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1. **Darfur**
   A new formula is inaugurated to give a better overview of key operations to the Partner Sections: on the Friday afternoon, joint meeting Extended Codir + Extended Board with Departments presentations (this time Operation, Communication, Research Center), followed-up with a debate. It is suggested this formula be reiterated on an Ad-Hoc basis.

**Presentations**

*Dan Serman*, back from Sudan, where he was head of mission.  
*Document: “Sudan-Darfur.ppt”*

Summary of the key points:

- Unlike the simplified presentation in the media, the roots of the Darfur crisis are complex. It is not a simple case of “the Arabs against the Africans”
- For Dan the GoS has no particular purification plan and no ideological construction behind its actions
- MSF’s response, although better than the other NGO’s, was slow. The crisis started in Feb 2003, but MSF had operations ready (in Chad for refugees) only in September 2003
- First operations in South Darfur started in Nov/Dec 2003. The 5 OC’s are present in South/ North/East and West Darfur from June/July 2004. This represents 194 expats and 2970 national staff, 1/3 of the international presence and 1/3 of the humanitarian operations in Darfur.
- Few NGO’s on the ground in Darfur in 2003 when the forcible expulsions and killings had already started.

*Lucy Clayton (Com. Department):*

Some observations and questions:

- MSF witnessed bombing victims at the Chad border, but made no explicit criticism because of ongoing access negotiations … Should MSF have denounced the GOS? By March 2003, MSF had evidence of GOS involvement in extreme violence against population of Darfur …
- Is the genocide/ no genocide question taking too much time and energy?
- If other organisations make public the atrocities that are being committed, does that get MSF off the hook?

*Simone Rocha* (research centre) presented the methodology and findings of a data collection system, designed for Darfur, and meant to allow for an epidemiological surveillance of violence and better knowledge of its medical/humanitarian consequences.

Expected outcome: provide operations with useful info, info for testoignage and lobby if needed.

Main findings:

- Understanding of ethnic configuration
- Reconstruction of the history of the conflict in the area
- History of displacement
- Access to health care
- Pattern of violence against civilians
- Situation of the population under Janjaweed control and enclaves
- Genocide?
Debate

Some points of discussion:

- The discussion in MSF until now has mostly been “no genocide / could be genocide”. But in Gorik’s view, this is probably not the role of MSF to go that far in this complex analysis, we should rather focus on the following issue:

  “MSF should be actively distancing itself from pronouncements linked to possible military intervention” -or- “Darfur victims need more protection, which is not provided by GOS” (implying need for outside intervention)

- Cc. genocide/no genocide:
  - Re-centring the debate on the protection issue doesn’t prevent us from doing the analysis of the situation (genocide/no genocide) for ourselves. It is very important to know exactly what is going on (to take appropriate daily/strategic decisions) and also to define a position to be able to answer to journalists. Speaking out or not is another question.
  - The problem is that the word “genocide” is used to the profit of one or the other interest
  - If no agreement was reached at an international level, no section should speak out. But now that MSF-F said publicly there is no genocide it is difficult to avoid the debate.

- Cc. the protection issue:
  - Some think we should document the need for protection, make a report and urge leaders of the international community to take up their responsibility
  - Others think that MSF should neither gravitate towards the non-intervention nor the intervention position. Neither is neutral, we should stick to describe what we see, stick to facts, with medical data
  - In both cases, medical data’s of what we see would help building testimony, and give it an added value.
  - People feel protected because of the mere presence of MSF (that is witnessing and can speak out), but there is no guarantee and this can be a dangerous false sense of security. We should be honest with those people in this regard. But it is true that media attention brings some security. From there the need to keep Darfur in the media.

  ➔ Need to develop a common position on asking for protection or not / on the need to diminish violence

2. Iraq update

  Presentation: Koen Henckaerts (DO)

Our action:

- 3 PHC in Sadr City, Bagdad with 12,000 consultations/month
- Emergency services in health centres with 2 ambulances (transfers to hospitals we collaborate with)
- Plans to improve triage of wounded in several places in Bagdad
- Health centre in Faluja

Present situation:

- Not easy for wounded to go to hospital, danger of being seized in hospital raids by Americans
- Triage and nursing are the main medical shortages, enough skilled surgeons at the hospitals.

Security

Until recently:

- Remote Control through national staff, with expats based in Amman and visiting regularly our mission
- Use of unidentified ordinary cars, few trips outside Bagdad
- We were never menaced or attacked

Since the kidnapping of 2 Italian volunteers:

- No expats visits any more
- Special security measures for national staff
- Project in Fallujah and triage project have been suspended

Report Extended Board Meeting 24-25/09/04 for approval
Our plans
On 13 October, Koen and Marc will go in Amman to discuss our further operational plans in Iraq, assess the possibility to go on with remote control depending on the security we will or will not be able to ensure to our national staff, the operational space we can or cannot maintain, … Until then our operational ambitions are still valid, as there are many needs and we are almost the only NGO remaining in Bagdad.

Communication
- Our communication line was not to give any comment on expat presence.
- The Board feels we should give a clear positioning on the expat presence to the media not to maintain any longer this mist, especially if expats stay out longer to avoid skids as the one we had with the frontpage in Le Soir entitled “MSF-Belgium stays in Bagdad” and mentioning on the 1st page that “several expats, Belgians more in particular, are staying”…
Le Soir promised to publish an article to give more deepness and perspective to our operations in high security contexts and break in this way the “MSF, humanitarian cowboy” image it gave.

3. Sweden’s demand to adapt the OCB Code of Conduct
Presentation: Pehrolov Pehrson

Pehrolov presents the issue:
- Starting point:
  - In 2002, an UNHCR report on abuse of minors by NGO’s/UN employees in West Africa made a lot of noise.
    At the MSF-Sweden 2002 GA, a motion was voted with the aim to combat sexual abuse in the field and suggestions to the HR were made to change the OCB Code of Conduct but little response was given.
  - Swedish media storm in August 2004 after a PPD participant went to press about her understanding of the MSF Code of conduct (being shocked MSF had no strong position on sexual abuse)

- Motion passed at the 2004 General Assembly in Sweden:

  “MSF Sweden shall require that all Swedish expats follow the “Recommended Code of Conduct for Swedish Staff on International Missions” mentioned above. By this taking a lead on the issue of sexual abuse and its connection to abuse of power within the movement.

  MSF Sweden shall in the same time continue to push for changes in the OCB Code of Ethical Behaviour, condemning the use of prostitutes/buying sexual services by MSF staff. MSF Sweden shall also push for the implementation of the term “abuse of power” in documents and discussions concerning the behaviour of MSF field staff. This will primarily be done within the OCB group, but also at the overall international level”.

The intention behind the introduction of this motion is to create a normative culture in the movement, not to introduce a police.

- Yesterday’s Co-dir decision on this issue: creation of a working group to critically review the code of conduct as a whole, clarify the principles (the Code of Conduct position: “MSF objects to the exploitation of people’s personal vulnerability in the broadest sense possible - economical, social or otherwise - and any implication by expatriates in it “ is judged good enough), separate the code in itself from the discussion paper with examples as they are misleading. The result of the work will be proposed and discussed at the HoM week. A A first review will be done by the HR department and will be submitted to the working group.

Discussion
- A key issue is how the HoM can do the follow-up, and how we can help them, as in some cases the existence of abuse of power is very difficult to judge, and mistakes could be done in the handling of the case. The decision to exclude an expat should always be taken through the GAREC or through the HR Director to avoid abuses.
- Media could ask information about how we are doing the follow-up. We should be prepared to that.
- Only 1 related case went to GAREC in the last 15 months. But the real number of abuses may be higher.
The discussion until now assumes HoM capable of policing, but what if the abuser is HoM? Examples have been seen of use of prostitutes by HOM’s, coordination team or HQ member as well ...

4. International

a) Arjan’s Case
   Presentation: Barbara, Gorik

   The presence of Rowan was the occasion to exchange on divergent points of view on the management of Arjan’s case.

   The way the information to be shared is shared within the EXCOM or DG 18 is an important element of concern. More transparency is requested (see also Gorik’s mail to Rowan).

   The OCB Board is also worried about the lack of strategy at a legal and communication level. The case is so specific that we need to put a full-time professional on the external communication issue knowing MSF and also being able to capitalise on previous MSF experiences.

   **OCB Board recommendation on Arjan’s case**
   Regarding the management of the « fall out » Arjan Erkel’s kidnapping and release, the Court Case and the release of Arjan Erkel’s book, the extended board of OCB has the following recommendations to make to the International Office and MSF-CH:

   1. Hire a communication professional to develop MSF’s external communication line in relation to the court case as well as the release of Arjan Erkel’s book
   2. Have the steering committee pro-actively develop scenarios of possible outcome of the court case, so that both the discussions with the lawyer and the decisions in MSF’s international platforms (Excom, ICB, IC) are informed and of a strategic nature.

   The OCB Board also asks
   - Michael be able to have a look at the lawyer’s assessment.
   - The risk of loosing the case be evaluated
   - The way the case is managed be an ad-hoc one and not a new jurisprudence
   - Lessons to be learnt be capitalised for the future
   - The TOR of the IO be reassessed

b) International Governance
   Presentation: Rowan

   Rowan asks the Boards to have discussions on what the International, platforms and decision-making should be so that a new process/set-up for the movement can be presented and discussed at the AGMs. This will be at the agenda of the October ICB in Paris as well.

   Some wonders whether it is the right moment to launch such a process. It is very institutional, not attractive and if it fails we could be back to 5 years before. On the other hand others think we should not be so pessimistic, we have good international collaboration on the field and should look forward instead of back ...
c) **Internal conference Rwanda-Darfur**  
The purpose of the conference was to get France and Belgium discuss openly on Rwanda’s genocide and its commemoration, to be able to come out with lessons to learn for present contexts and especially for Darfur. This enlightened by the input of external invitees. In fact, we wish to be much more forward looking. The draft format and agenda will be discussed at the 8 October ICB.

5. **DG Point**

- **Indemnities for « expatriates » in Europe**  
  **Document**: remun expat siege.doc

  This file is linked to the internationalization of the OCB. It was put on the table to facilitate the movements within the OCB. 
  The discussion was also raised with the recruitment of a new DG in Sweden. 
  This is a board issue as it is a salary grid issue.

  See the document annexed for all the details.

  **Decision**  
  Agreement favoring mobility within the OCB and on the main principles proposed by the executive. Murray and Stéphane follow-up for the details (make sure we get no more advantages from working abroad than in home country, check if there are no extra-benefits: this can make jurisprudence)
I. OCB GOVERNANCE

a) Shared Operationality with MSF-Italy

Stefano Savi explains were we stand with the process:
- Problem of mistrust solved: at the beginning of September meeting, frustrations from both parts were discussed openly. Lack of communication was obviously the source of many misunderstandings or frustrations.
- It was highlighted b.o. that we could improve the information and decision sharing at executive and associative level for a real co-ownership.
- At the executive level,
  - Stefano will assist all the Codir and Coops meetings and it is expected all the departments involve the operational partner sections in the decision making processes (through teleconferences)
  - Interviews with Christopher to recruit the Ops Coordinator of the Italian cell will occur next week and MSF-I will become operational earliest in january 2005, latest April/may 2005
  - Peru, Colombia, Haiti and Ethiopia will be handed-over to Italy.
  - Meinie explained cell 4 would be dismantled:
    - Actually we are not in a situation of growth
    - Total number of cells in OCB will remain 7
    - 1 in Luxembourg, 1 in Rome and 5 in Brussels
    - Brussels will reduce with 1 cell
    - Most countries transferred to Italy come from cell 4 so cell 4 will be closed.
    - People from the cell were guaranteed to keep an undetermined duration contract at the Ops department.
  - A new Yalta has also been decided accordingly:
    - Cell 1: DRC, Rwanda, Burundi
    - Cell 2: N & S Sudan, Kenya, Somalia, RSA
    - Cell 3: Ivory Coast, Guinea, Liberia, Sierra Leone, Angola
    - Cell 5: Mali, Burkina Faso, Benin, Mozambique, Chad, Zimbabwe
    - Cell 6: Russia, Armenia, Serbia, Iraq, Malawi, Belgian Projects
    - Cell 7: Cambodia, Thailand, India, China, Indonesia, Sweden, Brazil
    - Cell 8: Peru, Haiti, Colombia, Mission Italia, Ethiopia

- At the associative level, better representation in the OCB Board should be worked on (now: 12 MSF-B, only 2 Italians). This point is discussed extensively in the following chapter.

Discussion
Issues to be solved and considered within the OCB governance discussion framework, as both are linked:
- Need to share the same vision of co-ownership, same wish to work altogether for the same aim: the OCB and the beneficiaries, to be stronger altogether. If not, risk of mess
- Is there a commitment to share the resources needs (financial and HR)?
  If real co-ownership is developed, commitment comes from itself.
- With the participation of some PS to the Codir and Coops, who’s the final decision maker?
  DG 7 meetings with teleconferences?
- What will be the relation between the Italian operations and the MSF-I Board?
- Whatever the associative structure will be, it has to answer to a need. The executives should reflect on what they expect form their BoardS.
- What vision do MSF-I has for its future operations?
  MSF-I wants to work within the OCB plan and share the common vision. If everything is going well, and in discussion with the OCB executive, a second cell could be opened within 4-5 years.
- How to keep the coherence of the OCB as some PS are not operational?
- The Steering committee “Shared Operationality MSF-I” seems to have disappeared! What follow-up at Board and executive level?
With the new Yalta, we seem to come back to non-thematic cells on the contrary to what was done after Mc Kinsey. We should document this tendency.

Who will finance the extra-costs of the Shared operationality? (travels, building, telecoms, …) ?

Decision-conclusion:
- The Board acknowledged the reorganization of the cells at the operation department and supports it.
- Many questions on shared operationality are still to be answered but have to be considered within the OCB governance discussion framework, as both are linked.
- Close follow-up to be done by the Presidents (or person in the Board mandated for this) of the Belgian and Italian sections

b) OCB executive working group
Presentation: Patrice vastel
Document: OCB Gov. executive WG.PPT

As associative and executive are linked and have to fit in the same vision for the future, an executive working group on the OCB governance was created to provide models.

- 1st meeting in June; questionnaire on advantages/disadvantages, expectations, …sent to all GD,
- Synthesis made in September showed lots of common concern’s (national, OCB and international ones) : see here-under for a summary and propositions for next steps

General / International

+International:
  > International perspective should not be forgotten in our process towards OCB
  (In the actual context it remains essential for MSF to be perceived as an international, and not a western-European NGO)

  Need of increased attention to the structure of the movement and its coherence,

  > Recent issues proved that sometimes msf is it’s worst enemy.
  > Stronger ties! Clarity would be welcome.
  > And if this is not possible anymore, then start to face the reality.

General / OCB

+ Many pending questions on the OCB
  + Example of questions:

    +Organization, coordination & hierarchy within the executive (who is coordinating/responsible for organizing what?)
    +Feasibility, added-value & cost of the model
    +International representation of the OCB? (and more generally how to articulate the three components national, group & international levels)
Analysis

- Lack of common strong & clear vision for the OCB model (structure & functioning associative & executive, why a split?)
- Lack of clear vision for the role of PSs and OCB within the movement (commitment towards OCB vs commitment towards the movement)
- Distance with operations / Why and how being more operational?
- How to take advantage & build-up on the specificities of the different sections of OCB & develop PSs skills?
- Lack of "working together" / team spirit / common plans & strategies (partly consequence of first & second point)

... plus some other common internal issues .... And some more minor issues of organization....

NEXT STEPS

- Finalize documents (briefing paper on OCB concept in the actual international context) that provides the description & reasoning behind the OCB concept in an international perspective and starts to address the issue of feasibility / operational concern / specificities PSs.
- Inform the OCB-Group properly on the OCB concept and the conversion document & standard presentation & get the ad-hoc support and common understanding.
- Consolidate & finalize a list of the other major points to work on at the executive level and a list of recommendation for the associative.
- Follow up the implementation of the recommendations
- Conventions to be updated
Time frame: January

Comments

- One scenario could be: need for an OCB board to ensure decisions taken are the same in the 2 decision lines: one practical example: decision on Inpats salary grid (see above) for European non-Italian people working in the Italian cell ->

  - Why not a full-time OCB associative secretary to prepare OCB debates, discussions on principles, ... responding to the 7 presidents
  - Legal split doesn’t seem to be an option to the GD 7 (administrative nightmare, costs, to be done in all ops PS)
c) **Associative OCB Governance Working group**  
*Presentation: Stéphane Goriely*

The OCB Board is working from 2 years on the OCB governance at associative level. A working group started to work on:

- 2 possible models (OCB Board elected by OCB GA / mini-IC OCB Board model with representatives elected by the national boards);
- on ways to improve co-ownership through common debates,
- and finally on a unique membership for all the PS

No agreement could be reached and as it was very difficult to go forward only through mail discussions and tri-annual meetings the following is proposed:

### Proposition

- to hire somebody that will
  - study the diverse representation modes at Board level with advantages and disadvantages (to avoid quick but inappropriate decision),
  - present implementing scenarios.
  - propose a solution to be tested for a determined period.
  
Rem.: the documentation of the legal split will not be part of this part of the work.
- that Alex would do this work. Knowing well the problem he would work together with the associative working group and in consultation with the executive working group
- the deadline is the January extended Board meeting where a decision has to be taken.
  
Hilde Klovstad will take-over the lead of the associative working group on OCB governance

The aim of this work is to ensure a stable and coherent frame for our OCB operations with all the Partners (and now with Italy becoming operational).

### Round table on this proposition:

- MSF-I agrees. Update on Shared Operationality with MSF-I to be presented at spring
- MSF-DK agrees with the process and will ensure someone from DK participate to the working group.
- No active discussions on OCB governance at the Danish Board yet.
- MSF-HK: Joe will take part to the working group and will discuss all this with Dick who’s responsible for .... at executive level.
- MSF-Sweden: the OCB governance is discussed at each Swedish Board meeting. Important to feed each other with material for discussion
- MSF-Lux: agrees on the solution

### Decision

The proposition here above is accepted by all the Extended Board members.

### Process:

- Alex will make a synthesis of all arguments and different scenarios, make a first draft and distribute this to the contact person of the working group in all sections.
- Through meetings and discussions with the various boards, a final proposition will be presented at the extended board meeting in January.
- Alex will try and participate in the different sections board meetings. If this is not possible in all cases, it is important that the representative in the working group will discuss the different drafts presented with their respective boards.
- A meeting with the working group is scheduled for the week-end 5-7 of November in Oslo (to allow the participation of Patrice Vastel, chairman of the executive working group, so to give an update on their work, and to better synchronize the work of the two groups).
2. **PS recent General Assemblies debriefing**  
   **a. Sweden’s General Assembly debriefing**  
   - More or less 100 people attended  
   - Themes for discussion: women’s health (with external guests from other NGO’s); security in the field (Afghanistan)  
   - Motions: statutes modification; abuse of power  
   - Board elections with Peter Casaer and Muriel Cornelis as internationals Board members.

   **b. Denmark’s General Assembly debriefing**  
   - Attendance: 55 people  
   - Themes for discussion:  
     - Afghanistan  
     - Denmark and the War on terror …with the CIMIC (civil and military affairs in post conflicts)  
       - How can MSF distanciate in the media?  
       - How to raise awareness  
       - Lobby work to do  
     - Update on AIDS programs, CAME, participation in the Bangkok conference  
     - Update on Arjan’s case  
     - Darfur  
     - Code of conduct

   William noted MSF-DK’s association dynamism increased a lot as well as the level of the debates.

3. **MID YEAR OVERVIEW AND FORECASTS**  
   **a. FINANCE**  
   **Document:** OCB august 2004.ppt

   Financial indicators august 2004  
   Comparison to the budget, i.e. outcome of the second forecast, with a loss of 2 mio Euros.

   **Expenses**  
   - Mission Direct Expenses – cumulatives figures:  
     By the end of august 54 mio were spent which correspond to 100% compared to the 2nd forecast.  
   - HQ expenses: expenses are under the budget (8.984.718 compared to 10.562.259)

   **Income**  
   - Institutional income  
     - Contracts: the budget foresees to get 44 mio € in institutional funding. A the end of August, still 3.8 mio needs to be found for 2004. Today the total amount of the ‘gap’ has been introduced.  
     - Institutional contracts obtained by donor: The most important donor is ECHO, followed by DFID and the governments of the Scandinavian countries.

   - PS Fundraising evolution:  
     The trend until now is positive. Clear increase compared to the result obtained at the same date in 2003 but still need to be confirmed by the end of the year.

   Result: 94 mio breakeven, based on the PS assumptions

   **Discussion**  
   - We are on tracks cc. expenses but what about our capacity to answer to emergencies? See next point cc. matching operations to resources.  
   - A not insignificant risk remains the realisation or not of the “décotte” which is now evaluated to 6% (instead of 12%)  
   - Cash situation?  
     30 mio was available at the end of august, 8 mio is available this week, which is less than one-month expenses but which is a lot seen the cumulative loss.  
     A treasury plan for the next 6 months is to be done. Banks have been contacted in due time to prepare borrowing lines in case we would need it.
Conclusion:
We are on tracks, no specific concerns but we remain careful.

b) **MATCHING OPERATIONS TO RESOURCES**
Presentation: Christopher
Document: Slides

See slides in Annex

c) **PROSPECTS 2005**
Presentation: Koen
Documents: slides prospects 2005.ppt

See slides in Annex

Discussion
- The Action plan was made in a restrained resources environment but what are the efforts done to increase the fundraising? Is it realistic to think we will go on with stagnating revenues? Indeed a risk to enter a deficit structure exists and efforts are done on the expenses side to overcome it, but those efforts could be supported by our capacity to increase our income (besides MSF-I).
- Are there no risks to over-react, going from deficits to surpluses indefinitely, sending contradictory messages to the field from years to years?
- With the presented plan, we are adapting our ambitions to the resources we foresee, given, between others, PS assumptions. Shouldn’t we do the contrary, agree for an OCB plan, then share the collective responsibility, with all the partners doing all the necessary efforts to achieve it? In other words, sections that still have the capacity to invest to get more resources should commit to do it once they agreed on the Action. Smart investments throughout the whole OCB could be made on the basis of an analysis of possible return on investment in the different PS countries.

This raises different issues that still have to be solved within the OCB Governance framework and its evolution towards a more coherent co-ownership (presently, neither the OCB GD nor the OCB Board have the legitimacy to mandate such an analysis and consequently to take any decision for new investments in Partner Sections. This issue will need to be tackled in the future OCB governance framework)

- An important issue is also the planification of the costs linked to AIDS projects. We are not an AIDS organisation. The number of patients we treat, the cost of second line treatment and the likelihood to hand over this financial burden should be studied carefully. We should advocate for partners of the GF complying with their commitments
- Pooling of resources at the level of the whole movement should be worked on
The future of the Projects fund according to the new law for not for profit entities

From 01/01/2005 onwards, the Belgian law concerning not for profit entities (ASBL/VZW) will change. From then on ‘big’ ASBL’s – like MSF Belgium – will need to do the same financial reporting as commercial corporations (what we already do).

The project fund can remain as it is (a provision for future projects) and our current practice in managing the fund does not need to change either, except of two small changes:

- the name changes: instead of ‘provision for the project fund’ it will be called ‘earmarked funds’ or committed/allocated funds as “earmarked funds “ is often used in another context (“fonds affectés” - The word provision can only be used for future events of which one knows now that they will certainly materialise)
- from 2005 onwards the use of the fund will need the approval of the General Assembly at the moment we present the annual accounts, and thus the total financial result.

Therefore in the future minutes of the meetings of the Extended Board of Directors, its decisions regarding the approvals for the use of the fund will be phrased as following:

“….decides that….subject to the approval by the General Assembly.”
“….décide que….sous réserve de l’accord de l’Assemblée Générale.”

Projects Funds and the 2004 accounts

For 2004 it is proposed to use 946,000 € out of the projects’ fund for the following projects:
- Balkans, (already approved)
- support to Aids ngo’s (already approved)
- ACT in DR Congo (to be approved)

By doing so we’ll start 2005 with a project fund of 19,067,000 €.