

Report of the General Meeting of the European Forum Restorative Justice

Verona, Italy, 17 April 2008, 18.00-20.00¹

Participating members²: *Albania:* Rasim Gjoka, representative of the Albanian Foundation for Conflict Resolution and Reconciliation of Disputes; *Austria:* Christa Pelikan; Kurt Koblizek; Christoph Koss, representative of NEUSTART; *Belgium:* Ivo Aertsen; Jolien Willemsens; Clara Casado (associate); Inge Vanfraechem; Leo Vangarsse, representative of Suggnomè; *Bulgaria:* Dobrinka Chankova; *Croatia:* Davorka Lalic-Lukac (associate); *Finland:* Leena Soopanen; Kaisa Kurikka; Aarne Kinnunen; *Germany:* Petra Guder; Frauke Petzold; Michael Kilchling; *Hungary:* Borbala Fellegi; Vidia Negrea, representative of the Community Service Foundation of Hungary; *Ireland:* Kieran O'Dwyer; *Italy:* Federico Reggio; *Latvia:* Daina Anspoka; Laima Zelmene; *the Netherlands:* Rob van Pagée; Jaap Smit (associate); *Norway:* Siri Kemény, individual member and representative of the Norwegian Mediation Service; Gro Rossland; Torunn Bolstad; Terje Chr. Myklebust; Karen Kristin Paus; *Portugal:* Sonia Pereira; Isabel Cunha Gil; João Lázaro, individual member and representative of APAV; Pedro Morais Martins, representative of IMAP; Bruno Caldeira, representative of Associação de Mediadores de Conflitos; *Serbia:* Jasna Hrcic; *Slovenia:* Marko Bosnjak; *Spain:* Alberto Olalde; Marta Ferrer Puig; Jaume Martin, individual member and representative of the Secretaria de Serveis Penitenciaris; Xabier Carlos Etxebarria, representative of Gobierno Vasco Departamento de Justicia; Pilar Lasheras, representative of Universidad de La Rioja; *Sweden:* Eleonore Lind; *Turkey:* Galma Jahic; *UK:* Marian Liebmann; Panagiota Papadopoulou; Martin Wright; Niall Kearney; Belinda Hopkins; Robert Mackay, individual member and representative of Restorative Practice Scotland Ltd; Keith Simpson, representative of SACRO; Harriet Bailey, representative of the Restorative Justice Consortium; *Ukraine:* Vira Zemlyanska.

Non-members present: *Slovenia:* Robert Friskovec; *Albania:* Merita Bala; Mirela Mema; *Finland:* Pia Mäenpää; *Germany:* Eduard Matt; *UK:* Charles Pollard.

Proxies: *Belgium:* Johan Deklerck to Ivo Aertsen; Katrien Lauwaert to Ivo Aertsen; *Italy:* Anna Mestitz to Inge Vanfraechem; *Romania:* Doina Balahur to Ivo Aertsen.

Rapporteurs: Clara Casado, Brunilda Pali, Leni Sannen and Ines Staiger.

This report will also be made available on the Forum's website: <http://www.euforumrj.org>.

0. Opening of the General Meeting

Siri Kemény welcomed everybody to the meeting.

The agenda for the General Meeting was approved.

1. Formal issues

1.1. Approval of the report of the previous General Meeting (16 May 2007)

The report was approved.

¹ Approved by the Chair, to be accepted by the next General Meeting.

² Applicant members who were accepted during this General Meeting are also included in the list of participating members.

1.2. Approval of the annual accounts 2007 and the budget for 2009

Accounts 2007

Jolien Willemsens presented the accounts of 2007 in a power point presentation (see annex 1). An exhaustive explanation was provided with regard to every entry of income and costs.

Because towards the end of the year the Forum was informed that it had been awarded an operating grant by the European Commission, more was spent on certain items in the budget: postage costs, office supplies, documentation (books on restorative justice for the documentation centre), and publications and website (design of the new logo, printing of a new brochure, design of new letterhead, new membership database). In order to deal with the workload, some of the staff's time that was foreseen for the AGIS3 budget was shifted to deal with the extra work created by the award of the operating grant. More was spent as well on accountancy. Because of the different grants of the European Commission, bookkeeping is becoming more complicated.

Some money could be taken back from the provision that we had made to cover 'vacation money' (i.e. the amount that staff members receive at the end of their contract to cover what they normally would have been paid in June as vacation money).

Overall, 5.732 EUR was spent less than what was foreseen in the budget.

On the income side, a difficult issue is the membership fees. When membership fees are not paid by the end of the year, the Secretariat has to anticipate which fees will still be paid and which not. Especially people who become members due to a reduced conference fee tend not to pay their membership fee for the year following the conference. A suggestion was made to ask them for two years membership fee with the reduced conference fee. This would however create double administrative work, because the payments have to be included in the correct year. Furthermore, it should be noted that the in-time payment of the membership fees is a crucial issue since the membership fees are the only stable income of the Forum.

A small loss was made on the organisation of the summer school. Overall, the income was 10.189,87 EUR more than what was foreseen in the budget.

However, Jolien Willemsens said that some caution was needed, because 1) interests generated by pre-financing of the European Commission in relation to the different projects will have to be given back, and 2) it is possible that – after evaluation of the financial reports of the projects – the European Commission will not accept certain costs, which will then fall on the general budget of the Forum.

Approval of the annual budget 2009

The annual budget 2009 (see annex 1) was based upon the hypothesis that the Forum will get an operating grant for 2009. If this grant is not awarded, the budget (2009) must be redefined drastically.

Jolien gave an overview of the budget for 2009. In the budget, the cost for 3 staff members has been foreseen so there are 3 stable people.

Galma Jahic asked the question where the income 'other' would come from. Inge Vanfraechem replied that the Commission only contributes 70% of the total budget, which leaves the Forum to provide for the other 30%. In order to have a balanced budget we need to find an additional 24.000,00 EUR. She stressed that members should approach their governments if they have good contacts with them in order to ask them to contribute to this 30%. In addition, it is important that members pay their membership fee in time. Also,

governments might be more interested to contribute financially to a project with certain specific objectives, rather than to the overall functioning of the Forum.

Martin Wright pointed out that the presentation of the budget represents a rather optimistic approach. He would prefer to have a more detailed set-up to increase income, e.g. how should governments be approached, how can applications to charitable organisations be made. In his view, fundraising needs people that should be appointed for this task. He suggested that members could email each other to work out a strategy on fundraising. Siri Kemény appreciated this initiative and asked for volunteers. Besides Martin Wright, also Torunn Bolstad and Ivo Aertsen volunteered.

Belinda Hopkins appreciated the presentation of the budget very much and thanked Jolien for her work.

The budget for 2009 was approved.

1.3. Approval of the annual report of 2007

Jolien highlighted that the version that was sent out was still provisional. Some editorial changes were made during the Board meeting (reformulating some sentences, but also adding a picture of a Board member which was left out by mistake), but no content wise changes were made.

The annual report 2007 was approved.

1.4. Approval of new membership applications and other membership matters (annex 2)

The applications for membership were approved. The resignations from membership were acknowledged, and the terminations of membership due to non-payment of the fee were approved.

1.5. /1.6. Report of the activities of the Board and Report of the activities of the Secretariat

Siri Kemény mentioned that the activities of the Board and the Secretariat are interlinked, so the two points would be discussed together.

The Board had two meetings, one in Lisbon (May) and the other one in Leuven (December). The following topics were discussed in these meetings: funding, ongoing projects, general management of the Forum, strategic planning, organisational development, tasks of the Secretariat, organisation of the summer school, newsletter issues, pool of trainers, and the new logo. The financial situation is a recurring important topic, as is the general management of the Forum. In December a start was given to an in-depth strategic planning exercise for the organisation.

Siri highlighted that the Forum and more specifically the Secretariat assisted other members and organisations to elaborate project proposals. Furthermore, she mentioned the considerable work done by the current staff members and introduced new staff member Brunilda Pali.

Both the activities of the Board and the activities of the Secretariat were approved.

1.7. Report of the activities of the committees

Frauke Petzold gave a short introduction to the goals of each of the 5 committees and introduced the chairs of the respective committees.

- Practice and Training Committee: the coordinators are Niall Kearney and Frauke Petzold. The pool of trainers has been created and a number of applications have been received so far. Information on its functioning is available on the Forum's website. Another activity of this committee is the summer school. In 2007 the summer school took place in Riga (Latvia). In total, 21 persons attended. Niall thanked Diana Ziedina for all her support in hosting the summer school.
- Communication Committee: the chair is Christa Pelikan. The focus of this committee is the preparation of the scientific side (programme, structure, speakers, themes) of the biennial conference and this in close cooperation with the Secretariat. Christa will take care of elaborating the report of this conference which will bring together the reports of the workshops and the presentations by the workshop and plenary speakers. It will be available in October 2008 on the website of the Forum.
- Editorial Board of the Newsletter: Vira Zemlyanska coordinates this committee. She mentioned that the newsletter was published three times in 2007. She was pleased to inform that the editorial board welcomed 3 new members: Borbala Fellegi (Hungary), Panagiota Papadopoulou (Greece/UK) and Robert Shaw (UK). The template of the Newsletter was re-designed which will be visible in the first issue of 2008. This is the reason why it is taking a little longer to be sent out.
- Research Committee: Borbala Fellegi is the chair. Her work consists in sending research-related information on restorative justice to researchers and other interested people on the mailing list (50 so far). However, there is a constant time problem due to her full-time job. The news edited by Borbala is sent out every 2 months. She encouraged people to send her information on events, publications, job postings, scholarships, legal developments, etc. that can be relevant for researchers. The bimonthly newsflash is called EUFOREC. People who are interested in becoming part of the mailing list are invited to contact Borbala.
- Committee on Restorative Approaches in Schools: the chair is Belinda Hopkins. The initiative for this committee was taken in Barcelona (2006). Belinda has created a network that is still rather loose, hence they are not yet a committee strictly spoken. She pointed out the need to recruit people interested in this committee. Maybe the website could be used to create a clearer identity for the committee. She proposed to organise a fringe meeting at 17:30h the day after to have a discussion on the interest in schools and on the committee.
- Information Committee: this committee is not in function. Siri Kemény pointed out that this is a symptom of how the Forum is functioning.

Martin Wright expressed that the work done by the committees is excellent thus he suggested making the outside world aware of this. He wondered whether there is a low-effort way to reach more people, e.g. by contacting the European Society of Criminology on the work the Forum is doing. Siri Kemény replied that the pool of trainers for example has just been established and that the announcements only just started. Sonia Pereira added that it is also up to every individual member to spread information about the Forum. For example, she is in the Practice and Training Committee and hands out information on the work of the Forum to everybody who is interested. It is part of the responsibility of the members to use the information to extend the network. By doing this, she has received the interest of people who later became members of the Forum. Ivo Aertsen pointed out that if the Forum opens the work of the committees up to non-members, members might feel disappointed. By broadening the public there will not be a difference anymore between being a member or not.

Members will feel as if they have no benefits when even non-members receive the information of the committees. Borbala Fellegi pointed out that the committees can be used to formulate ideas and projects as well as to find partners. She encouraged all members to see the committees as a resource.

1.8. Election of three new members to the Board

The Board members stepping down

Three Board members were stepping down since they served their maximum time on the Board, namely 6 year. Siri Kemény expressed her gratefulness to Frauke Petzold, Jaume Martín and João Lázaro. It has been a great pleasure to work with them and it is sad to say goodbye. They have offered their spare time and work within their own organisation to help out the Forum wherever they could. Thank you very much!

Frauke Petzold will continue to be an active member of the practice and training committee.

Election of three new members of the Board

Christa Pelikan was the chair of the selection committee and explained that in Barcelona things did not go very smoothly which is why modifications were made to the internal regulations for the election of Board members. In Lisbon, the foreseen selection committee was established. Its members were Christa Pelikan, Sonia Pereira and Gerd Delattre. The aim of the selection committee was to present sufficient candidates to the Board. A letter was sent out to all the members with information on how the Board is constituted. A profile of the candidates was also given in this letter and applications needed to be received within the deadline. Christa reported that the necessary number of candidates was received, but some other proposals although very valuable, could not be considered because they arrived after the deadline of 17 December 2007.

The selection committee received nominations for 3 candidates. These were Marta Ferrer (Spain), Aarne Kinnunen (Finland) and Eleonore Lind (Sweden).

Marta Ferrer briefly introduced herself. She is from Catalonia (Spain) and lives and works in Barcelona. She has worked for many years in the juvenile justice system and now she is working in the Centre for Legal Studies. Currently she is also involved in the training for penitentiary services and other related staff. She is involved in the Council for Penological Co-operation of the Council of Europe's European Committee on Crime Problems, which makes her colleagues with Jaume Martin, who proposed her to the Board. She offers her experience in her work and her connection to the Council of Europe, as well as her Southern European point of view to the Board. She was proposed by the Secretaria de Serveis Penitenciaris and seconded by Siri Kemény.

Secondly, Aarne Kinnunen introduced himself as a civil servant working in the Ministry of Justice in the department of criminal policy in Finland. He holds several duties, all of them having to do with the criminal field including restorative justice and mediation which are really close to his heart. He has been working in mediation, drafting the law on mediation in Finland and developing the implementation process of mediation in criminal matters in Finland for many years. Furthermore, he appreciated very much the work of the Forum and hoped to give his best. He was proposed by Torunn Bolstad and seconded by Ivo Aertsen.

The third candidate, Eleonore Lind has been involved in the governmental commission on victim-offender mediation in Sweden. She is a mediator-coordinator of 5 regions in Sweden and has also worked as a mediator before. Furthermore, she was a member of the Board of the Nordic Forum for Mediation and ADR. She was proposed by Siri Kemény and seconded by Kjersti Lilloe-Olsen.

Whilst Bruno Caldeira and Harriet Bailey together with Leni Sannen counted the votes, Siri Kemény continued with the agenda.

The results of the election were as follows: Marta Ferrer (56 votes), Aarne Kinnunen (57 votes) and Eleonore Lind (55 votes). Siri welcomed the new Board members and announced that the Board would constitute itself on Saturday, 19 April 2008.

2. The functioning of the Forum, evaluation of activities

2.1. Project activities

a) *“Restorative justice: an agenda for Europe”* (AGIS 3): The project finishes at the end of May and then there are 3 more months to deliver the final report to the European Commission.

b) *“Developing standards for assistance to victims of terrorism”*: The project finishes at the end of June. There was an excellent conference in Tilburg. The topic however has shown to be very controversial. The report will be finalised by the end of June.

c) *“Building social support for restorative justice”*: This project has just started. The new researcher and project officer is Brunilda Pali. Information on this project will be circulated soon on the website. The partners are organisations from Norway, Belgium, Albania, the Netherlands, Austria and the UK.

d) Assistance to the research project *“Promoting the practice of VOM in Turkey”* awarded to the Istanbul Bilgi University by the European Initiative for Democracy and Human Rights. The general objective of the project was to assist in the implementation of victim-offender mediation. The Forum was a partner in this project providing a research report and assistance to identify the key speakers for the seminars for legal practitioners. Galma Jahic mentioned that an extension of the project has been awarded in order to have the time to make a publication of the seminar proceedings. This will be in Turkish and will be very relevant material for legal practitioners and NGOs in the field.

e) The Latvian project *“Restorative justice versus juvenile delinquency”* was introduced by Providus. The goal is to promote the effective development of restorative justice as a response to youth crime in the Baltic States and to enhance mutual knowledge of best practices and initiatives in the field of restorative justice in this region and beyond. It focuses on Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia, but nevertheless has a strong European dimension through its activities. The Forum would be involved in, amongst others, doing the comparative research in phase 3 and supervising the research work.

f) The Italian project on *crime prevention and mediation* was introduced by the Juvenile Justice Department of the Italian Ministry of Justice. The Juvenile Justice Department has been awarded the status of framework partner by the Commission, which is a status that can only be granted to public bodies and gives access to more calls for proposal. The call for proposals on which they acted asked for initiatives investigating the role of restorative justice in crime prevention. The project now consists of three interrelated research parts 1) the possible connecting points between restorative justice theory and crime prevention models and vice versa; 2) the extent to which restorative justice is inscribed in crime prevention policies in the Member States of the EU; and 3) an analysis of research on restorative justice processes and effects, particularly in terms of their effect on re-offending.

As a general comment, it is mentioned that the members can always contact Jolien in case they would like to establish a new project and need to identify partners in that respect.

2.2. Financial concerns and fundraising

Siri Kemény wanted to take the liberty to give general information about how she sees the situation and functioning of the Forum. Her concerns are linked to the financial side and the functional side, which was the reason for initiating the strategic planning exercise.

The year 2007 was a very active year. The amount of activities has definitely increased. She was impressed about what the Forum has achieved with very limited resources. The number of staff members has increased.

According to Siri, the staff of the Forum gives more than the contract requires and has to work on time-limited contracts. The executive officer, Jolien Willemsens, although having worked at the Forum for many years, is still employed on the basis of short term contracts. Siri raised the issue of what will happen in case Jolien cannot stand this situation anymore.

There is also the importance of giving recognition to the University of Leuven which gives important advantages to the Forum. The University also benefits from the activities of the Forum. Furthermore, also the active support and contribution of Ivo Aertsen should be stressed who despite not being a Board member anymore, is actively involved in the steering committees of the projects and in supervising the staff members.

Siri stressed that it is important to take care of those people working in the organisation and despite the fact that a lot of work is being done by volunteers (Board members and Forum members) it is crucial to give stability to the Secretariat. If the Forum does not succeed to raise more money to provide this stability to the Secretariat, restorative justice in Europe will suffer a lot because the role of the European Forum has become very important.

Siri urged the members to think this over and support the Forum. Good ideas, practical support, useful contacts and networks are welcome, and big and small tasks are waiting to be done. You will gain a lot, if you engage yourself in one way or another.

Siri emphasised that the initiative for the working group of 3 persons that will work on the financial side of the Forum in dialogue with the Secretariat and the Board is very much appreciated.

2.3. Policy work and the relation with international organisations such as the EU and the Council of Europe

EU: Ivo Aertsen has offered to help in lobbying with the departments of the European Commission. He will do this together with Inge Vanfraechem and Jolien Willemsens.

Council of Europe: Michael Kilchling is taking care of this because he is located in Freiburg, which is close to Strasbourg. The Forum follows up whether or not the Council of Europe Recommendation No. R (99) 19 concerning mediation in penal matters will be updated.

2.4. First results of the strategic planning exercise

Siri Kemény, Michael Kilchling, Jolien Willemsens and Niall Kearney met for the first time in January 2008. The objective was to find a stable working strategy for the Secretariat, and to define the tasks of the Secretariat and the Board more clearly. The results of that meeting have been used in order to apply for the operating grant for 2008 and for structural funding.

The starting point was to define where the Forum should be in 5 years. The aim is to have a self-financed office that is able to work in a stable way and not on an ad-hoc basis. The conclusion was that there is a need for 4 permanent staff members: a chief, a secretary, a project officer, and an executive officer. This would be the way to secure a more stable situation. The secretary and the executive officer should not be involved in other projects.

The means needed in order to accomplish these objectives is stable funding. The operating grant will not suffice. Structural funding is needed.

The next strategic planning meeting will be held in June 2008.

3. Proposals

3.1. Proposal by the Board to raise the membership fees

When the operating grant is approved, the Forum has to contribute 30% of the total budget. As mentioned before, at the moment, the membership fees are the only stable income. Therefore, the Board made the following proposal to increase the membership fees:

- Individual membership: from 40 to 45 EUR
- Local NGO membership: from 120 to 135 EUR
- Regional, national and international NGO membership: from 175 to 195 EUR
- Governmental organisations' membership: from 600 to 675 EUR

Bruno Caldeira re-opened the issue of people becoming a member because of the reduced conference fee and then not continuing membership. He suggested again to ask them to pay for two years. Jolien Willemsens explained that this is administratively quite difficult in the circumstances under which the Secretariat is functioning right now.

Borbala Fellegi pointed out that the membership fee is very high for certain countries like in Central and Eastern Europe and this represents a barrier for some individuals or organisations who might find it very difficult to pay in a certain year. She suggested to take this into account and to consider the possibility to establish a reduced fee for these countries which are objectively in a much more difficult economical situation. Siri Kemény replied that this situation is recognisable. However, it is rather difficult to establish a distinction and define where to draw the line between countries deserving this reduction and countries which do not. Ivo Aertsen suggested that the standards of the Council of Europe can give grounded parameters to decide on the need for a reduced fee on the basis of the economical context of the country. Siri Kemény stressed that there is a possibility to apply for a waiver. A policy for awarding waivers regarding the membership fee has been created and waivers to certain organisations and individuals have already been granted for the reason Borbala Fellegi raised. Though the applicant has to explain the reasons in the waiver application, Jaume Martin pointed out that the amounts asked to governmental organisations are not excessive at all, these should definitively be increased.

Belinda Hopkins wondered what needs have not been met. The Forum should know the reasons for not renewing membership. Jolien Willemsens replied that when people want to resign for a specific reason, they usually state that reason in their resignation. For those that we have to exclude because of non-payment of the fee, it will be difficult to find out the reason.

Harriet Bailey shared that in the Restorative Justice Consortium, they ask members to pay for two years. Belinda Hopkins suggested that members of the Forum who organise a seminar, training or conference, could offer a reduced registration fee for those who are Forum members; this will attract new members to the Forum. It was agreed to look into this possibility.

3.2. Proposal to create a “European day of restorative justice”

Niall Kearney asked the members for their opinion on developing a day of restorative justice throughout Europe. The benefits could be that there is a focus on activities to promote

restorative justice at the national level. The drawback is that it is an additional day besides all the other days.

Harriet Bailey mentioned that there is an international restorative justice week during which organisations organise activities. Shall the Forum then promote a separate RJ day?

Christa Pelikan was not in favour of another day because there are already too many. Aarne Kinnunen mentioned that it is not enough to have such a day. This would also require additional work and financing to campaign such a day. Who would do this work? According to Belinda Hopkins, the opportunity of other days should be used to demonstrate how restorative justice approaches can contribute to these issues. Siri Kemény mentioned that her first reaction was that there were already too many days, but if it were decided that we should go for it, then it would be necessary to first of all explore it a little bit further. This could tie in to the Building social support project.

According to Rob Mackay the Board needed to decide whether it fits within the objectives and strategies. Ivo Aertsen commented that it should be linked to a very strong commitment. It can work and it can be effective. Nevertheless, then a real commitment from the partners is needed. The Forum can learn from the European Day for Victims. He suggested to include the exploration as a research question for Bruna's research.

Everybody agreed that this topic should be further explored.

3.3. Proposal for a resolution which recognises that restorative justice goes beyond the criminal justice system, by Martin Wright and Christa Pelikan

It was proposed to adopt the following resolution:

“This General Meeting recognises that the theory and practice of restorative justice include the strengthening of civil society by responding restoratively to all forms of harmful or criminal behaviour in communities, schools, commercial organisations and other contexts

through the facilitation of dialogue between those affected

with a view to repairing the harm and promoting mutual understanding

and recommends the Board to encourage activities in the Forum that promote restorative justice as a general approach to reaching consensus and dealing with conflicts in society.”

Martin Wright explained the background of his proposal. He stressed that it is rather a declaration of intent. Therefore, it is not for now to work on it.

According to Inge Vanfraechem, restorative justice does not include all the elements proposed by Martin Wright. His proposal is about the broader framework of restorative practices. Robert Mackay stressed that the Board should be asked to consider the issues brought forward by Martin and come back with their consideration to the next AGM. He highlighted that the Board should deal with this proposal in an appropriate way. Martin suggested getting feedback from the members present at the AGM, but Robert disagreed.

Siri Kemény stressed that the Board already discussed this issue briefly. However, to go into this in detail requires additional work and the staff and the Board are already barely coping. Robert Mackay proposed to consider this proposal for a year. In the meantime, the membership could be consulted and the issue would be put on the agenda again next AGM.

Martin Wright communicated that it would be a good idea to broaden the interpretation of restorative justice and the scope of the Forum so that they include schools, community mediation etc. Inge Vanfraechem reacted that as a theoretical researcher, she considered restorative justice to be about justice. Robert Mackay adhered very strongly to this point as

well. He repeated that rather than voting on the proposal, the Board should be asked to consider it.


Niall Kearney expressed his confusion about the procedural issue. There is now a proposal, an amendment and a recommendation. On what do we vote? Robert Mackay recommended not to have a vote, but to leave the amendment on the table. It was clear that the AGM was not ready to vote on the substance and that more time was needed to think this through. Marko Bosnjak expressed that he has the same concerns as Inge Vanfraechem. He suggested to first engage in a dialogue before making a decision. An in-depth discussion is needed. Marko Bosnjak suggested the following: 1) rephrase the proposal, 2) leave it until the next AGM. Robert Mackay suggested just leaving the proposal as it was and letting the Board contact the members. Siri Kemény agreed. The issue will be put on the agenda of the next AGM.

4. Next Annual General Meeting

The date and place of the next meeting will be communicated to the members as soon as possible.

Closure of the AGM.

Annex 1




Accounts 2007

COSTS	BUDGET	RESULT	
Postage	2.500,00	3.846,77	
Copies	400,00	211,13	
Travel + acc	6.200,00	5.668,26	Dec Board meeting
Office supp.	500,00	1.693,70	Operating grant(OG)
Document.	0,00	406,68	OG
Computer supp	300,00	0,00	
Other	400,00	516,69	
Software	200,00	159,72	
Website	1.000,00	13.340,25	OG (incl. database)
Accountancy	1.050,00	2.314,13	More complicated




Accounts 2007

COSTS	BUDGET	RESULT	
Newsletter	1.300,00	990,64	I paid by AGIS3
Publications	2.000,00	4.511,91	OG (incl. new logo)
Membership	100,00	95,00	
Financial	500,00	409,06	
Representation	500,00	45,85	
Meetings	750,00	0,00	
Conf org	0,00	0,00	
Summer school	5.000,00	4.174,04	Small loss
Seminar legal pr	0,00	1.888,15	Covered by BE
Personnel	0,00	15.336,03	OG




Accounts 2007

COSTS	BUDGET	RESULT	
Vacation prov.	0,00	-5.904,14	Correction
Prov. personnel	0,00	0,00	
MF not paid	700,00	2.760,00	No conf in 2007!
Overhead KUL	0,00	882,40	OG
Tax	0,00	567,63	
AGIS3 staff	144.120,00	134.826,45	OG
AGIS3 travel	4.200,00	1.013,56	
AGIS3 equipm.	1.993,40	877,25	
AGIS3 consum.	150,00	153,90	
AGIS3 conf+sem	78.445,00	82.597,67	




Accounts 2007

COSTS	BUDGET	RESULT	
AGIS3 publicat.	720,00	484,72	
AGIS3 overhead	2.000,00	1.325,27	
Terrorism staff	48.125,00	45.366,02	
Terrorism books	200,00	0,00	OG
Terrorism conf	23.950,00	15.171,72	
Terr. overhead	4.900,00	365,93	
Terr. partners	50.469,99	40.845,00	
TOTALS	382.673,39	376.941,39	5.732 less




Accounts 2007

INCOME	BUDGET	RESULT	
Norway	12.000,00	12.242,56	Conversion rate
Belgium	0,00	3.000,00	Seminar legal pract.
Summer school	7.000,00	3.782,00	Small loss made
Pool of trainers	0,00	150,00	
Membership	12.000,00	15.340,00	
Registration fees	0,00	10.091,00	Lisbon GM
Books/newsletter	200,00	1.664,00	Lisbon/AGIS3
External services	0,00	5.673,00	Turkish project
Financial	300,00	3.784,19	Goes back to EC!!!!
Other	0,00	336,64	



Accounts 2007

INCOME	BUDGET	RESULT	
AGIS3 income	5.250,00	10.916,00	
AGIS3 EC	236.465,40	210.000,00	Less costs made
Terrorism EC	129.574,12	108.000,00	Less costs made
Terr. income	0,00	0,00	
OG EC	0,00	28.000,00	
TOTALS	402.789,52	412.979,39	10.189,87 more




Result 2007

	BUDGET	RESULT
COSTS	382.673,39	376.941,39
INCOME	402.789,52	412.979,39
RESULT	20.116,13	36.038,00


WORD OF CAUTION:

It might be that we will have to make corrections after the review of the financial reports by the EC!!!!




Budget 2009

COSTS	
Postage	4.000,00
Copies	400,00
Board meetings	6.000,00
Office supplies	1.500,00
Documentation	200,00
Depreciation office materials	1.350,00
Other	250,00
Software	200,00
Website	1.000,00




Budget 2009

COSTS	
Accountancy	1.500,00
Newsletter	1.800,00
Membership directory etc.	1.000,00
Membership NGO	100,00
Financial	500,00
Representation	250,00
Meetings external	1.500,00
Planning meetings	4.000,00
Conference organisation	0,00




Budget 2009

COSTS	
Summer School	5.000,00
Personnel	118.700,00
Vacation provision	0,00
Provision personnel	0,00
Memberships not paid	3.000,00
Overhead KUL	0,00
Tax	400,00



Budget 2009

COSTS	
Social support staff	104.500,00
Social support travel	12.960,00
Social support equipment	396,00
Social support consumables	650,00
Social support conferences	63.300,00
Social support publication	4.200,00
Social support overhead	0,00
TOTAL COSTS	338.656,00



Budget 2009

INCOME	
Summer school	6.000,00
Pool of trainers	200,00
Membership fees	15.000,00
Books and newsletter	100,00
Financial income	500,00
Operating grant EC	106.855,00
Other	23.995,00
Social support related income	46.800,00
Social support EC	139.206,00
TOTAL INCOME	338.656,00

Annex 2

General Meeting 17 April 2008, Verona, Italy

MEMBERSHIP MATTERS

New membership applications – to be approved

Full membership status:

1. Tonim Fernando, Portugal	2. Asociación Bienestar y Desarrollo, Spain
3. Shaw Robert, UK	4. ProPeace, Tanzania
5. Restorative Practice Scotland Ltd, UK	6. Damásio Teresa, Portugal
7. Slachtoffer in Beeld Nederland, the Netherlands	8. Leinonen Marju, Finland
9. Lee Francis, China	10. Koblicek Kurt, Austria
11. Skare Tone, Norway	12. Vaerland Arne
13. Tellum Gry Akre, Norway	14. Artinopoulou Vasco, Greece
15. Kinnunen Aarne, Finland	16. Woodbridge Simon, UK
17. Anspoka Daina, Latvia	18. Gobierno Vasco Dep. De Justicia, Spain
19. Universidad de la Rioja, Spain	20. McNeese Martin, Italy
21. Claro da Fonseca Maria José, Portugal	22. Clamp Kerry, UK
23. Fresnay Thierry, France	24. National Commission on Restorative Justice, Ireland
25. Magalhaes Manuela, Portugal	26. Bonfanti Thierry, Italy
27. Handegaard Tina Luther, Norway	28. Sironi Anna, Italy
29. Vico Maurizio, Italy	30. Saarinen Eva, Finland
31. Smit Jaap, the Netherlands	32. Sopenen Leena, Finland
33. Fazaeli Mostafa, Iran	34. Lewicka Agnieszka, Poland
35. Colamussi Marilena, Italy	36. Claes Bart, Belgium
37. Harty Katrina, Ireland	38. Frondigoun Liz, UK
39. Nicholson Jan, UK	40. Robertson Annette, UK
41. Stenius Vanja, Italy	42. Davies Murray, UK
43. Guder Petra, Germany	44. de Savornin Lohman Alexander, the Netherlands

Associate membership status:

1. Lalic-Lukac Davorka, Croatia	2. Oppedal Laila, Norway
3. Apterioaie Cristina, France	4. Sayous Benjamin, France
5. Wiman Staffan, Sweden	6. Oliveira Flavia, Portugal
7. Cross John, UK	8. Boswell Gwyneth, UK
9. Poland Fiona, UK	10. Killett Anne, UK
11. Parke Jennifer, Australia	12. Altemark Linda, Sweden
13. Baum Mikaela, Sweden	14. Claes Mia, Belgium
15. Hinch Ronald, Canada	16. Van Welzenis Ingrid, Belgium
17. Sanders Bart, Belgium	18. Maelbrancke Saskia, Belgium
19. Raymaekers Karen, Belgium	20. Segers Antje, Belgium
21. Claes Erik, Belgium	

Resignations from membership – to be acknowledged

1. Association for Probation and Mediation in Justice, Czech Republic (full)	2. Braithwaite Stephanie, UK (full)
3. Martin Margaret, UK (full)	4. Coppola Gioia, Germany (full)
5. Meznar Alenka, Slovenia (associate)	6. Johnsson Erik, Sweden (full)
7. Pitts John, UK (full)	8. Buist Maureen, UK (full)
9. Penny Jan, UK (full)	10. Vanspauwen Kris, Belgium (associate)
11. Hayler Barbara, USA (full)	12. Stenberg Jan, Sweden (associate)
13. Roffey Jane, UK (full)	14. The National Council for Crime Prevention, Sweden (full)

Memberships to be terminated due to failure to pay the membership fee

1. Rasmussen Dagmar, Denmark	2. HELP foundation, Bulgaria
3. Hutchins Kevin, UK	4. Davel Catharina, South Africa
5. Duarte Nogueira Marta, Portugal	6. Loghin Corneliu, Romania
7. Kite Deniz, Turkey	8. Glesti-Drayton Martin, New Zealand
9. Drayton-Glesti Nicola Mary, New Zealand	10. Gama Marcia, Brazil

Nominations for election to the Board of the European Forum for Restorative Justice

Nominations for election to the Board at the next General Meeting

On 17 December 2007, the date at which the period for nominating candidates to the Board of the European Forum for Restorative Justice was closed, the Selection Committee had received following nominations:

1. Marta Ferrer Puig, Spain

Proposed by: the Secretaria de Serveis Penitenciaris, Rehabilitació I Justícia Juvenil, Spain

Seconded by: Siri Kemény, Norway

Brief summary of the candidate's background:

Marta Ferrer began her work experience as educator in a detention centre for young offenders in 1983. She worked for 17 years in connection with the juvenile justice field, always in the Department of Justice of the public administration of Catalonia (Spain).

At present she is Head of the Department of Social and Criminological Research and Training in the Centre for Legal Studies and Specialized Training. Her close connection with the European Forum for Restorative Justice began in the year 2006 when the Centre co-organised the Forum's biennial conference in Barcelona.

She has participated in some European projects in relation to restorative justice in Europe: *Project BEST Alternatives for Juveniles* (AGIS), *Project Another Way* (Socrates-Grundtvig) and the current project of the European Forum, *Restorative justice: an agenda for Europe*.

Since 2006 she is a member of the PC-CP (Council for Penological Co-operation) of the Council of Europe.

2. Aarne Kinnunen, Finland

Proposed by: Torunn Bolstad, Norway

Seconded by: Ivo Aertsen, Belgium

Brief summary of the candidate's background:

Mr. Aarne Kinnunen is a Ministerial Adviser in the Ministry of Justice in Finland. He works in the Department of Criminal Policy dealing with issues concerning restorative justice and mediation, prevention of crime and violence, drug issues and criminal policy in general. He is M.Sc. in Social Sciences (University of Helsinki). He has worked as General Secretary of the Council for Crime Prevention in Finland and as a researcher within criminology and drug policy in the National Research Institute of Legal Policy, in the Police College of Finland and in Statistics Finland. He has acted as an expert for the Council of Europe and represented his country in the United Nations and European Union.

He has been active in developing the legislation and quality standards of victim-offender mediation since the 1990s. He is a vice chairman in the Advisory Board of Victim Offender mediation in Finland. During the Finnish EU Presidency in the latter half of 2006, he took on the responsibility of the organisation of the joint seminar on restorative justice in Helsinki with the European Forum for Restorative Justice and the European Law Academy (ERA).

Nominations for election to the Board of the European Forum for Restorative Justice

3. Eleonore Lind, Sweden

Proposed by: Siri Kemény, Norway,
Seconded by: Kjersti Lilloe-Olsen, Norway

Brief summary of the candidate's background:

Eleonore Lind is responsible for the national training, quality assurance and quality development of victim-offender mediation at the National Council for Crime Prevention, Sweden, since 2004. She co-wrote the handbook on victim-offender mediation that is used in training all over the country.

Since 1996 she has been training mediators in different areas of mediation: community mediation, peer mediation, work place mediation and family mediation. In 2001 she published a handbook on peer mediation in schools. This lays the foundation for peer mediation in about 300 schools in Sweden.

She started working as a mediator in community mediation in 1997. Since then she has worked as a mediator in the field of victim-offender mediation, peer mediation, family mediation and workplace mediation.

Extracts from the

Annex 1 to the Code of Internal Regulations of the European Forum for Restorative Justice v.z.w.

Selection, nomination and election of candidates to the Board

C. Elections

During the General Meeting, the chair of the selection committee, or another member of the selection committee if the chair is not present, will present a short report on the work done by the committee since its appointment. He or she will also describe the procedure to be followed in the election.

The candidates for election to the Board are invited to present themselves briefly. If the candidates are unable to attend the meeting, they may ask one of the people who support their nomination to do so in their stead.

An election committee will be composed by the General Meeting, consisting of one staff member of the European Forum and two full members attending the General Meeting. None of these people can be a candidate for election, or act as a proposer or seconder for a candidate.

Voting will be done by secret voting ballot.

Full members of the European Forum who have received (a) proxy vote(s) from (an)other full member(s) will receive a number of voting ballots equal to the number of proxies they hold on top of their own voting ballot.

The voting ballots will contain the names of the candidates for election. The chair of the selection committee, or his/her replacement, will clearly explain how many candidates to vote for and how.

The voting ballots will be collected by the members of the election committee. They will count the votes and present the General Meeting with the results of the vote.