia site : https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/International_Fellowship_Of_Reconciliation
d. The Fellowship of Reconciliation India's own understanding of the IFOR

The IFOR Working Group – IFOR Analysis and Renewal Process – had administered a questionnaire and gathered information from a cross section of IFOR covering the BGA's, current and former members who have served on various Committees, Office bearers - on the structure, roles and tasks of all bodies in the IFOR.

The compilation of the responses by the Working Group and the Analysis done, are both the perception and the reality, of IFOR's functioning. The IFOR Secretariat is essential for the International Fellowship of Reconciliation. Was the Secretariat mandated to represent the IFOR exclusively or was the Secretariat meant to facilitate communication? Was IFOR's mission separate and distinct from that of the BGA's? How was the mandate of the Council to be implemented? Can the decisions of the council be implemented by the IFOR secretariat if there are no resources or if it is understaffed? These questions are to be answered only with reference to the IFOR constitution and an understanding of how the IFOR functions. The IFOR constitution at this stage needs to be specific in areas which affect the life of the International and the BGA's. The one evident fact was that the Secretariat, at times, exercised a disproportionate influence on the functioning of the IFOR. The influence was not only functioning but also on the level of decision making, direction and ideology of the IFOR. The primary reason for this disproportionate influence (sometimes quite unhealthy), was that except for the IFOR staff who were full timers and remained in the proximity of the IFOR office, all others including the President and Treasurer were volunteers had limits for the time and energy spent for the IFOR and had infrequent attendance at the IFOR office. The Ex-Com which met more frequently and the International Committee which met less frequently went about the agenda of the IFOR but often failed to reach out to the larger constituency of the BGA's. The International Committee though in contact with IFOR secretariat, met and dispersed and the limited time they had was just enough to take care of agenda items. These meetings had minimal

impact on the relationship of the IFOR with the BGA's. Though there was a requirement that Branches of the IFOR state on their letterheads that the Branch was a part of the International Fellowship of Reconciliation, the plain truth was that IFOR branches lived in separation, worked in isolation, and did not have much contact with either the IFOR or amongst each other. The Working Group noted this state of affairs in its Final Report.

The website of the IFOR states that the Secretariat coordinates communications amongst IFOR members. The President of the IFOR, the Executive Committee, the International Committee, the Personnel Committee, the Stichting also have a role in communicating with the IFOR members when occasion or need arises, either directly or through the Secretariat. That little or no communication takes place is evident from the working group report.

The website further states that the IFOR Secretariat links the Branches to capacity building and finding and building up resources. When the IFOR secretariat had succeeded in finding resources, in particular financial resources, the tendency was to hire more staff and conduct the activity and program by IFOR staff themselves. Some BGA's were left out, ignored, sometimes even mocked and ridiculed. There are branches which have distanced themselves from IFOR and branches which have reduced financial contributions. We need to ask questions and find answers for the happenings of this nature.

The Website mentions that the IFOR Secretariat helps coordinate international campaigns, delegations, representation and urgent action. The IFOR has consultative status B with ECOSOC, UNESCO and has representatives at the United Nation offices at New York, Geneva, Vienna and Paris. The UN is a body formed to avoid and prevent war for the settlement of disputes amongst nations. The largest component in the UN budgetary allocation is for Peacekeeping. Unfortunately Peace keeping for the United Nations is often sending in armed troops. The present UN Secretary General Antonio Guteress has proposed reforms for the UN so that no one is left behind and peace and prosperity is for all. Can the IFOR and BGA's use the resources of the UN for building a culture of peace through active nonviolence? if so how?

The IFOR working group in its Final Report- IFOR Analysis and Renewal process has touched on almost every area of the functioning of the IFOR and has made recommendations. The amendments proposed by The Fellowship of Reconciliation India have the desire of having a vibrant IFOR and practical way of achieving contact, communications and connection between IFOR and its BGA's.

The shared experiences of the BGA's at various councils indicate that the decisions taken at Council with regard to mission of the IFOR are statements of good intentions and plans for action. The IFOR through its Secretariat was mandated to implement decisions of the Council with the oversight and concurrence of the President, Treasurer, the Ex–Committee, the International Committee, Personnel Committee, and the Stichting. Today the IFOR Secretariat with one staff cannot function like the Secretariat which had several fulltime staff. In the scenario of several staff, IFOR was considered to be a distinct International NGO by some of the staff and the only responsibility branches had was to pay their annual fee and to submit reports. The Branches sent their volunteers to serve on the IFOR Executive Committee, the International Committee, Personnel Committee and as President and Treasurer. These committees were meant to take decisions for the IFOR between councils and also to review the implementation of the decisions taken at Council. Very appropriately the Working Group asks for clarity on what IFOR vision is

and the nature of the fellowship (relationship) the IFOR has with its BGA's as a fundamental decision before issues of structure are decided.

Objective of our amendments

The proposals made by the Fellowship of Reconciliation India is towards amending the constitution to enable the IFOR and the BGA's to move forward in unity and cooperation with each other. The IFOR is distinct from the BGA's and needs to be adequately staffed to be effectual. As an International NGO part of the resources must come from the branches and the fees from groups and affiliates. The IFOR goes about its mandated mission by constantly searching for resources and assisting the BGA's to find resources, connect to one another and for undertaking campaigns which require international support. The Vision of the IFOR needs to reflect the fact that some of its members have its vision based on distinct Christian teachings , some members have inter faith Christian teachings, some members have faith traditions and do not like to define or limit its vision, some branches do not have a vision statement but have a mission statement to include inter religious and inter faith groups. Branches which carry on the mission of building peace through nonviolent means can have their own spiritual basis and vision.

3.

	I. Structure, roles and tasks of all IFOR bodies	**II. Internal communication at all levels**	**III. Decision-taking within IFOR**	**FIEFA observations**
STATE OF PLAY	IFOR as a **movement/fellowship** and as an **international NGO** (top-down, centralised) with 30% of respondents. **Social movement** (horizontal, action for social change) and **network** (loose association, decentralised) remained stable with 20% each.	However, there exists a general consensus about the fact that **communication within IFOR is unsatisfactory, in particular between BGAs and ICOM**.	**Lack of transparency** in decision-making and communication around decisions taken is unsatisfactory; 50% perception rate of ease of efficient participation in decision-making.	Social movement oriented towards delivery of training programmes for a pool of trainers for the BGAs (support for institutions such as CFM or Fampihavanana Malagasy).

4.

MIR Italy value the possibility to have Regional Representatives who are elected by BGAs at Council every 4 years as stated in the Constitution in article 4.1. This practice is a democratic process to choose

representatives and therefore involves direct accountability for those elected. It also enhances the proximity with BGAs thus supporting also a two-ways flow of communication.

As to IFOR structure it would be more useful to simplify it and strategize the energy and resources.

On one hand ICOM is the main decision-making body, on the other hand RCC lists additional Regional Representatives who potentially, for the above reasons, are important links to BGAs. Regional Representatives are connecting points within the movement which is a fellowship that needs as well to be able to act as an international organization whenever needed.

MIR Italy is then to propose a constitutional amendment to combine ICOM and RCC and have only 1 single body. Therefore, to transfer all RCC tasks to ICOM, erasing article 4 and updating article 5.

This proposal is aimed to simplify the structure and therefore the organizational needs for meetings, decision processes, communication flow, financial resources, enhancing efficiency and valuing contributions from all elected members.

RCC has an added value which we would like to transfer to ICOM and make it more useful. As already stated Regional Representatives are valuable because of the process of their election.

We propose therefore a procedural amendment to modify the process of nomination of ICOM members and therefore to have first a designation of candidates by the Branches, Groups and Affiliates of their respective region, 2 or 3 from each region as preferred, and then the nomination of ICOM members out of those candidates designated by all regions, through a Nomination Committee which will take in account competences and availabilities as the current procedure implies.

This is a mediation between the designation process of ICOM and RCC, valuing democracy with the need to look for competences. The constitutional amendments proposed is strongly related with the procedural one. The first without the second will fail as to the general purpose.

These proposals are aimed to strengthen IFOR and look for a more closed relation among BGAs, regional areas and the leading international body.