



**ifsw**

**international federation of social workers**

fédération internationale des assistants sociaux  
federación internacional de trabajadores sociales

## **Europe**

### **European Delegates Meeting**

**Porto, Portugal**

**16-18 May 2008**

**Minutes**

#### **Countries being represented:**

1. Austria
2. Bulgaria
3. Croatia
4. Denmark
5. Finland
6. France
7. Germany
8. Ireland
9. Lithuania
10. Malta
11. Norway
12. Portugal
13. Romania
14. Russia (with proxy for Belarus)
15. Spain
16. Sweden (with proxy for Iceland)
17. Switzerland
18. Turkey
19. United Kingdom

#### **Observers**

Serbia

<p><b>1.</b></p>	<p><b>Welcome and Formalities</b></p> <p>1.1 <u>Welcome from the Portuguese Association</u> Fernanda Rodrigues gave a welcome to the Delegates Meeting on behalf of the Portuguese Association.</p> <p>1.2 <u>Approval of the agenda and timetable</u> The European President, Nicolai Paulsen thanked the Portuguese Association for their welcome and outlined the meeting timetable. The President explained that the agenda had been circulated prior to the meeting and no comments had been received.</p> <p>A special welcome was extended to the IFSW General Secretary Tom Johannesen and to IFSW President David Jones who would be joining the meeting on 17<sup>th</sup> May.</p> <p>Apologies were given from Armenia.</p> <p><b>Appointments</b></p> <p>Due to the apologies from Siv Kjollmoen a new election officer was needed for the meeting. The Executive proposed John Brennan from Ireland who was elected unanimously.</p> <p>The Executive proposed that Eila Malmstrom from Finland be appointed as Parliamentarian for the meeting. Eila was elected unanimously.</p> <p>The President explained that two positions on the executive committee were up for election and three nominations had been received. Nominations would be allowed until 6pm on 17<sup>th</sup> May.</p>
<p><b>2.</b></p>	<p><b>Minutes of the Delegates Meeting 2007</b></p> <p>2.1 <u>Delegates Meeting Parma 17-19<sup>th</sup> March 2007</u> Austria said that in item 4.7 they had asked for the amount of money spent on exploring the British proposal about the legal body, they could not find it in the minutes. The President said that we would cover this in the meeting.</p> <p>The President asked if the minutes of the Parma meeting could be approved. <i>Proposed: Finland</i> <i>Seconded: Austria</i> <i>The minutes were approved unanimously</i></p>

<p><b>3.</b></p>	<p><b>Matters arising from the minutes</b></p> <p>Romania asked if the legal body was to be covered in the meeting. The President confirmed that it would be covered in agenda item 11.</p> <p>The United Kingdom asked if it would be appropriate to discuss the fact that the meeting was conducted in English only – the President said that this would be discussed as part of the work programme.</p>
<p><b>4.</b></p>	<p><b>Report of the Executive Committee</b></p> <p>4.1 <u>General Report on the Work Programme 2007-2008</u> The written report was circulated prior to the meeting.</p> <p>The President presented the work programme. He explained that over the years this had grown such that now the work programme was very ambitious and this should perhaps be reconsidered. The diversity within the organisation is very significant and everyone works voluntarily, work therefore needs to be clearly prioritised.</p> <p>The President outlined that in between the Delegates Meeting the main actors in IFSW Europe are – the executive committee, member organisations, the permanent EU committee, representatives and partners. It is sometimes possible to work in conjunction with partners who share the same aims etc.</p> <p>The President outlined that the main tools available to the organisation are resources/facilitators, communication, legal body (recognition), partnership agreements and projects. The Executive have ideas on how communication can be improved – during the meeting the honorary secretary will check email addresses with each country present.</p> <p>The President highlighted the following issues within the work programme:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Service directives</li> <li>• Social reality stocktaking</li> <li>• Elderly and abuse</li> <li>• Policy on confidentiality and information sharing – United Kingdom and France</li> </ul> <p>The President reported that the Executive were looking into communication to, from and between members. With emphasis on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How to ensure the participation of organisations in cooperation on an equal basis</li> <li>• How to improve communication between member organisations.</li> </ul> <p>Belarus has written to Antonina Dashkina in her capacity on the Executive committee. Antonina presented the letter to the meeting. This outlined the</p>

difficulty the Belarus has in continuing as an association, because of changes in registration and the law, and changes in the amount of their rent. Antonina said that member organisations must realise that the situation is very different in different countries, and she urged member organisations to take this into account when deciding upon the work programme and priorities.

Some group work on the issues covered then took place. The President asked that people move around so that each group represented a few different countries. The questions given to groups were as follows:

1. What is the experience in your organisation to bring in European perspectives in the work of your organisation?
2. How have you used the work of IFSW Europe in your National Organisation?
3. How has IFSW helped you to link to International sister organisations/ partners?
4. Which activities and issues of IFSW has been relevant in your organisation?

Feedback from the group work was given as follows:-

The IFSW work programme gives good support to countries such as Turkey and Croatia. In Turkey social workers can feel very alone – there are only 3,000 social workers in a country of 70 million. Using IFSW Europe documents and policy papers can help social workers feel that they are sharing problems and issues with European countries. They would like more support though. This could assist them to organise small conferences. They would also like to have support in political lobbying.

Spain said that they find it useful to be able to reflect on IFSW Europe policy papers etc. It can be helpful to them to see how others in Europe are working. They found it useful to discuss the situation of social work in other countries within their group. They felt it is useful to have an international perspective.

Another group felt it was important to have documents from IFSW Europe so they could look at what countries have in common and what is different in diverse countries. They have made use of some of the documents in negotiating in parliament. They used some IFSW Europe documents as well as some from sister organisations.

Human rights issues were seen as important for all countries. Human rights were seen as the basis for all social work and for the professional identity of social workers. The situation of social workers in many countries is still very difficult – with unemployment, low salaries etc.

	<p>Coming together can be useful and IFSW Europe documents and papers can be used in the National context to look at the development of the profession. Some countries have used IFSW Europe papers in looking at regulating their social work education. Also some countries have worked together in small groups to consider particular ethical issues.</p> <p>The definition of social work was seen as a key document widely used in a number of countries.</p> <p>Membership of IFSW Europe was also seen as important in helping member organisations in the development of codes of ethics – the ability to share different members’ codes of ethics was seen as important.</p> <p>There was a feeling that there is a need to protect the profession in different countries. There are a number of questions currently about the future of social professions. Coming together in IFSW Europe can assist in this.</p> <p>World Social Work Day was seen as a good way to promote the profession.</p> <p>One group talked about cross border workers – and how IFSW Europe may be able to help with issues this raised. The Bologna agreement raised and there was an acknowledgement that there is a great deal of work to do together in Europe.</p> <p>The President thanked members for their participation in the group work and for their valuable feedback on the work programme. He explained that it is also important to consider how the European work programme fits into the Global level work programme – which will be discussed at the General Meeting in Brazil.</p> <p>To conclude this agenda item, the President asked if the report of the Executive Committee could be approved:</p> <p><i>Proposed: Sweden</i>  <i>Seconded: Norway</i>  <i>The report was approved unanimously</i></p>
<p><b>5.</b></p>	<p><b>Report from the Permanent Committee on EU Issues</b></p> <p>Executive Committee Member, Barbara Molderings, presented the report – the committee were elected last year – Marjut Kosonen from the United Kingdom and Ana Lima from Spain are now the committee members. Others who volunteered for the committee were asked to act as consultants in their expert areas – Bengt Rasten from Denmark as a specialist on working conditions, EU labour law and EPSU and Georg Dimitz as a specialist on migrant workers and refugees.</p> <p>Barbara said that IFSW Europe currently have observer status in the Social Platform. When the legal body is established the organisation can apply for</p>

	<p>full membership. The Social Platform is very interested in the work of IFSW Europe and has been extending invitations to workshops.</p> <p>The President said that it is very positive that we have now been invited to social platform events.</p> <p>The President encouraged members who are members of the EU to make contact with the committee to discuss issues and highlight any areas for discussion.</p> <p>Barbara explained that she has been providing an update on social policy issues for members approximately 3 times this year. She asked if this was helpful, members agreed that it was helpful and they would like this to continue.</p>
<p><b>6.</b></p>	<p><b>Report from the Representative to the Council of Europe</b></p> <p>Gabriele Stark-Angermeier explained that she had not been able to send her report out prior to the meeting, but a paper copy was provided at the meeting. The Honorary Secretary will also place the report on the website.</p> <p>Gabriele said that she has now been the IFSW Europe representative to the Council of Europe for three years, she feels that she is now making good contacts, relationships are improving and IFSW Europe is now well represented. Gabriele said that she and Bruno Keel had alternately represented IFSW Europe at all Council of Europe meetings this year.</p> <p><b>6.1 <u>Children's rights and the work on the next session in Council of Europe</u></b></p> <p>Gabriele briefed the meeting on how the Conference of NGOs has adopted a new structure and new Rules of Procedure, aiming to enhance its efficiency already around the next session in COE. The new structure includes reorganising the groupings of the NGOs in the COE, one of which are the Social Cohesion and Eradication of Poverty Committee.</p> <p><b>6.2 <u>The change of statue of the NGO in the Council of Europe</u></b></p> <p>Gabriele said that the most important development for the NGO conference was the adoption by the Committee of Ministers on the legal status of NGOs in Europe and the resolution of the Parliamentary Assembly on co-operation with the NGO conference.</p> <p>The renewed influence of NGOs in the Council of Europe is especially very important to strengthen the position of NGOs in Eastern countries. Every session there are different meetings to reinforce this network in order to take more steps towards a living democracy.</p> <p>Austria asked whether it was possible to follow up the 2001 Council of Europe report which recommended National law on social work. Gabriele said that as yet there is no specific report on this but she could raise this</p>

	<p>issue through the NGO network. The President said that we could also follow this up in the work plan to be discussed later.</p> <p>Russia said that there were a number of interesting issues in the Council of Europe – particularly in relation to human rights, the social charter and regulation of NGOs. The Russian Association was invited to a workshop on the day of poverty which was very useful.</p> <p>Gabriele said that these workshops were very useful and that the network which can be provided through the Council of Europe is very helpful. She encouraged other members to make use of this – she is happy to support countries to make links.</p>
<p><b>7.</b></p>	<p><b>Reports from representative of IFSW Europe to other organisations and IFSW global committees</b></p> <p><u>7.1 To receive report on ENSACT</u></p> <p>The President provided a report on ENSACT. He explained that ENSACT is an umbrella organisation which is a network of 6 organisations all working in the social field. It includes social professionals, lecturers, researchers, policy makers and social service providers in Europe.</p> <p>The main activities of ENSACT are to promote the quality of social services, voicing its members concerns and interests on a European level, organising common conferences, providing information on relevant issues for all members. A website has been established – <a href="http://www.ensact.eu">www.ensact.eu</a></p> <p>At this stage the organisation is still developing. The President explained that an article had been published in the European Social Worker about ENSACT and it's member organisations.</p> <p>Romania asked if we would be returning to discuss joint work with ENSACT in the meeting. The President said that we would be referring to it at various stages of the meeting and that we would come back to the issue as part of the work plan too.</p> <p>Gabriella said that ENSACT is a very useful network in her work with the Council of Europe.</p> <p><u>7.2 To receive reports on the IFSW work on Human Rights and Ethics</u></p> <p>Ruth Stark had circulated a report prior to the meeting . Ruth said that she felt very sad that she was not able to say that real progress had been made. The good news is that concrete information works – the children's rights manual is now published in 7 languages – having been translated into Portuguese this year.</p>

	<p>The other positive thing was that in seeking information for the meeting between IFSW Global and the UN Committee on the Rights of the Child lots of member organisations responded.</p> <p>Ruth said that this showed her what is important and what works. Therefore she said that we need to really concentrate on this when we look at the IFSW Europe project. She feels that we need to learn from what works – concrete and practical. What she feels does not work so well is networking.</p> <p>The Nordic Countries said that they are having joint workshops as part of European Social Forum in September this year to consider prostitution and trafficking. Croatia said that the Croatian Association of Social workers are organizing a Conference in October focusing on social work and human rights.</p> <p>Ruth said that before people to go to Brazil, she feels it would be useful to have discussions about how the human rights commission for IFSW Global could work more effectively.</p> <p>Brain Auslander of Israel is the representative for Europe for ethics - unfortunately he was not able to attend the meeting. Brian had reported to the President that there was nothing to report on the European level in terms of ethics. Brian also said that he had tried to get some feedback from the Global level on ethics and had not been able to get any feedback.</p> <p><b>7.3 <u>To receive report from the global group on Definition of Social Work</u></b></p> <p>The President said that at the General Meeting in Munich, there was a decision to review the definition of social work. It was felt that the definition had many strengths but there may also be parts that need to be reviewed. A group has just been appointed to carry out this review. There are 10 group members representing both IFSW and IASSW from all continents. The first dialogue with members will take place in Brazil 2008. Followed by regional meetings in 2009 (the European meeting will be during the 2009 Conference in Croatia). There will be email dialogue between 2008-2010. A report on the review is due in 2010. At present the aim is not to come up with a new definition, but simply to review the existing definition.</p> <p>The General Secretary said that he expected there would be a great deal of debate at the conference in Brazil. It appears that Brazil very much wishes to challenge the definition – they see it as very Anglo Saxon and not addressing the needs of Southern America members.</p>
<p><b>8.</b></p>	<p><b>Approval of the annual accounts and the report of the auditors</b></p> <p>Barbara Molderings, treasurer of IFSW Europe, presented her report. Barbara explained that membership fees take some time to come in and some countries have not paid for some time. The General Secretary agreed</p>

	<p>that these members are not paying Global fees either. Member organisations who are not paying fees will be discussed at the General Meeting and their status may be changed to provisional members.</p> <p>The President said that it is worrying when previously active members disappear. He called upon members present to see if they could assist in making contact with those members who have now ceased contact with IFSW Europe.</p> <p>Austria said that there are members who are in active contact who do not pay – he wondered why this was. The President explained that some countries struggle to be able to pay for various reasons. He explained that we have an agreement with Israel about how they will pay. The General Secretary explained that Israel have just paid their global fees.</p> <p>Barbara explained that she has made some changes to the way that accounts are recorded to make travel expenses more transparent.</p> <p>The United Kingdom asked whether any interest was paid by the bank. None shows on the 2007 accounts and on the 2008 accounts very little is expected. They asked whether more money would be accrued in interest if the balance were left at the Global level. The General Secretary said that more interest could be earned in a German bank.</p> <p>Barbara said that she would look into this and report on what action has been taken next year.</p> <p>The President asked if the annual accounts for 2007 and the report of the auditors could be approved.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Proposed: Lithuania</i>  <i>Seconded: France</i>  <i>Agreed with 2 abstentions</i></p>
<b>17<sup>th</sup> May 2008</b>	<p>The President began the second day of the meeting by thanking Cristina Martins and the Portuguese Association for arranging an excellent dinner and evening of entertainment the previous night.</p>

**9. Report from the IFSW President and General Secretary (IFSW Global)**

Tom Johannesen – Secretary General

The General Secretary started his report by asking if we could take a moment to remember Irena Sendler who died 5 days ago at the age of 98. IFSW supported her in her nomination for the Nobel prize and appointed her most distinguished social worker.

Following a short silence the General Secretary provided some information on the Global Conference to be held in Brazil in August. So far 1,123 participants have registered but as yet only 85 are from outside of Brazil. Future Global conferences are planned for – Hong Kong June 2010, Sweden July 2012.

Membership development will be discussed at the General Meeting in 2008 – there are new applications from Asia and Pacific and Africa, hopefully also Europe. There will also be a number of assessments due to lack of contact and fee payment. A report will be sent out to all on this matter.

A number of IFSW policy statements are in progress – often little feedback is received from member organisations during consultations. Poverty and the role of social workers – still in progress. Genocide – paper has been sent out. Health – paper has been sent out. Cross border reproductive services, ageing and older persons – are both at an advanced stage. IFSW Global expect to be able to report in Brazil. Women (gender), Youth and Racial discrimination papers are still at the early stages.

Visits to the IFSW website have been growing (for example there were 45300 in April). Europe has more visits than all the other regions put together. Development of the website is being considered – a news section will be developed and feedback from member organisations will be sought. There are also plans to introduce some interactivity.

World Social Work Day – there are reports from 36 countries on the web site. The proposal is to have WSWD on the third Tuesday of March each year. The themes for 2009 and 2010 are to be decided upon in Brazil.

At the General Meeting in Brazil ethics and the definition of social work will be discussed before revisions in 2010. This meeting will also mark the beginning process of preparation for the world conference 2010.

The posts of human rights commissioner and ethical convener are currently open, so there will be a process for finding new people for these posts. These should be appointed at the General Meeting.

The General Secretary reminded members to remember to pay membership fees ahead of the general meeting. He also encouraged people to send proxies to ensure that we have quorate at the meeting.

The General Secretary also gave a reminder of the photograph competition (details can be found on the website); the Andrew Mouravieff-Apostol medal (again information is on the website) and the fact that jubilee merchandise is still available on the website.

Finally the Secretary General reported on other Global matters – IFSW Global is active in the mental health revision process with the World Health Organisation. IFSW Global had a meeting with the UN committee on the rights of the child, which went very well.

The World Urban Forum will take place in October in China. IFSW is preparing for this and will be sending a delegation partly from Africa, partly from Asia.

#### David Jones – Global President

David Jones reported that he had recently been in Brazil at the Association's conference. He said it was breathtaking. They are used to organising big conferences. The conference will be mainly Latin American and it may be a challenge for others. He encouraged people to book now as hotels are under pressure. The conference programme is going to be good.

David said that he was pleased by the fact that in a meeting with the UN representatives stated that social work is the most important profession in terms of implementing the UN convention on Human rights.

The website is very important, if people do work for IFSW it is important that they send a report to go on the website.

Finally David said that he was excited by the prospect of work in preparation for Hong Kong. Now is the chance for IFSW to begin to work with the UN and the Council of Europe to influence the social agenda for the next ten years. To prepare effectively IFSW Global will be encouraging debates and seeking feedback from member organisations. 3,000 people are expected at the Conference in Hong Kong. It will be a defining change moment for the social agenda for the world. The general meeting will be at the end of the conference rather than at the start to try to integrate the issues from the Conference within the General Meeting.

The President thanked Tom and David for the Global report and asked for any questions.

Ruth Stark (UK) said that she felt that the cooperation with IASSW on human rights is not working. She hoped that this could be addressed in Brazil. David Jones said that it is clear that IFSW is the most active organisation in terms of human rights; elections are due within IASSW this may mean that cooperation improves. There will be space to discuss this in Brazil.

Barbara Molderings (Germany) asked what action could be taken in situations of genocide – particularly with the development of the paper on genocide in development. Barbara said that papers are good but action is

	<p>important and she had concerns about Tibet. David said that he had discussed this with the UN Habitat, there is the possibility of developing an organisation such as <i>medicin sans frontiers</i> for social work.</p> <p>Austria asked about the policy paper on homelessness which had been developed within Europe and forwarded to the Global level. David said that this would be looked at prior to Brazil. Global are looking at having a different process for the development of policies – involving experts in the writing of the policies. The General Secretary said that through monitoring the website it is easy to see what policy development is most interesting by seeing who is visiting what etc.</p> <p>Austria asked about the Global positions of the human rights commissioner and ethics representative. David explained that there has never been an election for these posts – they are appointed at the General Meeting. Global would be happy to receive nominations.</p> <p>Antonina Dashkina (Russia) raised the issue of Social Work Action Day. She said that Europe has always been very active in this, but this year Russia did not take part which she felt was very sad. She feels that the topic was too broad and should be more defined. Antonina also commented on the photo competition – members from her organisation sent their entries by post as requested – it is expensive to send post from Russia to New Zealand and she was disappointed that entrants had not received any acknowledgement or feedback. Antonina also asked whether it would be possible for IFSW to develop a standard on how to respond to disasters, when statements should be made. Antonina also commented that she felt there could be a problem with the number of proxies which member organisations might take to Brazil.</p> <p>David responded by stating that in Terms of World Social Work Day, each member organisation needs to decide on what they will do as their own theme.</p> <p>The General Secretary explained that the change regarding proxies was agreed at the Munich general meeting. It will need to be kept under review. He is not sure how people will use the option. He does not imagine people will come to Brazil with large numbers of proxies.</p> <p>The General Secretary said that it is difficult to be clear about what we should do in relation to disasters. How big does a natural disaster have to be for IFSW to make a statement? If members have any thoughts or comments Global would appreciate them.</p>
<p><b>10.</b></p>	<p><b>Social policy issues</b></p> <p>10.1 <u>Presentation of the results of the Burn Out Study, facilitated by the French Association ANAS</u></p>

Veronique Barr of ANAS gave a very useful presentation on this study carried out by the French Association

The United Kingdom thanked the French Association for carrying out this project and for an interesting presentation. The United Kingdom currently have a joint project between Norway, Russia and the United Kingdom to explore the impact of very complex trauma work on social workers.

Austria agreed that we need to consider the issue of burnout and the problems of retirement on the grounds of incapacity – particularly on those aged 55 plus. This is a European issue. Social workers should not have to work beyond 55 because of the risks of burn out.

Finland said that recently there had been a headline that social workers were more at risk of depression. In Finland they don't use the term burn out but discuss depression.

Germany thanked France for carrying out and sharing this research. It has been particularly useful in Germany. It shows the need for increased quality supervision and support from colleagues for social workers.

Malta said that they wanted to stress the importance of this study. Although the number of social workers graduating in Malta is increasing they are having problems in retaining staff. A recent study day highlighted that this was due to burn out.

Lithuania said they are talking about the burn out of social workers in their country too. One issue which has been raised there is about the way that social workers feel that they can no longer be sensitive in their work because of the risk of burnout.

Denmark said that they have developed a new approach to stress for social workers – they are giving recommendations to the municipalities about workload levels. They have had surprising success with this. The municipalities have been accepting the recommendations and some municipalities where there were shortages of workers are now advertising themselves as “we work to the recommendations of the association”

Russia said that they have worked very hard to promote the status of social workers in Russia. They have also developed some projects to provide support for social workers to address the stress that social workers work under. They feel that this is a vital topic which could be discussed at the conference next year.

#### 10.2 General social policy issues

The President said that the executive committee had added this to the agenda to look at what were seen as key social policy issues. This would feed into what the Global President had described as the social agenda. The President gave a short presentation highlighting that some of the issues already raised within the meeting were:

- Cross border issues
- traveling social workers (with a criminal record)
- traveling service users
- cross border service provision
- youth, conflict and crime

Marjut Kosonen then gave a presentation cross border issues. It is clear that there are workers traveling from one country to another and there are lots of issues around this. For example, a worker could have been struck off in one country and there is currently no agreement between countries to be able to check this although there is now an agreement which relates to health services. There are also issues about whether countries can afford to loose workers who they have trained to other countries, it is not clear how good the agencies who are recruiting migrant workers are, how well migrant staff are prepared etc. Marjut encouraged member organisations to encourage MEPs to address this issue.

The President said that there may be many other social policy issues and introduced the groupwork questions, as follows:

1. what is a “hot issue” in relation to Europe and social work in your country?
2. which issue is relevant for your country?
3. what to recommend for IFSW to prioritise.
4. how to approach a prioritised issue and what shall be the outcome?

The feedback from the group work was as follows:

Norway, Russia and the United Kingdom worked together and identified 4 “hot issues” –

1. Criminal responsibility and how the state treats children who are at risk of offending. Some countries see children as their offence first not as children – and there are great variations in ages of criminal responsibility. They felt IFSW could help to link children’s needs to the human rights agenda.
2. Growing intolerance of difference – perhaps caused by increased migration. Difficult to say what IFSW could do – but could we have statements around what is and isn’t acceptable.
3. Social work is very much based on individual case work and the profession has lost the ability to address broader community work and community issues. We need to have a way of connecting with international community development themes and work. So that we can learn more about these approaches.
4. Migrant children. The group felt that there is a need to establish ties with relevant agencies in other countries to find a quick way of addressing whether a child can return to their country of origin – for children who need adoption and placing with family members. Maybe IFSW could develop a list of people who could assist.

Malta, France and Portugal worked together and identified 5 main issues

1. The old and new faces of addressing poverty in Europe. Social Work is now often of a transitory nature. Having a salary is not enough often to protect people from poverty.
2. The provision of health care across Europe and a system of better social care and social security across Europe.
3. The movement of workers across Europe – particularly the recognition of qualifications.
4. Tolerance across Europe.

This group felt that IFSW could be more active about these issues in the media and be present at the World Social Forum.

Spain, Germany, Austria, Romania, and the United Kingdom worked together and identified 5 issues.

1. European law on social work – do we need a European law on social work to protect rights and protect service users from offenders working with vulnerable people.
2. Workload of social workers and issues of potential burnout.
3. Social workers facing imprisonment when they are seen to “fail” to prevent child abuse or neglect.
4. Social work should work on prevention rather than crisis.
5. Migration issues need to be acknowledged – e.g.: Many older people retire to Spain which will have an impact on the call for services.

Turkey and Croatia worked together and identified 4 issues:

1. Migration issues – people moving from rural areas to the city and the consequent urban pressure.
  2. The clash between state bureaucracy and social work values and ethics.
  3. The clash between neo liberal approaches and community services.
  4. Countries who are candidates for the EU need to develop social work.
- There is the possibility of projects in these countries – there was a question about whether we can draw on the experiences within IFSW to support this.

This group’s strongest recommendation is to develop projects. This needs to start within particular countries.

Russia, Bulgaria, Ireland, Germany, Lithuania, France, Portugal and the United Kingdom worked together and identified 4 main issues:

1. Support for social workers, needing good quality supervision. IFSW could produce some guidelines and templates on good quality supervision.
2. Criminal records of social workers, cross borders and not only cross border. IFSW could produce some guidelines for policy makers and governments.
3. There is an urgent need to raise the image and status of social work.

	<p>4. Issues of interdisciplinary working and the social work role within this.</p> <p>Denmark and France worked together and identified 3 main issues:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Recent urban violence in both countries – position of social workers in this climate. How to manage the political and professional position of social workers.</li> <li>2. Access to health care – especially in France. Ethical problem for social workers – new law which creates a problem in that minorities are not able to access health care.</li> <li>3. Burnout – we need to look at how this can be addressed.</li> </ol> <p>Finland, Malta, Sweden, Iceland and Switzerland worked together and reported that they had not discussed specific policy areas but engaged in a long discussion about the political conflict that social workers operate in. There are issues about finding a mutual language with policy makers, society, and partners. There is a need to understand the jargon whilst maintaining the values of social work and we need to find new ways of challenging. There is a real tension between the core identity of social work and how to respond to a changing world involving neo-liberal privatization. The current challenge is how to keep an open dialogue with these changing realities whilst maintaining core values.</p> <p>The President thanked the Delegates Meeting for the feedback and advised that the executive will draw on the feedback to inform the work programme and the priorities of IFSW Europe.</p>
<p><b>11.</b></p>	<p><b>Amendments to the IFSW Europe Articles</b></p> <p>The President said this is a long standing and very important discussion. He recommended that members have the papers which were sent out prior to the meeting in front of them.</p> <p>Barbra Molderings, Executive Committee Member, began to introduce the subject which has now been on the agenda for 8 years. It is important to try to finalise this now so that IFSW Europe can become a registered association. This is vital to enable us to apply for funding, to take on projects and to make financial arrangements more straightforward. IFSW Europe needs to be a registered association to be able to apply for membership in the Social Platform. The relevant papers had been circulated 90 days before the meeting. No comments had been received. Barbara asked if there were any questions.</p> <p>The United Kingdom said that at the Delegates Meeting in 2007 a motion was made that the executive should work on this issue and make some recommendations to the membership. The United Kingdom is very happy that the executive have done this and they would like to support the</p>

executive in their recommendations.

Romania asked whether article 3 covered whether we get project funding. Barbara confirmed that project funding would be covered within fees and funds.

Romania would like an addition to be made to article 8b to state that decisions can be made based on email communication. Sometimes swift decisions need to be made.

Romania would like article 12 (4) to say that in the case of liquidation all funds will go to IFSW Global.

Austria would like it to be pointed out that at present it says that no one can earn a salary – but it would be good to say that this would be possible so that for example members of the exec could act as experts on projects etc.

The United Kingdom asked whether it would be possible to put something in about the need for social workers to advocate on behalf of service users. This may be important in terms of attending the Social Platform – the wording needs to reflect the citizenship role so that service users can be involved.

Austria proposed that we vote on the new articles and new by laws, bearing in mind the comments that were brought forward during the meeting. The executive committee can discuss with the lawyer how these comments can be incorporated. We may be able to incorporate the changes this year or we may need to return with them next year.

A proposal was made that the new articles and by laws should be agreed.

*Proposed : Austria*

*Seconded : United Kingdom*

*Carried unanimously*

The President thanked the meeting – explaining that this had been a major piece of work for the executive. He extended his thanks to the Executive committee.

The President explained that there also needs to be a proposal about where the seat of the organisation will be held. The executive propose Germany. This is more straightforward because of legal issues. Germany said that the town officially would be Berlin. The General Secretary said that the seat of the first IFSW secretariat in 1932 was also in Berlin.

*Proposed: Finland*

*Seconded: Lithuania*

*Carried by a majority – one abstention*

<p><b>12.</b></p>	<p><b>Consideration of and amendments to the Mission Statement and the European aims (IFSW Europe Policy Platform)</b></p> <p>The President explained that the executive are not proposing any changes, he asked if any members had proposals to make on amendments to this document. No changes were proposed.</p>
<p><b>13.</b></p>	<p><b>IFSW Europe Regional Project 2007-2009</b></p> <p>Anthea Agius, Executive committee member gave a presentation on the project. The project title is <i>social work standards meeting human rights</i>. The executive committee has started the project process by distributing a questionnaire to member organisations. This focused on obtaining information about national organisations and demographics, technical information and outcome objectives. So far eight questionnaires have been completed and returned by member organisations. Some of the questionnaires were returned very late so we have not had time to analyse the results. Anthea asked member organisations to return the questionnaires to the executive as soon as possible.</p> <p>Anthea explained that the main aims of the project are to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Promote the links between social work and human rights (“social work <i>is</i> human rights work”)</li> <li>• Highlight human rights thinking and promote it in the language of social workers</li> <li>• Clarify and promote standards of social work practice</li> <li>• Share and promote good practice</li> <li>• Raise awareness about the conditions in which social workers practice</li> <li>• Promote the status of social workers across Europe</li> </ul> <p>Anthea then asked the meeting to go into group work to consider:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Information / feedback on the questionnaire and any questions / clarifications</li> <li>2. Differences and similarities</li> <li>3. Suggestions / ideas for topics to be discussed at the workshops</li> <li>4. What outcome would you now expect at the end of the project?</li> </ol> <p>Ruth Stark (speaking as the human rights representative) said that she is quite concerned about the project title. Following on from the report given to the meeting earlier and the struggles with addressing human rights across Europe, she feels that this project should link in and go back to the project on social cohesion. She therefore feels that we should be talking about standards of social work and achieving social justice rather than human rights – as this is more concrete as a term. As a term she feels that it will be picked up on more fully than the term human rights – which people tend to</p>

view legally. She feels that we should focus on something concrete. The term social justice means the same as human rights and the project content would remain the same. However, it would be more helpful in getting people to consider the project.

Denmark said that they feel Ruth's comments are very helpful. They have had great difficulty in discussing the questionnaire, they tend to think of the areas covered in the questionnaire in terms of social justice not human rights.

As a result of this discussion, Anthea asked the groups to consider the suggestion to use the perspective of social and economic rights rather than human rights.

The feedback from the group work was as follows:

The United Kingdom, Norway and Russia worked together and feedback that they found this exercise very difficult – because it is so important in social work to address issues about human rights. It brings up difficult questions about whether social workers actually benefit from people's needs. It brings up difficult issues but this should not be an easy issue to address. We need to try to tackle a system that is moving towards a greater divide in society. We need to make some very fundamental changes to the way in which we work. We need to look at political lobbying.

Malta, Portugal, France and Serbia worked together. They thought the questionnaire was ok. They feel it highlights the differences and similarities between countries particularly in terms of the conditions in which social workers work. There is a need to change the system from within. Supporting people with their human rights needs to be addressed through transnational cooperation.

Austria, Spain, Germany, Croatia and France worked together. They felt that the questionnaire was good to bring together issues in one topic. But it is difficult to answer the detail in some of the questionnaire. Statistics in particular can be difficult to obtain. They would like to suggest that the questionnaire only covers the first few questions and then the more detailed questions are covered in the workshops. Every country should have human rights in their legislation but this varies across the countries. They would like to suggest that we look at the title social justice and social standards. Lots of the member organisations have been doing work on standards and human rights – can we gather information on these for sharing? For example, a number of the countries working together in this group had topics in their National conferences. They feel that it would be useful to make more use of the website and develop links to national seminars and conferences.

Ireland, Lithuania, Russia, Portugal, the United Kingdom and France worked together. Their discussion reflected the fact that it was difficult to agree probably because human rights is so central to social work and everyone feels so passionate about it that they felt they would have needed all

afternoon. On the issue of the questionnaire it was difficult and repetitive in parts but would have helped workers to reflect on the issues. In terms of outcomes they would like the project to have a positive impact on training and practice. It could possibly empower social workers to be more confident when making decisions on human rights issues. It would be useful if the project could provide some case examples. Can we have an observatory – could each association hold a “watchdog” role around the issues of human rights? One outcome should be a link between global standards and practice. In terms of whether the title of the project should be changed the group could not agree.

Denmark, Malta, Portugal and France worked together. They feedback that they felt the topic was too weak, social justice – what does it mean? They considered that the term social rights was easier to understand. There have been deep discussions in the Danish association about the project. They had considered possible outcomes for the project and felt that it could be helpful to define social justice, to produce guiding documents for how countries should be drawing up their standards, and to provide guidance on the conditions that are necessary in countries for empowering social workers?

Switzerland, Sweden, Iceland, Finland and the United Kingdom worked together. They feedback that they felt the questionnaire must have been very difficult to produce. It was difficult to answer. They felt a key issue was who takes care of the social workers? which links to the burnout study. They felt it was important to discuss working structures and the management of work, when social workers feel better and are empowered they can pass this on to their client. We need to have the means to work as professional social workers. The more that we discuss human rights and social rights the more we will find extra questions.

Anthea thanked the groups for their work. Taking on board the feedback the executive proposed to reframe the project to social justice, social and economic rights rather than human rights as this provides a firmer basis for the project across different countries.

Anthea said that the workshops will be in October / November. They will be held in Berlin, Spain and Bulgaria. There is the possibility to hold one more workshop. If another country wants to host a workshop they should inform the executive. The executive would like to receive questionnaires by the end of June. The executive will reflect on the involvement of partners in the project. The executive will send final information about the workshops by the end of June. If anyone feels they can offer specific assistance with the project, they should inform the executive. There was an offer from the United Kingdom and Ireland to jointly host a workshop and also an offer from Austria to host a workshop.

The Delegates Meeting said that they were satisfied and felt engaged in the project process.

David Jones said this is hard work because we are dealing with difficult

	<p>conceptual questions about the nature of our work so it is not surprising that we struggle with it but if we can work with partners and find a solution then we can be powerful. Secondly David said that this links closely with the work that will be carried out in Hong Kong. He feels that the links are now clear between local, national, regional and global issues and work.</p>
<p><b>14.</b></p>	<p><b>World Social Work Day 2009 (European Social Work Action Day 2009)</b></p> <p>Barbara Molderings, Executive Committee member asked the Delegates meeting if there were any proposals for the theme of World Social Work Day 2009. Austria proposed the legal framework for social work, Russia proposed poverty in rural areas and the role of social work.</p> <p>Barbara said that the executive committee will take these suggestions to the global level and report back to next years Delegates Meeting. If other member organisations have further ideas or suggestions these should be forwarded to the executive committee.</p>
<p><b>15.</b></p>	<p><b>European Conferences</b></p> <p>15.1 <u>The ENSACT Conference 2009 in Dubrovnik</u></p> <p>Tatjana Katic Stanic, Executive Committee member, gave a presentation on the first joint conference with ENSACT. The conference title is “Social Action in Europe; Different legacies and common challenges”. There are three themes to the conference – social conflict and resolution; individualisation and social cohesion; personal engagement and professional accountability.</p> <p>The President said that he would like each association to take home two posters to advertise the conference. The website is open and further information can be obtained from there (<a href="http://www.rathanea.hr/ensact">www.rathanea.hr/ensact</a>). Leaflets will also be sent to member organisations so that they can publicise the conference to their members</p> <p>Ingri-Hanne Branne is the IFSW Europe representative on the scientific committee.</p> <p>The President said that it has been challenging but exciting working with the partners to develop the themes etc.</p> <p>The President asked member organisations to consider who could be invited to give a key note presentation. This person should represent social work practice to help maintain the social work profile within the Conference. Member organisations should send ideas about this to the executive before 1<sup>st</sup> September.</p>

## 15.2 Future conferences

The next European Conference will be in 2011, a host needs to be identified. There were discussions at the Delegate Meeting last year about whether we should continue to have joint conferences or whether we should have IFSW Europe conferences. The President said that the executive have discussed the fact that working with partners has been positive in that it helps to bring people together, there can be better economy within the conferences. At present we have no clear evaluation of the first ENSACT conference – following 2009 we will be able to more fully evaluate this. Alternatively we could look at having a sole IFSW Europe conference in 2011 and then have a joint conference in 2013, so that every fourth year the conference is joint.

Austria said that they felt that we need to focus on developing our own profession, and to strengthen the identity of social work practitioners and not only teachers. Their view is that joint conferences are very much dominated by the teachers and so would like to have a sole conference in 2011.

Finland agreed with Austria. Finland is down as a venue possibility for 2011, but there hasn't been one joint organised meeting. The Association feels that it is one lecturer in their university who wants the conference in Finland. This highlights for them that the conferences are dominated by academics.

Malta said that the list of people working together in the ENSACT 2009 conference is an impressive list, if they can work together to develop the conference this is a richness.

Romania welcomes the fact that the ENSACT Conference 2009 is to be in Croatia. They feel that the next year conference should be joint. The Romanian association feels that strategic partnerships within ENSACT can be very useful when liaising with organisations such as the Council of Europe, on the other hand it is useful to support our own member organisations.

The President explained that if we decide upon a joint ENSACT Conference for 2011 then the process will be that after the summer an invitation will be sent out to all member organisations for nominations for venues. It is expected that Finland will nominate themselves again – as they did for 2009. The schools there, however, have not yet talked to their partner organisations.

Decisions on the venue will be made prior to Christmas so that the 2011 Conference can be promoted at the Conference in 2009.

Lithuania said that it is very important for IFSW Europe to work together with partners, but questioned whether joint conferences help with this. Identity can be developed better if we can discuss common issues for the same profession. Their experience is that in joint conferences the identity of social work can be lost. Social workers need time to consider social work, not just social professions generally.

	<p>The General Secretary said that there have been similar discussions at the Global level. He feels that cooperation and identity should not be seen as two separate matters – we need to find our own identity within cooperative arrangements.</p> <p>The President concluded that maybe it is too early to plan for our own Conference – as we cannot yet evaluate the Conference in 2009. He asked whether the Delegates Meeting would give the go ahead for the executive to go back to ENSACT to discuss clearer arrangements for joint conferences – there may be the option to allow some time within the conference for IFSW Europe to address specific social work issues.</p> <p>Austria asked if we can seek feedback from ENSACT prior to the informal meeting in Brazil.</p> <p>Germany proposed that the executive committee should be given the task to clarify clear conditions for working together prior to the informal meeting in Brazil.</p> <p>The President proposed that the executive have the task to clarify with ENSACT the conditions for 2011 – to ensure that there is a clear social work profile within the conference. The executive are to feedback on this at the informal meeting in Brazil and email out to all members around the same time.</p> <p><i>Proposed Romania</i>  <i>Seconded Germany</i>  <i>Carried by a majority – with 3 abstentions</i></p>
<p><b>16.</b></p>	<p><b>An informal meeting of European delegates at the IFSW General Meeting 2008</b></p> <p>There will be an informal meeting of European Delegates on 15<sup>th</sup> August 2008 in the morning. This will include the election of the regional President and anything that is put on the agenda by members. The executive will send out information and a preliminary agenda ahead of the meeting. If member organisations are not attending the IFSW General Meeting, they are invited to send a proxy for the election, which will be the only item for decision.</p>
<p><b>17.</b></p>	<p><b>Delegates Meeting - 2009</b></p> <p>This will be before the Conference in Croatia. The executive propose the meeting to be held from 24-26<sup>th</sup> April and to be held in a social work establishment – it will be interesting to be in a social work forum and will also make it cheaper for the organisation. This was agreed by the Delegates Meeting.</p>

<p><b>18. Statements</b></p>	<p>18.1 <u>Proposal of a statement to Support the New Regulation on Professional Organisation of Social Workers in Portugal</u></p> <p>Fernanda Rodrigues presented this proposal – the Portuguese association is applying for self regulation under Portuguese law. She felt that this was important to bring to the Delegates Meeting as it is not a situation which is unique to Portugal. The Portuguese association therefore asked not only to share this with the Delegates Meeting but to ask for support, they feel it would be very useful to be able to say that they are not alone as social workers.</p> <p>Sweden asked about the process that Portugal would need to go through to achieve self regulation. What would be the difficulties in order to be recognized? Fernanda explained that in the past most social workers worked for state organisations, however now it is perhaps 50/50 with social workers working in the state and the private sector. Some other professional bodies such as those of older professions feel that social workers don't need this kind of status, so they are not supporting the organisation.</p> <p>The United Kingdom said that they fought for 25 years to have regulation of social work and social care. They said that it took a great deal of time to persuade people of the need to regulate social work and social care. They would want to support Portugal in it's attempts to regulate social work, however they feel that self regulation is not necessarily a good thing. The separate nature of the way that regulation is carried out in the United Kingdom can help – it protects the interests of service users but shows that social workers don't need to hide behind self regulation.</p> <p>France expressed it's support for the Portuguese Association.</p> <p>It was proposed that the Delegates Meeting support Portugal in this statement:</p> <p><i>Proposed: Sweden</i>  <i>Seconded: Malta</i>  <i>Carried unanimously</i></p> <p>David Jones said that the Global level would always be willing to support member organisations in matters such as these – if the organisation contacts David then he will ensure that if Global feels that they can help then they will, by writing a letter etc.</p>
	<p>As the second day of the meeting came to a close two National organisations were given the opportunity to promote their own conferences.</p>

	<p>Serbia gave a presentation on the second Balkan Conference of Social Workers to be held in Serbia from 18<sup>th</sup> – 23<sup>rd</sup> June 2008.</p> <p>The conference will be fully funded. Participants will only need to pay their fares to Serbia. Serbia officially invited all delegates at the meeting to attend.</p> <p>Russia gave a presentation about the third Siberian Conference. It is in a central part of Siberia with direct flights from a range of areas, the conference will consider a range of perspectives about rural areas. A number of countries will be represented.</p>
	<p>Before closing the meeting for the day the President invited member organisations to reflect overnight on what they would like the Executive to concentrate on in the next year. He explained that the Executive would work overnight on the work programme for presentation the next day.</p> <p>David Jones explained that he would not be present at the meeting the following day. He said that he had enjoyed taking part in the meeting. It is an exciting time for social work and a good time to be part of IFSW. He thanked the executive for all their work in organising the meeting – in particular he extended his thanks to the European President, Nicolai Paulsen, for organising and planning the meeting.</p>
<p><b>19.</b></p>	<p><b>Adoption of the Work Programme 2008-2009</b></p> <p>The President explained that the work programme had been further developed by the executive last night. He presented the revised document and said that he was confident that issues raised during the Delegates Meeting had now been incorporated into the work plan. Comments were invited.</p> <p>Austria asked for a follow up on the homelessness policy to be added – they feel that there is a need to follow this up with Global. Austria also offered to send the executive a paper which addresses the neo-liberalism issue.</p> <p>Ruth Stark (speaking as the human rights representative) asked member organisations to inform her if the organisation's representative changed. She has a list of contacts and would like to update that.</p> <p>Portugal asked whether we would have a European perspective on the review of the definition of social work before Brazil. The President said that the review was ongoing until 2010. He feels it is not realistic to have a perspective paper before Brazil.</p> <p>Romania said that in relation to ENSACT they would like the executive to bear in mind the discussions yesterday about developing a strategic partnership but that we do not have to do everything together.</p>

The President then invited each country to sit and reflect on the work programme using the following questions:

- What to prioritise?
- How can you be involved?
- Offers to take responsibility?

Each country then provided feedback as follows:

- France – would like guidelines to support social workers to prevent burn out and to address multi-disciplinary work.
- Finland – want to address working conditions. They are keen to work with the EU and Council of Europe on this.
- Sweden – has a special working group focusing on social issues, in cooperation with EPSU.
- Bulgaria – gave 3 main points as follows: 1. they would like to change the legal framework in Bulgaria regarding Social Work and would like support from other countries. They asked that other member organisations send their laws on social work to the Bulgarian Association 2. Social work training and qualifications 3. They are keen to organise a workshop on the project in October.
- Russia – wants to be involved in the regional project to promote standards in social work and social care, they are involved in conferences, they also propose to write some articles for the newsletter and to maintain contacts with organisations close to them.
- Denmark – they would like the executive to prioritise work with the EU, to go on with ENSACT cooperation and to engage in issues which are on the agenda in the European Union.
- Ireland – agrees with Denmark about priorities in relation to the EU. It is growing by the year and becoming more important in social policy. Working with other organisations such as ENSACT is vital to give us strength. The Irish Association wants to engage in looking at standards of support for social workers, especially supervision. In terms of the project they have offered with the United Kingdom to host a workshop.
- Germany – feel that administrative tasks are very important, they asked that the executive continue this work, this is the basis for all other things we want to go forward. Germany will support the executive in setting up the legal body. They would also like to support in future regional workshops. On policy issues the most important thing for Germany is to work further on standards – that is important to get more together in Europe so that professionals can move more and more across Europe. Mutual recognition is a big part of this.
- Romania – are very interested in the project and the follow up of the social cohesion project. They also offered support to what is currently called the Balkan conference in 2009.
- Austria – hope we will soon complete process of legal body. They felt it is important to look at social work European law, they would like to

develop a discussion paper on social work law at a European level. This will take a long time.

- Spain – the project is very important. Second priority is to influence policy at EU level.
- Croatia – an important priority is the confidentiality policy and standards is also very important. It is also important to look at the conflict between social work and neo liberalism.
- Malta – supports others priorities, but our priorities are to look at trends in neo-liberalism and also to prioritise standards. Would like to prioritise human rights, maybe there could be a budget for this area. Also would like IFSW Europe to support those member organisations that are looking at standards and regulation. Cooperation with ENSACT is still young and this is why it is challenging at times but they would like it to continue. Malta would like to be more involved in the human rights network.
- Norway – felt that the most important issue is to get a clear legal framework for social work, connected to that it is important to look at working conditions and burnout and to develop support for social workers. Norway is also keen to work on social work day. They prefer social work action day. This gives the opportunity to address these issues and raise the profile of social work. A key priority for Norway is also youth conflict and crime. European Conferences are also very important. They feel that it is also important to develop the website for IFSW Europe.
- United Kingdom – would continue the work on travelling social workers. They feel the Association would be well placed to contribute to the definition of social work – as the Association has recently been involved in looking at the roles and tasks of social workers in the countries of the United Kingdom. The United Kingdom is keen to work on the project. They feel it would be useful if as an outcome practice based suggestions in terms of supporting social workers, supervision etc were developed. They wish to contribute to work on mutual training and recognition as the United Kingdom regulatory body is looking at this currently – they will be able to learn from that process and will be well placed to contribute to that work. They would like to be more active in linking up with EU matters, particularly user networks.
- Serbia (observing) – would like to inform the Delegates Meeting that they have a document in Serbia called strategy for social protection. Social work is not high status in Serbia. Working conditions are not really adequate.
- Portugal – just recently started a new team in the Association. They feel they have lots of energy and want to be very involved. They are keen to support IFSW Europe on the work programme. Their main priority is standards for social work. They also want to be involved in EU – giving special importance to the area of poverty. They are also keen to contribute to the review of the definition of social work.

The President thanked member organisations for their feedback. The executive felt that this was very important feedback to see what people

	<p>prioritise and who may be able to assist. The proposal is now that the Delegates Meeting approve the revised work programme:  <i>Proposed – Portugal</i>  <i>Seconded – Russia</i>  <i>Unanimously agreed.</i></p>
<b>20.</b>	<p><b>Revised budget 2008</b></p> <p>Barbara Molderings, IFSW Europe Treasurer, presented the revised budget for 2008. She advised that following the discussions earlier in the Delegates Meeting 600 euros should be added for bank interest. Barbara explained that 1,000 euros had been added to the budget expenditure to support Siobhan Maclean (Honorary Secretary) and Tatjana Katic Stanic (Executive Committee Member) to attend the General Meeting in Brazil. The UK asked if there was any scope to assist other members to attend the meeting in Brazil. Barbara said that the Executive had decided to offer this support to Tatjana because she was organizing the conference in Croatia and to Siobhan because she could develop her understanding of the Global level. The UK were satisfied with this but wondered if there was any scope to assist others. Barbara advised that there was no additional funding available.</p> <p>Barbara asked if the revised budget for 2008 could be agreed by the Delegates Meeting.</p> <p><i>Proposed: United Kingdom</i>  <i>Seconded: Germany</i>  <i>Carried unanimously</i></p>
<b>21.</b>	<p><b>Membership dues</b></p> <p>Barbara Molderings, Treasurer of IFSW Europe, explained that she had circulated the membership dues paper. There are a number of members who have not paid fees for some time. This will be discussed at the Global level. Portugal wanted to explain that they are struggling financially as an organisation at present but they hope that this will be different soon.</p> <p>Barbara proposed that the same model for the payment of membership fees be adopted for the next year. (20cents per member.)  <i>Proposed: Austria</i>  <i>Seconded: France</i>  <i>Carried unanimously</i></p>
<b>22.</b>	<p><b>Budget 2009</b></p> <p>Barbara Molderings, IFSW treasurer, distributed a budget for 2009. She asked that the bank interest be changed to 600 euros and invited any comments or questions.</p> <p>Austria said that only 500 euros was marked in the 2009 budget for the legal</p>

	<p>body. They asked if this was enough. Barbara said that the majority of the money needed for the legal body will be taken from the 2008 budget, she hopes that this is a realistic figure for 2009.</p> <p>Barbara asked the Delegates meeting if they accepted the budget for 2009.</p> <p><i>Proposed: Malta</i>  <i>Seconded: Iceland</i>  <i>Carried unanimously</i></p>
<p><b>23. Elections</b></p>	<p><u>23.1 Nomination of candidates for Regional President to the General Meeting</u>  The current regional President was elected two years ago. In Brazil there will be an election for the regional President from 2008-2012. This is an election which is carried out at the General Assembly – voted by European members taking part. Nominations must be made by 24<sup>th</sup> June. The Danish Association will be nominating Nicolai Paulsen again.</p> <p><u>23.2 To elect other members of the Executive Committee</u>  There are two places on the executive committee (those of current members Antonina Dashkina and Ingri-Hanne Branne). Four nominations were received as follows:</p> <p>Veronique Barré (France)  Ingri-Hanne Branne (Norway)  Ian Johnston (United Kingdom)  Cristina Martins (Portugal)</p> <p>After each candidate gave a presentation an election was held. The results were as follows:</p> <p>Veronique Barre (France) 12 votes  Ingri-Hanne Branne (Norway) 6 votes  Ian Johnston (United Kingdom) 5 votes  Cristina Martins (Portugal) 18 votes</p> <p>Cristina Martins and Veronique Barre were appointed to the executive. Christos Panayiotopoulos (Cyprus) was moved to first deputy. Ingri-Hanne Branne was appointed as second deputy.</p>
<p><b>24. Appointment of Auditors</b></p>	<p>Barbara Molderings, IFSW Europe treasurer, proposed that the organisation retain the same auditors – <b>Alpha Concept, Steuerberatungsgesellschaft mbH, Wilhelmstrasse 147a, D-42489 Wülfrath, Germany.</b></p> <p><i>Proposed: Malta</i>  <i>Seconded: Finland</i></p>

	<i>Carried by a majority with one abstention.</i>
<b>25.</b>	<p><b>Appointment of external and internal representatives of IFSW Europe</b></p> <p>25.1 <u>Representative of IFSW Europe to Council of Europe</u></p> <p>Two nominations were received for this position. Antonina Dashkina was nominated by Russia and Gabrielle Stark Angermeier was nominated by Germany. After each candidate gave a presentation an election was held. The results were as follows:</p> <p>Antonina Dashkina (Russia) – 7 votes  Gabrielle Stark Angermeier (Germany) – 14 votes</p> <p>25.2 <u>An IFSW European contact person to the Global Human Rights Commission</u></p> <p>Ruth Stark of the United Kingdom said that she was happy to continue in role.</p> <p><i>Proposed: Croatia</i>  <i>Seconded: Norway</i>  <i>Carried unanimously</i></p> <p>25.3 <u>An IFSW European contact person to the Global expert group on Ethics</u></p> <p>In the past Brian Auslander of Israel has held this position. However, as Israel has not paid their membership fees, Brian cannot be nominated. There was therefore one nomination from Lithuania for Dalija Snieskiene.</p> <p><i>Proposed: United Kingdom</i>  <i>Seconded: Malta</i>  <i>Carried unanimously</i></p> <p>25.4 <u>IFSW Europe Election Officer</u></p> <p>At the start of the Delegates meeting John Brennan (Ireland) was elected. The Executive would like to propose that John continue in this role.</p> <p><i>Proposed: Romania</i>  <i>Seconded: Portugal</i>  <i>Carried unanimously</i></p>
<b>26.</b>	<p><b>Any Other Business</b></p> <p>The President asked if there was any other business.</p>

The Austrian organisation said that they have been working with their partners to produce a document on procurement and quality in social services. One of the results is the Vienna document. The document also gives the opportunity to sign in support of the declaration. They asked if IFSW Europe will sign it. The President said that IFSW Europe will sign the document and will provide information to member organisations to see if they wish to support it. The declaration and information will be circulated either with the minutes of the Delegates Meeting or as a separate email.

Croatia talked about the plans for the Delegates Meeting next year. If any groups want to arrive earlier or leave later they should let the Croatian organisation know and they will send information and assist in arrangements.

Antonina Dashkina said that she had enjoyed her role on the Executive committee and that she had learnt a great deal from colleagues. Her work in IFSW Europe had helped to progress social work in Russia. She wished newly elected members of the Executive her best wishes for their work.

The President thanked Antonina for all her work. It has been important to have diversity reflected on the Executive and Antonina's presence has helped to represent Europe from all around the corners of Europe. IFSW Europe will still see Antonina as she is the President of the Russian association and they remain a member of IFSW Europe.

The President asked the Norwegian Delegates to pass his thanks and that of the meeting to Ingri-Hanne Branne for her work on the Executive committee.

The President of the Portuguese Association thanked IFSW Europe for holding the Delegates Meeting in Portugal. She said that the meeting had provided a very interesting experience to think about diversity and Europe.

The President then concluded the meeting. It had been a good meeting with lots of dialogue and many people taking an active part.

*August 1, 2008*

*Siobhan Maclean / Nicolai Paulsen*