OCA COUNCIL MEETING Fri 28th/ Sat 29th Sep 2007 - Office MSF-H 9.30 a.m. – 7 p.m.

Present: Albertien van der Veen (Chair), Max Glaser, Joanne Liu, Doug Kittle, Christa Hook, Paul Foreman, Tibor Sasse, Johannes Ledinger
Absent with apologies: Tankred Stöbe
Guests: Marilyn McHarg, Claire Mills, Arjan Hehenkamp, Jean-Michel Piedagnel, Geoff Prescott, Adrio Bacchetta
Minutes: Bianca Paslak

FRIDAY

Minutes approval

Meeting March 24th
→ OCAC agreed that London Meeting will not have minutes but a report.
→ Motion of OCA C (24th March) should read: The OCA recognizes the Manson Unit as an integral part of OCA operations, that should be represented on the OCA operational platform by the end of Apr 2007.

Action Point: Officially inform OCA MT of motion regarding MU (for motion see report March 24th)

Meeting July 7th/ 8th
After a long discussion first with the Council, later with the MT, it is obvious that the participants can’t agree on a final version of the minutes, as the draft is not reflecting the discussion. While this is considered as a failure, Max will write a report on that meeting.
As a consequence it is agreed, that an action & decision list will follow every OCA meeting. This will ensure that the work has more continuity. A first draft will be available within 7 days, a final version within 10 days.

Action Point: Max will redraft a report on the combined session of MT and board from July 7th

TC September 12th
→ Approved as a report!

Reflection on proceedings last two months (follow-up action and decision)

After reflecting the OCAC work since the last meeting in July, the council came to the conclusion that it needs to work more consistently. This could be achieved by regular TCs in between the F2F-meetings. The TCs should be used to update each other on further proceedings from the action & decision list, as well as an update on the executive work and possible problems, where guidance might be needed from the OCAC.

Action Point: -Organize an OCAC meeting (F2F or TC) at least every sixth week
-Draft an agenda (incl. schedule + discussion points) and send it around beforehand

Decision: OCAC-meetings shall be hosted by different sections, which are then responsible for agenda and minutes of that meeting.

MT meeting report (MT joined session)

The OCA-MT joined earlier than originally planned in the agenda. They presented the status quo of their group’s work. They stated that they are not able to continue working together.
Positive aspects to judge the present situation within the OCA:
The OCA is able to run operations from different desks (Amsterdam, Berlin, Toronto)
The structure of the OCA allows input from different locations
We do have a good (strategic) plan for the future.

Negative aspects:
It has to be acknowledged though that there is no environment existing that neither supports nor guides
operations in a way that is needed. This lack of progress is causing disappointment in every section.
Symptomatically there are four different opinions, expressed by the four different sections concerning topics like
i.e. legal entity, emphasis on hierarchy etc. At the same time there no common vision exists, whereto the OCA
should proceed within the next five years.
Though the motivation in all the section’s offices is good in principle the dysfunction of the OCA starts to effect
operations and is seen by the OCA-MT as a further threat in the near future. It is felt that a fundamental change
has to be made within the next six months. The MT expressed clearly that they felt that the OCA in its current
structure has failed. At the same time they acknowledged that they could not continue to work like this.

**OCA structure and functioning**

The session started with Adrio’s presentation, which was reflecting a progress in August. At the time of the
meeting it was agreed, that this presentation was partly over aged.

"2007 09 28 OCA
Structure and function"

The session was used to discuss why the OCA has failed and how to proceed with the information given by the
MT. After a long and controversial discussion it became clear that the OCAC/MT lack a common vision as well
as mechanisms of co-ownership. There is yet no structure in place where decision processes are clearly defined.
The atmosphere within the OCA seems increasingly affected by mistrust. This has led to a situation where
frustration and doubts about the OCA are rising not only on executive level, but also on associative level through
the sectional boards.
Therefore it is agreed to initiate a process which is structured as a holistic inclusive forward looking process,
which follows the current cathartic moment based on our last year’s experience. This process is seen as an
analysis rather than an evaluation and should be facilitated by an external consultant plus possibly a senior MSF-
Person. (The composition will finally be decided by the OCAC.) It seems inevitable that this process will also
include a strong dialogue within and between the sections. It shall be open for failures but also achievements.
The outcome shall be a common vision with shared values and a defined common language that can be shared
by all four sections. Finally a road map how to achieve our vision including structure etc. shall be defined.
Timewise these results should be available and agreed on by March. They could then be presented to the
members on the respective GAs. To wait until the new GDs are in place was considered as no option because it
will take at least one more year.
Until that moment the OCA MT will work together in the best possible way, not threatening Ops in any way

**AP process and guidance**

The AP will be drafted by the MT until November. On each MT’s platform relevant topics shall be identified and
be worked on according their strategic priority. A new issue will be the question how to sort out public health.
The OCAC will take the responsibility for all decisions regarding the field and the resources. The OCA C will
approve AP which will be binding (assuming that it fits in the APs of the four sections). The MT is asked to come
timely if controversial issues arise.
Action Point: AP-Process – OCA C will approve AP which will be binding (assuming that it fits within section board APs)
The MT shall come up timely with significant issues regarding the AP, like i.e. shortfalls before the OCAC-TC on 25th October

It was emphasized that national boards shall not be bypassed esp. regarding the issue of resources.

Action Point: Reserves must be left intact and possibly replenished. If necessary through increase of institutional funding.

After all four sections had given a short overview on their expected income in 2007 it was obvious that each section has difficulties reaching the targets except MSF-H. Realizing that this might continue in 2008 it was agreed that institutional funding should be increased, even if this is opposing the strategic plan. The AP shall highlight cost-saving-measures for 2008.

Action Point: The AP for the OCA as well as AP’s for the individual sections shall highlight cost-saving-measures within the AP

Different Strategies were discussed here including economization of HQ, environmental footprints (Joanne was asked to provide the OCAC with a MSF-US study, how to increase environment protection), reduction of number of sections in one mission-country. Following issues were additionally mentioned as being important for the AP: policy on opening and closing missions, governance structure and guidance. The AP shall also highlight the potential of each section and how this potential can be linked and used within the OCA (i.e. the value of the MU’s expertise for OCA’s projects in 2008)

To do Geoff: Send around CD Rom from the CoDays (opening and closing missions), to the Council members

**Reserve policy (update / further process) (MT has left)**

Ruud Keulen had been asked to check with the other 3 sections treasurers and the executive to have a general overview on the reserve policies in OCA. He should have given a short feedback, but was unfortunately unable to come. Therefore each section’s president explained their section’s reserve policy.

**German position** (for the time being)
- decentralized model preferred
UK prefers a centralized model. It is not 100% clear if it does cover the MU, doesn’t hold a reserve for the projects but for the Manson Unit, as this is necessary to fulfil the British charity law.
**Canada** holds a reserve for the office, but is still discussing how to deal with the subject regarding the projects

Again it was reflected that, Germany and Amsterdam had been decreasing their reserves recently to fill the gap due to a shortfall in funding. As an incriminatory discussion about the reserve policy has to be avoided in the future the following action was stated:

Action Point: In the absence of an all inclusive reserve policy the OCAC will ask Thijs and the four treasures to come up with a paper on how to address potential shortfalls in 2008
Relations of OCA sections with other MSF sections

MSF-C/-G/-UK explained their relationship with other sections and their financial and further commitment towards them. It turned out that all three are contributing 70% of their budget to the OCA and 30% to other OCs. None of them experienced this as a lack of commitment towards the OCA but as a positive tool to avoid further block building. Again it was mentioned that it is up to MSF-H as an equal partner within the OCA to equally share their budgets with other OCs. MSF-H replied that this policy can also be seen as a lack of solidarity esp. in times of financial shortfalls. All four partners emphasized that in this case OCA has highest priority. Still foreseeable shortfalls due to mismanagement should not be understood as an unavoidable crisis.

Cooptation of board members from other sections are seen as a tool to enrich the inner sectional debate and therefore as a possibility of cross fertilisation. At the same time the concrete added value for Ops is questioned. It became clear that each section has a different policy on that issue. A common policy is not needed.

OCA evaluation

Following up on the discussions on the expected outcome the day before, various options were discussed how to evaluate the OCA process wise. It was decided to approach four to five different consultancies to come up with a proposal/ time schedule and expected costs until 24th October. Johannes will be the focal person while Paul will briefly summarize the background in a so called “problem paper”. Johannes will give additional information if needed when contacting the companies. The costs will be equally shared by the OCA-sections. Timeline: Decision is taken which company will facilitate the process at the TC on October 25th. Final results are expected to be presented at the F2F-meeting 29th February/ 1st March. Meanwhile the OCAC wants to get feedback regularly on the process.

Parallel the national boards shall reflect on their visions and expectations and formulate them until end of February.

It was agreed to be transparent with the offices and communicate that we contact a facilitator.

Long discussions if a senior MSF-person shall be accompanying the Company arouse. As many arguments pro as against it were seen. Finally it was concluded that it is difficult to find a person who is seen as being impartial by all sections. Final results could then be seen as being biased and could endanger the whole process. Therefore the OCAC doesn’t see enough sufficient added value for the time being.

It was agreed, that the OCAC has to take the responsibility and monitor the evaluation process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Point each section:</th>
<th>Draft a paper with problem statement and the desired outcome for a roadmap for the future of the OCA and circulate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action Point Paul:</td>
<td>Create a short list of all possible agencies that the 4 sections identify - exchange the possibilities and finalise brief and selection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Action Point Johannes:     | -shortlist of 3 or 4 companies, that might be able to facilitate the evaluation  
-communicate the ones in the first week of Oct |
MSF presence in Ireland (presentation Christa Hook)

MSF-UK would like to strengthen and improve ongoing FR/HR-activities in Ireland, as good potential is seen (expected fundraising in 2011 ca 7 Mio. €). According Irish charity law there is the requirement to establish an autonomic office in Ireland. Additionally the now used name "MSF UK in Ireland" does not have a positive reputation within the Irish population. The registration in Ireland should be started before the law changes. It should be figured out if it is possible to change the name after the law has been changed (from “MSF UK in Ireland” to “MSF Ireland”).

All decisions about opening a new section as well as the brand “MSF” (right on the name “MSF Ireland”) are within the responsibility of the IC. But the OCA is positive towards the presented initiative.

In addition the OCA was asked for financial support, but answered that financial commitments can’t be made at this moment.

In general a decision should be taken by the IC on the issue how to deal with countries with similar wishes on autonomy but who are not turning into sections.

A special problem is the fact that these countries use to recruit staff with high engagement and quite often don’t get places in projects for their first mission expats (influence on MSF in general: hampering MSF’s reputation).

MSF Africa (report Paul Foreman)

At the MSF UK GA it was agreed that a support group will be formed, that would guide and assist the initiative, without getting involved in the presentation at IC level. Paul as being a member of that support group updated the OCAC on the current developments. It became clear that the initiative is working on a proposal to underline the added value for the whole MSF-movement. While making progress on that issue they are still struggling to find a decision on the name. To network in their home society, a name and brand are needed. Most OCAC members saw difficulties with the name MSF-Africa to be successful in a proposal to the IC

Decision: OCA C supports the Africa initiative as presented by MSF UK and encourages them to make their presentation in front of the IC; the working group has assisting character.

GD selection process

German update
50 incoming applications until now, 6-8 will be invited; 1st round on Nov 1st/2nd, second round end of November, final decision awaited in mid December
Committee: 3 board members, 1 Holland board member, 2 office staff, 2 international guests (one Ops, one GD)

UK Update (Process outsourced)
Probably 1st round by the end of October
Committee: Albertien(C), Marilyn (MT), 1 IC, 2 from the board, plus 2 from the office

Holland Update
Wants to involve OCA C/MT in the process: 2 Board, 1 Council, 1 HR, 2 OCA MT (1 GD), 1 OCA C
Albertien asked if any OCAC member would be willing to join their commission.
Court Case Update

- IC resolution dropping case until 15th of September, dialogue with foreign affairs
- Willingness to discuss dropping the case; problematic process
- Swiss are willing to enter negotiation with Dutch government through their lawyers involved as representative
- MSF-H role finished, MSF Suisse is now on track

➔ Next meeting: Nov. 28th, 29th: Christa Hook Agenda; MSF-H will provide minutes and space