



Minutes

Rainbow Cities Network

6th Annual Meeting Summary

8-9 November – City Hall, Barcelona

Participants

Arnold van den Broek (Amsterdam, The Netherlands)
Olga Arisó Sinués (Barcelona, Spain)
Meritxell Sàez Sellarés (Barcelona, Spain)
Florencio Chicote (Berlin, Germany)
Sølve Sætre (Bergen, Norway)
Tale Berntsen (Bergen, Norway)
Babet Brilleman (Bruges, Belgium)
Danny Jacqmot (Brussels, Belgium)
Susanne Bonnemann (Cologne, Germany)
Guillaume Mandicourt (Geneva, Switzerland)
Sabien Blondeel (Ghent, Belgium)
Dorothee Bramlage (Hamburg, Germany)
Juliane Steeger (Hannover, Germany)
Grace Proch (Hannover, Germany)
Simona Topolinjak (Ljubljana, Slovenia)
Sören Landmann (Mannheim, Germany)
Christine Burmann (Nuremberg, Germany)
Torolv Moe (Oslo, Norway)
Philippe Lasnier (Paris, France)
Anouk Erkelens (Rotterdam, The Netherlands)
Bruna Sveltlic (Sao Paulo, Brazil)
Eufemio Gianluca Truppa (Turin, Italy)
Angela Schwarz (Vienna, Austria)
Wolfgang Wilhelm (Vienna, Austria)
Shelley Berlowitz (Zürich, Switzerland)

Members that were unable to attend

Manuela Corazza (Bologna, Italy)
Sarah Tighe-Ford (Brighton and Hove, UK)
Dominique Vitali (Esch-sur-Alzette, Luxembourg)
Kristel Wildiers (Leuven, Belgium)
Adriana Aguilera (Mexico City, Mexico)
Ulrike Mössbauer (Munich, Germany)
Ceren Suntekin (Sisli - Istanbul, Turkey)



Day 1

- 12:30-13:30 *Arrival & Refreshments*
13:30-14:00 Official Welcome & Photography / Agenda for the Meeting
14:00-14:15 Input: RCN Power - Short introduction on cities that are very interested to apply
14:15-15:30 1st Working Session: Association (Deeds, Common Grounds, Fees, Coordinator & Board)
15:30-16:00 *Coffee Break*
16:00-17:30 2nd Working Session: Association (continued)
17:30-19:00 Documentary Screening: *El fil Rosa* by João França (Director) & Adrià Rodríguez (Screenwriter)
19:00-20:30 *Break: Time to Check-In Hotels & Relax*
20:30 *Dinner – Restaurant “El Gran cafè” C/ d' Avinyó, 9*

Official Welcome and Agenda for the Meeting

Official welcome of attendees by **Laura Pérez**, including a reference to the gift to them of a photo collage of the first LGTBI demonstration in Spain, which was in Barcelona 41 years ago.

Laura Pérez introduces herself as the Barcelona City Government Counsellor for International Relations and Feminism and LGTBI issues. She notes that it makes sense that she gives the introduction because of the work they are doing in the LGTBI department, but also because Barcelona has already established many alliances with other international cities.

The Rainbow Cities Network includes 29 cities in 14 countries, some of which have rapidly changing political landscapes that can affect LGTBI collectives, feminism, legal challenges, and the response to hate crimes/speech. Coming together can allow the cities to work collectively at a technical level, improve capacities, and share projects, concerns, experiences, official positions, and actions. The Network can also especially support cities in countries where fundamental rights are a challenge to guarantee.

Thanks to the cities that were particularly involved in organizing this meeting: Hanover, Berlin, Vienna, Ljubljana, and Barcelona. And thanks also to Olga Arisó, Head of the Department of Promotion of the Rights of Women and LGTBI, and Meritxell Sàez, also of the Department of Promotion of the Rights of Women and LGTBI.

She hopes that the group can come to necessary agreements regarding regulations and commitments to the Network, and that these complex debates are useful and can be put into practice in all their services and projects. She hopes they will also learn about some of Barcelona's related projects, entities and social movements.

She introduces Meritxell, who works with her in the LGTBI Department.

Meritxell Sàez welcomes the attendees. She thanks all the support staff and asks that they be patient if there are any issues with the video stream or simultaneous translation.



She introduces Grace Proch.

Grace Proch welcomes the attendees in the name of the Preparation Group and thanks those who took on additional tasks in the absence of a Coordinator.

She introduces the program and says that they will talk about the Association and have two Working Groups. There will also be a documentary screening in the afternoon.

Meritxell Sàez notes that the documentary will be about the LGBTI movement in Barcelona, featuring important people related to the cause that explain the challenges, situations, and advancements therein.

Grace Proch covers the rest of the programme:

- Dinner at El Gran Cafè restaurant tonight
- Tomorrow's Working Sessions include presentation of the soon-to-open LGBTI Resource Centre; and Academic Input on Intersectionality and how the Network can implement it (Lucas Platero)
- Exchange of good practices
- Meet the local NGOs
- Talk about common projects
- Talk about the actions that will be taken between this meeting and next year's in Esch
- Dinner

Input: RCB Power – Introduction of cities interested in applying

Introduction by **Florencio Chicote** about the cities that want to join the Network. He thanks Laura and the team in Barcelona.

Florencio volunteered to be the contact person for **potential new members**. After the last meeting in Ljubljana, many cities had questions and wanted to join, and are quite keen on joining as soon as possible. He summarises by city:

- **Toronto, Canada**. This would mean another international city joins the Network. NGOs in Toronto invited him to come in May 2018 and bring the idea of joining to the city council because they want to develop an action plan. One week after Florencio's visit, the city council decided they would join as soon as the application process is opened. He notes as an aside that the population of the city should be a topic as related to membership fees.
- **Aarhus, Denmark**. The city is impatient to join, and would be the first city from Denmark.



- **Helsinki, Finland.** Quite interested and ready to join.
- **Lille, France.** Interested, and Jul has already been in contact with them.
- **Frankfurt am Main, Germany.** Interested, and a city with a population over half a million.
- **Reykjavik, Iceland.** Capital of the country; 123,000 inhabitants.
- **Sanem, Luxembourg.** Second-largest city in the country; 50,000 inhabitants. Impatient to join, and Florencio would like to get them in as soon as possible.
- **Lisbon, Portugal.** Thanks to Ceren for going to the conference as a rep from the Rainbow City Network. Lisbon was very impatient before; now being more patient.
- **Vitoria-Gasteiz, Spain.** Regional capital of the Basque Country; 247,000 inhabitants.
- **Zaragoza, Spain.** Regional capital of Aragón; 665,000 inhabitants.
- **Bern, Switzerland.** Very, very impatient to join.

There are also some cities that are more patient and he says they have told them they will contact them as soon as possible, as well as other cities that have asked about the procedure to join. These include:

- **Montreal, Canada.** The second Canadian city.
- **Dortmund, Germany.**
- **Heidelberg, Germany.**
- **Tel-Aviv, Israel.** A non-European city.
- **Torremolinos, Spain.** Southern Spain.
- **Lausanne, Switzerland.**

A small analysis of relevant figures:

- 29 cities right now; more than 11 in the first group (impatient to join), and 6 in the other group that may or may not join.
- The Network would be at least 40 cities in 2019
- The Network will get 5 plus 1 new countries; 3 are EU member states, which is important. As discussed in Ljubljana, there are certain EU funds for which the Association would then, once these countries join, be able to apply, such as the Europe for Citizens Programme.



- One city would have a population over 1 million; 4 cities between 500,000 and 1 million; 6 cities with less than 500,000.

Florencio feels very inspired by the interest and looks forward to working with this potential. He notes that when he went to Toronto, [Susan Gapka](#), a trans activist, received a key to the city, and in her speech, she said, "It takes a village to change the world." He hopes that we can be inspired by this quote in the present meeting.

Grace Proch says that she too was excited by the cities' interest. Some of the cities are saying that joining the Rainbow Cities Network will help get their council members on Board as well, because signing the Memorandum of Understanding is an official political commitment to take action in their cities. It is an example of how the Network helps our communities to do more and better work and get more commitment from our cities.

It also shows the importance of our ambitious goal today: to vote on the Deed with the Common Ground and Fees, and find a solution for filling the Coordinator position. As discussed in Ljubljana, not having the Association founded occupies a lot of discussion time, and we would like to settle this to free us to talk about good practices and real content. Not having a Coordinator has also led to some negative consequences, even though many people have tried to step up and help. We cannot continue to manage a Network without a Coordinator.

And if we pass the vote to found the Association, we can enable all these additional cities to join. That is why you received all the documents in the run-up to the meeting. They are also on the table in front of you.

Grace Proch gives a historical recap of the Deed:

- Between the meetings in 2016 and 2017, a Working Group prepared the first draft for presentation at Ljubljana in 2017.
- At the meeting, we discussed the draft and possible changes.
- The Working Group incorporated the changes, then sent it out for feedback, then prepared another version. Then more feedback, then another version. Thanks to Arnold in particular for all his work.
- A couple of months ago, we got the final draft, and were asked for any final change requests. Most cities were very positive about the version of the draft as it stood. There were a few questions and comments members wanted to discuss in this meeting.
- The Preparation Group has tried to prepare a summary of these issues that we can work with today. It was not easy because the scope of the comments was broad. **We propose that today we would answer questions and address the individual discussion points that were raised and then vote on the Deed. But since there are some things that will be impossible to address as a group, or that require more discussion, we suggest that we create another informal Working Group including all members that still have points they want to change, and they will bring revision points for the Deed to the meeting in Esch in 2019.**



She asks if everyone agrees with this approach, and there are no disagreements.

She also says that each city will find a voting card at their place. It is one city, one vote, and that is how all voting will be done.

Eufemio Gianluca Truppa asks whether they will be voting on every single article that is presented, along with the comments/changes that have been sent by the cities before the 31st.

Grace Proch replies that they will not discuss every article as in Ljubljana. They will talk about the discussion points raised in advance, clarify them, and vote on the final document.

Eufemio Gianluca Truppa then asks that before the work begins all members do a declaration vote to explain their vote today as Turin, Italy. The declaration is simple and he would like everyone to be involved. Turin and Bologna want to stay in the Rainbow Cities Network, and they have tried to be inclusive in every political and administrative action they have carried out. They will vote “no” today on the Deed, but only because the current version is incompatible with certain Italian laws, as they pointed out on the 14th of June. They have in the meantime sent the documents to the financial and legal departments so that they could come to the meeting with the specific requirements that would allow them to comply with Italian law. The issues are:

- Article 7, delegate. The word “delegate” is not compatible with Italian law 267/2000, because the only legal representative in Italy is the mayor, who cannot be obliged to delegate. The deputy mayor, head of departments, or other people could be obliged.
- The question of Common Grounds. Article 7 states no politicians can take part in Annual Meetings, and this is illegal in Italy. Law 267/2000 says you cannot ask for financial commitment of public funds and leave politicians, who are the only legal representatives, out of meetings.
- Article 8, the Board. There is explicit provision of remuneration for Members of the Board who are delegated specific tasks. Law 122/2010 of Italy says all associations joined by public entities cannot say or give money to Boards. There are no explicit rules for the conflict of interest in Article 1293 of Italy’s Civil Code.
- Article 6, Fees. There is no provision for a maximum Annual Fee (like that in the EURO CITIES statute) for partners who are legally and financially engaged. And there is no separation of responsibility of the members from the obligations of the Association, as Italian law 267/2000 requires.

We want to stay in the Rainbow Cities Network, even though we have to vote “no” today. If you so choose, we are ready to work with everyone to revise the statute so that Italian cities can join this important Network. Otherwise, Italy will basically be kicked out, which I don’t think is the financial aim of the Network. We apologise, but I had to clarify and ask that this be in the official minutes. We are ready to provide all financial and legal documents required to clarify our position.



Grace Proch thanks Gianluca for his work with the different departments and whether anyone else would like to respond.

A **member** notes that money is not given to the Board but to the Association.

Grace Proch says that they cannot discuss each individual point, and that is why they suggested the Working Group. She confirms that they do not want to kick out anyone, and that it is especially important that Italian cities are members. But they must find a way to found the Association now and use the Working Group to fix major issues, and the Italian cities should be part of this Working Group.

Eufemio Gianluca Truppa says they commit to being in the Working Group.

Grace Proch says that this means the Italian cities' status would not be clear for perhaps one year, but she thinks all would want to hear the Italian cities' suggestions for changes.

Eufemio Gianluca Truppa says that he would like to clarify whether, if they cannot join the Association until revision and legal compatibility with Italian law, they would still be considered members of the Rainbow Cities Network.

Grace Proch reiterates that it is important that Italy is able to stay in the Network and give their input to the Working Group.

A **member** says that in the Common Grounds there is no article for a situation like this one because it was agreed that there was nothing like an "observation" status. But perhaps they can make an exception for one year because they want to have the Italian cities involved.

Eufemio Gianluca Truppa says that they would not be inactive because they will answer to everything from the Network if given the opportunity. They cannot join the Association, but Turin and Bologna want to stay in the Network and work with everyone to make the Common Grounds legally compatible with the Italian system so that the entire country is not kicked out.

A **member** asks who the Chair is today.

Grace Proch replies that she is moderating.

The **member** suggests that they go through the points and questions already prepared, and then ask remaining questions or engage in further discussion afterwards. Otherwise we will just discuss important points city by city and not get to the Preparation Group presentation.

Grace Proch says that everyone would need to agree on this procedure. Then they will talk about the prepared points, then vote on the Deed, and then the Working Group can prepare revisions. She notes that the member question about not including political representatives is a fundamental one for the Network, and if all agree, perhaps another Working Group can think about this issue before the next meeting.

Eufemio Gianluca Truppa says they would only ask that it not be a veto ban of politicians, and that perhaps they could adjust and there could be parallel sessions to



separate politicians from administration, as in EUROCIITIES, but it cannot be an explicit ban.

Grace Proch says that there is no explicit ban in the Deed, and these issues could have been brought to the Working Group in the year since Ljubljana, rather than right before the meeting. They don't want to be mean, but the Network has to move forward and discuss points and vote. So that is what they suggest, but there must be member agreement that this is how the meeting will proceed. At the moment, it is a vote on the procedure, not the Deed or the Working Groups. She asks who is in favour of proceeding like this.

17 votes of 20 cities are in favour, so that is how the meeting will proceed.

She says they will discuss the different questions and topics raised in preparation, and talk again at the end about the Working Group and who will be in it, or whether there will be two Working Groups.

First, there are 9 topics prepared regarding the Deed: 5 in the Deed proper and 4 in the final statements of the Deed:

- 1) **Article 9.1. The duration of the mandate of the Board.** At the moment, it says 4 years. People asked how we came to that number, so let's discuss, and then we can vote. She asks if anyone has a different suggestion for the duration of the mandate.

Angela Schwarz says the first proposal was one year. That seemed too short. But people change jobs, so four years could be a bit much. But the Board members could be changed during their mandate, so she suggests sticking to 4 years and, if someone leaves, change the person on the Board when they meet annually, and approve the Board anew every year.

Grace Proch clarifies that the duration of the mandate of the first Board will be clarified later in the meeting. This only regards the Board in general.

Guillaume Mandicourt asks if members can be re-elected. If they can, then maybe two years is long enough for the mandate of the Board, and they can be re-elected. If not, then four years. The idea is to rotate cities.

Grace Proch says that perhaps it would be better then to talk about the re-election point first.

Eufemio Gianluca Truppa says that in the EUROCIITIES statutes it is a mandate of three years and maximum of two terms.

Grace Proch asks if this is a suggestion. She says one option is four years. Another option is three years with only two terms maximum.

Guillaume Mandicourt says that the two issues are linked for him because the idea is to rotate. If you cannot be re-elected then you need four years because if the members change year after year, you have a rotation on the Board, and we need some kind of continuity if you cannot be re-elected. If you can be re-elected then it can be two years and you get elected again if you do good work.



Grace Proch says they would have to add a paragraph to Article 9 about re-election and whether it is possible, and for how many years.

Florencio Chicote proposes 4 years for the mandate and the possibility of being re-elected an indefinite number of times, because the plenary and members won't re-elect if they are unhappy with their work. He makes the comment that EURO CITIES is driven by mayors, and mayors have a certain time mandate, but this Network is not driven by mayors on the Board.

Grace Proch says there are 3 things to decide on:

- **Is re-election allowed?**
- **Is there a limit to re-elections?**
- **The duration of the mandate of the Board**

Susanne Bonnemann says that if re-election is not possible, then you would always have a completely new Board every 4 years, and this is not healthy because then there are no veterans to help new people adjust. So, if we keep 4 years and say you can be re-elected, then at least one or two will be committing to almost 8 years. If you want more fluctuation on the Board, maybe 2 years makes more sense.

Wolfgang Wilhelm says he would just like to come together and make this as simple as possible. Since there are good arguments for different amounts of years, let's not waste energy and keep those discussions simple and just pick a duration.

Grace Proch says yes, and the Working Group can work on revisions for next year. She asks if they are ready to vote on the question of whether the Board members can be re-elected. She asks who is in favour of Board members being re-elected.

20 members are in favour of re-election.

Grace Proch next asks who is in favour of unlimited re-election. She asks if anyone plans to abstain, and whether they already decided how many votes are required for a decision.

The members respond that a majority is required.

Votes are counted. **11 members are in favour of unlimited re-election, and 10 in favour of limited re-election.** So, unlimited re-election will be possible, and changes can be proposed in Esch or at any point in the future.

Grace Proch reminds members that there are currently two proposals on the table for the duration of the Board mandate: two years and four years. Guillaume suggested that if re-election was possible, two years might be enough. Susanne said that if you can be re-elected and the duration is 4 years, an 8-year stint on the Board is a lot. Grace Proch asks if there are more proposals.



A **member** says that it's going to be harder to find people who can commit to four years. Perhaps two years is more flexible.

Wolfgang Wilhelm says that a shorter period makes it easier for new cities to become part of the Board and feel more involved. So, he agrees with 2 years.

Grace Proch asks who is in favour of a mandate of 2 years and who is in favour of a mandate of 4 years. She asks if anyone is abstaining and says this does not appear to be the case.

The members vote 17 to 3 for a Board mandate of 2 years, and this will be added to Article 9.

- 2) The voting procedure outside of the Annual Meetings. **Is it possible for the Network to make decisions outside the Annual Meetings?** At the moment, yes. There were some commentaries that fundamental decisions should not be made outside the meetings, but some decisions will have to be made. For instance, the Board is responsible for the day-to-day business. She says there was a movement to remove the possibility of making fundamental decisions outside the meeting, and asks if anyone is against this.

Florencio Chicote comments that an example of a decision outside the Annual Meeting could be accepting new members. That is done through the Mailing List.

Guillaume Mandicourt says the Board could make a pre-decision about that, since there are good indications about the cities that can and cannot apply. He doesn't think decisions by Mailing List are a good idea. He thinks the Board should make small decisions and the voting and big decisions be made at the Annual Meeting.

Florencio Chicote thinks accepting new cities is a big decision and they should continue to do it through the Mailing List, with a main contact and an alternate in case the city member representative is not available.

Eufemio Gianluca Truppa says that other Networks can decide urgent and important things outside of the Annual Meetings, but with a qualified majority of 2/3 of the members with electronic voting rights.

Shelley Berlowitz says she is unclear what kind of decisions they mean, because the Board makes decisions all the time. And there is also an article that says that if there is something important and the majority of cities want to convene an extra meeting between the Annual Meetings, they can do so.

Grace Proch says that she also is unclear because there is another article that says the Board can make decisions about their work. She says she gets the feeling that there are a lot of people in favour of not having other decisions made outside Annual Meetings. She says it's something they can try and then later change in the Deed if necessary.



A **member** says that maybe an example would be if there was a new Coordinator and a decision needed to be made about that person, e.g., if they left after a few months. Some decisions may need to be made during the year.

Grace Proch says she thinks maybe this is already part of the work of the Board.

A **member** asks if the question of how to vote for new member cities is part of this vote.

Grace Proch says it could be a second vote, but it's not part of this vote because that is an exception.

A **member** suggests asking, "Who is in favour of keeping all the main decisions for the Annual Meeting, except for voting for new cities?"

Another **member** asks if she means votes by email or Board votes in between meetings

Grace Proch says there are no other ways other than email or a special meeting. So, email.

Susanne Bonnemann says she still doesn't get which decisions the Board can make and which the members can make. Grace Proch replies that members vote the Board because they trust them to make the right decisions and that they can decide which are their decisions and which should be taken by members.

Grace Proch asks **who is in favour of keeping all big decisions, should they arise, and with the exception of approving new members, to the Annual Meetings.**

20 members are in favour, so Grace Proch says they will delete paragraph 12.3 in the Deed.

- 3) **Voting on new memberships.** There is some back-and-forth discussion about whether a paragraph needs to be added to give the Board the legitimacy to ask the General Assembly a question about new members, and Grace Proch says that some members wanted to keep the procedures for new members exactly as they are. She notes that new membership decisions might have to be an exemption from the above paragraph that was just agreed to.

Another **member** asks why the new memberships cannot just be decided on at the Annual Meeting, and whether it is really so urgent to do it throughout the year. Grace Proch says it is urgent because if they apply in January and the Annual Meeting is in November, they will want to come to the meeting in November. The member says they see the point, but notes that they could come as observers. Someone else says that they cannot, because observers were deleted from the Deed.



Eufemio Gianluca Truppa says that taking the example of other international networks, they could state that new memberships are decided by majority vote of electronic votes by the internal Rainbow Cities Network Mailing List.

Florencio Chicote says that if they allow in people throughout the year through email votes, they can participate immediately in the next meeting. And some of the cities want to immediately be able to announce their application and acceptance into the Network.

Grace Proch says they will do the vote in two parts: first, she asks **who is in favour of having this article clarifying that the voting for new memberships will be done via the Mailing List throughout the year.**

The vote passes.

Grace Proch then asks by which majority cities have to be accepted. In the past, it was informal; everyone sees the need to formalise now and have the same rules apply to everyone. It is mentioned that in the Common Grounds, Article 8, point 2a, "Member cities have three weeks to respond to the Coordinator about the application in case of positive feedback of the majority." So, whether the Network decides on a majority of half or 2/3, members know that they must respond. But the Network needs to have something written about what happens if there is no response.

Eufemio Gianluca Truppa says membership is important, and would suggest a 2/3 majority within three weeks. If 2/3 do not answer, then a simple majority: 50% plus 1. Grace Proch says she doesn't understand what the majority after the deadline does, and another member says it creates two rounds of voting, which is interesting but more work for the Coordinator. Another member says that since every city that fulfils the Common Grounds is allowed to become a member, they don't see why it needs to be more than a simple majority.

Grace Proch says they should vote: **a 2/3 majority or a simple majority to accept new member applications.**

The simple majority wins.

A **member** asks whether the votes will be sent to the Coordinator or to all members. In the Common Grounds, it says the votes should be sent to the Coordinator. Grace Proch asks **whether anyone would like the votes to be sent to everyone.**

Everyone wants to keep the current procedure: send votes to the Coordinator.

- 4) **Article 15.1, the location of the Annual meeting.** At the moment, the Annual Meetings can only be in Europe.

Juliane Steeger says that Mexico City asked to change this point, but this was discussed for a long time in the Annual Meeting in Vienna. She would propose to leave the article as is.



Eufemio Gianluca Truppa says he also proposes to leave it as is, but the topic should be discussed for the next revision of the statute, because if many new international cities join the Network, it is not very democratic.

Grace Proch says, yes, this was a suggestion of the Preparation Group. But she raises the vote: **who is in favour of leaving Article 15.1 as is, and only having Annual Meetings in Europe?**

16 are in favour, 3 against, 1 abstention. So, the article will be left as is. But for the protocol, perhaps they will give this question explicitly to the revision Working Group for Esch.

- 5) **Absentee ballots.** Someone asked whether you can still vote if you are unable to attend an Annual Meeting. The answer is in Article 12.2 of the Deed: “Yes, you can give your vote to another city if you tell the Coordinator at least some kind of time in advance.”

A **member** asks whether this applies to votes already on the agenda or anything that comes up during the meeting. Grace Proch says this was brought up in the Preparation Group as well and yes, it means that the Coordinator will have to do a lot more preparation for the meeting and circulate the issues to be voted on beforehand. But this is good because some cities want to discuss internally beforehand anyway.

A **member** asks if that means they will not be able to vote during the meetings on anything that isn't on the agenda, or just that the city who proxied the vote cannot participate in that vote.

Grace Proch says that at the moment it refers to the city who proxied not being able to vote on any items that come up at the meeting.

Florencio Chicote says that Berlin would never give their vote to someone else, even if they cannot participate, because no other city can substitute a city to vote. They would like to abolish absentee ballots because everyone is supposed to participate and it opens the door to allow people not to participate but just to vote.

Grace Proch asks for a vote: **who is in favour of abolishing the option to transfer your city's vote to another city if you are not attending the meeting?** It means if you are not present you have no say in the decisions.

17 are for abolishing the option to transfer votes; 3 abstain.

It is decided to take a 30-minute break and then discuss the final statements of the Deed. A member thanks Grace Proch and says she is doing a great job, and also says thanks for her participation, because there are not enough female voices in the assembly.



1st Working Session: Association (Deed, Common Grounds, Fees, Coordinator and Board)

Grace Proch is talking about members having asked why the three individuals mentioned as interim Board members got on the list; what was the decision-making process? She asks Arnold to explain.

Arnold van den Broek says that at the last meeting it was decided that these people would be on the Board between the Annual Meetings 2017 and 2018, while the Association was being formalised, and that at the next meeting we would decide who would really be on the Board. But since formalising the Association took longer than we expected, we have to think about what we and the people involved would like.

Danny Jacqmot says that he might replace Peter, but it has not been fully decided yet, and he has not been able to reach him.

Juliane Steeger says there are some new tasks for the Board that were not expected last year. The Board has to decide on the new fees; they may have to decide on a new Coordinator. She proposes electing a new Board today, because the current Board members are not present and didn't know what they were doing last year.

Florencio Chicote agrees it would be a good idea to make a Board proposal already, if possible. He suggests that someone from Hanover joins the Board because they did a lot of work on the Deed and the coordination.

Grace Proch says they have to decide first if they are going to vote on those three people or on a new Board and who should be there.

Anouk Erkelens says that if it is going to be a vote for the people listed currently in the Deed, then she is replacing Cornelia from Rotterdam because she is her replacement for the coming years.

Grace Proch says that that means that they will not be voting on those three people because aside from them not being present, there might already be two changes.

Guillaume Mandicourt says we may have to distinguish between members and cities, so the Board will be composed of cities, even if for a Deed they need the specific names. He suggests we should get used to talking about members as cities in the coming discussions.

Grace Proch asks if she can step out of the role of moderator for a moment, because she doesn't understand how we can give a seat to a city.

Guillaume Mandicourt replies that cities are members of the Network, so the cities must decide whom they delegate to the Network. But the cities may remain members of the Network even if the delegate changes, so it's not a question of people being members, but rather cities being members.

Florencio Chicote says that he understands that point, but because names are required in the Deed, we have to talk about both. Geneva sends Guillaume to the Board, but if Guillaume finds a new job, Geneva does not nominate a new Board member. The Board member has to be elected by the Network.



Guillaume Mandicourt says that is something that the Network has to decide.

Shelley Berlowitz would like to know if these people currently on the Board, besides Cornelia, are prepared, and also what they want or don't want. She says since they are not here we cannot think about voting for them, because we don't even know if they want to be on the Board.

Danny Jacqmot says that he discussed it with Peter, and when he signed up for the interim Board it was to make the statement that Brussels wants to commit to a core group to make this Network happen. It was without specific tasks in mind; more like an engagement for the project.

Grace Proch poses the vote: **who is in favour of finding the candidates of the Preliminary Board today?**

18 members vote in favour; 2 abstain.

Grace Proch says the discussion about the Board can be opened, but asks if the number of members of the Board is fixed at 3. That appears to be what is in the Deed.

Guillaume Mandicourt asks whether it can be more than three people.

Arnold van den Broek says that in Article 8.1 it is stated that there are three people on the Board: a Treasurer, a Secretary, and a Board Member. The Prep Meeting also had three people and the Coordinator, and we tried to keep it as close to what we had been doing over the years.

Guillaume Mandicourt replies that the Prep Meeting was three people because it was the cities that organised the previous meeting, the next meeting, and the prep meeting. But now if we have an elected Board for two years, it won't be linked to who organises the meeting. So, we could decide that the Board is more than 3 people.

Arnold van den Broek agrees that it can be more people if the group prefers.

Guillaume Mandicourt says that they should then write in the Deed that it is a minimum of three people, and another member says that they should put a maximum as well.

Grace Proch asks **who is in favour of changing the number of Board members as stated in the Deed from a definitive number of three to a minimum number of three.**

19 members vote in favour; 1 against. So, Article 8.1 will be changed to say, "A minimum of three people."

Grace Proch asks **who is in favour of having a maximum number of Board members.**

17 members vote in favour; 1 against; 2 abstain. So, they will set a maximum number. Grace Proch asks for suggestions for the maximum number.



Eufemio Gianluca Truppa suggests that the maximum should be proportional to the number of partners in the sense of having a maximum of at least five. Florencio Chicote suggests that to make it easier, and because there will be a Working Group to revise if necessary, there should be a maximum of just five.

Grace Proch poses the vote: **who is in favour of the maximum number of Board Members being five?**

17 members vote in favour; 3 abstain.

A **member** notes that we need to now say that in case of tied votes, the Chair decides, or something similar. Another member says that in the associations in which he works, that is something the Board can decide in its first meeting without writing it down in the Deed, and that is German law. Gianluca says that these things are contemplated in the EURO CITIES statutes, not outside them, and that in that case the vote of the President of the Association breaks the tie. Guillaume notes that maybe not everything has to be in the Deed because it is expensive and difficult to change, requiring notaries for every change. Shelley proposes saying that the Board constitutes itself, because they also don't say anything about the Chair or the President in the Deed.

Grace Proch poses the vote: **who is in favour of adding the sentence: "The Board constitutes itself"?**

18 members vote in favour; 2 against. The sentence will be added to the Deed. A member notes that the Deed already says that the Board positions will be elected by the Board Members themselves.

Grace Proch asks for **suggestions of at least three cities to be part of the Board.**

Sören Landmann offers **Mannheim.**

Danny Jacqmot offers **Brussels.**

Anouk Erkelens says she is thinking about offering **Rotterdam**, but not if someone else wants to do it.

Guillaume Mandicourt asks if the voting on the Board Members can be postponed until the end of the day or tomorrow so people have time to think about it and see how it goes with the Deed. Grace Proch says that is possible.

Guillaume Mandicourt asks if the Preliminary Board is elected for one year. Grace Proch says that was what was discussed in Ljubljana. But the final statement of the Deed did not state as such. So, she asks if they can vote on it.

There is some back and forth about when this year would begin: from the registration of the Association? From today? From Annual Meeting to the next Annual Meeting? Grace Proch asks Arnold whether the wording for this and for the two-year mandate that they just voted on for the general Board have to be changed from so-and-so-many years to something like, "two meetings hence" or "the next meeting"? Is it legally necessary? Another member suggests that maybe if they need a date they can just say December 1st to December 1st. Wolfgang notes that in Austria, legally, you have to announce who the representatives are and who is on the Board for the next period, and



you have to set a date. Arnold says that it has to be from meeting to meeting because they would have to elect a new one.

Grace Proch poses the vote: **who is in favour of making the wording more precise, to reflect that the Board is not elected for 365 days but rather from one Annual Meeting to the next, or two years hence?**

10 members vote in favour; 6 abstain; 4 against. The wording will be changed. Arnold van den Broek adds that he is in favour as long as it does not contradict Dutch law.

Grace Proch poses the next vote: **who favours limiting the duration of the mandate of the Preliminary Board that we will elect today, to one year?** Guillaume says he thinks that it is fair to limit to one year, because there are about 10 cities that want to join the Network in the coming year.

3 members are in favour; 2 abstain; 15 against. So, the Preliminary Board will have a mandate of two years.

Grace Proch notes that a question was raised about whether the name of the Coordinator has to be in the final Deed, and notes that Arnold said it was not necessary. As it would be practical to leave it out so the Deed can be finalised now, she poses a vote: **who is in favour of deleting the name of the Coordinator from the Deed?**

20 members are in favour.

Moving forward to section C of the final statements, **there were a lot of members that asked why the financial year is not from January to December.**

Arnold van den Broek replies that because the Annual Meeting is late in the year, you cannot talk about the results of that financial year if it is January to December, because it hasn't yet ended. But if you go from June to July, then you can talk about the past financial year's results in November at the meeting.

Wolfgang Wilhelm replies that you can always only draw conclusions after the year is over. The only difference is that in one case it is 11 months between the close of the previous financial year and the meeting, and in the other 5 months. So, his preference would be to do it from January to December because that's the set-up for every city's financial year and would be more compatible with the public administration.

Arnold van den Broek says that it is too late because too much time will have passed since the end of the last financial year to fix the current financial year, if there are any problems. Another member affirms that you must agree on the accounts for the previous year within six months of the end of that financial year. Gianluca agrees that the Association can decide the endpoints of its financial year independent of that of the public administration.

Grace Proch states that **since they must do it like this, nothing will be changed.**



Grace Proch states that they have now covered all the discussion points and they can move on to the Common Grounds. There were no vetoes or discussion points on the Common Grounds, and the only question was about the Fees.

How the Fees would work was discussed in Ljubljana, and there were no vetoes and many confirmations of their explanation in the Common Grounds. Members just **wanted to know about Fee payment in 2018**, because many of the cities wanted to pay the money. The answer is that because we are only finalising this today, and Arnold will then have to found the Association and open a bank account before cities can pay, it is highly improbable that this happens in 2018. **We will begin paying fees in 2019.**

Shelley Berlowitz asks whether, as the financial year begins in July, they are paying for the first half of the year even though the Association didn't exist for the first half year.

Susanne Bonnemann suggests that perhaps they can say that the 2019 Fees have to be paid between June and December of 2019.

Wolfgang Wilhelm suggests that the Network Membership year period be the same as either the financial year or the Board Membership period, because if Network Membership is from January to December and the financial year is from June to July, and the Board Membership is from November to November, then it gets complicated.

Florencio Chicote opines that they need to set a shorter time period for the Fees because the Board needs to know how much money they have for the Coordinator. If only 20% has arrived, they might not be able to pay the Coordinator. Grace Proch agrees that a payment due-by date is necessary so the Board knows how much money they have.

Angela Schwarz says perhaps they are overcomplicating things. She agrees they cannot wait until June to get money in, but it is perfectly possible to have a financial year and a membership year that do not coincide. That's not a problem.

Florencio Chicote insists that we need a time slot for members to pay the Fees, and since the Coordinator position is very involved in preparing the Meeting, they should set this time slot from the 1st of January to the 31st of March.

Guillaume Mandicourt says there will always be a delay of six months between the payment date and the usage of the funds.

Grace Proch says that perhaps if we follow Florencio's suggestion that financial year 2019-2020 has to be paid by March 19, we could pay the Coordinator beginning in April.

Philippe Lasnier says that in some situations the local elected officers won't be able to join in and vote, so he suggests May. There is a Paris City Council in February, not January, and since he does not know how full the agenda will be, he cannot guarantee the vote in Paris can be held in February this particular year.



Eufemio Gianluca Truppa says that in Italy it would be better if the period could be extended until April to give four months at least, because the budget is not approved until June and they need more time.

Grace Proch says we must talk about generalities now and about specific cases later. She poses a vote: **who is in favour of always paying the upcoming financial year Fees between the 1st of January and the 30th of April of the calendar year in which the financial year begins?**

19 members are in favour.

A **member** proposes adding a clause that would allow cities to apply for an extension of two months if they are in an emergency situation and cannot pay their Fees, and the Board can decide whether to approve this request.

Grace Proch proposes a vote: **who is in favour of adding the line that says cities can apply for an extension to pay until the 30th of June in the same way that they apply for the solidarity reduction?**

20 members are in favour.

Wolfgang Wilhelm asks for confirmation that the period of Network Membership is a year, January to December, and the group says yes.

Grace Proch says that once the Association is founded and they have the bank account, if all members pay what they should according to the model, they should have €63,400. But if some cities apply for the solidarity reduction, they are estimating that maybe they would have €6,000 less, so €57,400, with only the current countries in the Network. If we have at least 11 more members, of which some are M cities and one is an L city, that would be a lot more.

A **member** asks whether this considers that they will not have any Fees paid in 2018, and Grace Proch says that they will pay all Fees before April 30th, 2019, for the 2019-2020 financial year. Since it is not realistic that they will have a bank account until the end of the year, and cities can only pay for 2018 before December 31st, 2018, they will not have fees in 2018.

Guillaume Mandicourt asks whether they really have to have a Deed deposit to have a bank account, because they already have the budget for 2018 established, and it was founding members money, which was €3,000 instead of €1,000, that will be lost. He says that they can pay it before the end of January 2019, but afterwards it will be lost. Another member says it is the same in Germany.

Grace Proch says that it would be a shame to lose this start-up money, but some cities can only pay before the end of 2018. If some cities can take this money into the next year, they could give it like a donation, and everyone would be very grateful.

Arnold van den Broek says that a bank account can only be opened when they have an Association, and then they have to go to the notary and the Chamber of Commerce, and it is a bit tight to get the bank account by the 31st of January. But he will try if he gets the documents as soon as possible.



Shelley Berlowitz says that in order to pay more money, they need a bill by the 12th or 15th of January, and Grace Proch says that it is only for cities that are able to do that. Unfortunately, nothing else can be done.

Florencio Chicote notes that when they had the same situation in 2017, their mayor's office said that, at least in Berlin, if you could bring the meeting minutes to prove that there was a protocol and a cooperation agreement, the money could be set aside as a Cooperation Fee for a Network they were building, as opposed to a Membership Fee. That way, the money would not get lost. You could make the agreement, as an example, with Amsterdam, and say, "Amsterdam is doing everything for the start-up and creating the Association, and we want to give that money." You will have to check with your administration.

Grace Proch says they should talk about these creative solutions later, because this is not an obligation.

There is an aside in which a member asks about Mexico City applying for the solidarity reduction, and Grace Proch says this is a question for the Board. Others would also like to know about the where and when of the solidarity reduction, but others say that this is business to take up after the Association is founded. Another member mentions that the only relevant issue was that of the location of the Annual Meetings discussed earlier.

Grace Proch suggests they move on to talk about the Coordinator. She says, as many of you know, there are many reasons we need a Coordinator, and today we need to find a pragmatic solution that can work beginning in 2019. The Preparation Group came up with a suggestion that most members seemed to agree to, but the only issue seemed to be surrounding the selection Committee for the Coordinator. So, we will discuss these two points.

The proposal is to purchase the services of an NGO that employs somebody for the task of coordinating the Network, so that the Network can buy services rather than being a direct employer. The NGO proposed two options, so we would like to take up this proposal and discuss the options.

Eufemio Gianluca Truppa likes this solution, but would like to make sure that they are not breaking any public administration laws. He asks if they have to do a public tender. He says EURO CITIES chooses the Coordinator via a public tender carried out by the city that runs the Board. Another member says that because this is a private association, even if the parts of the Association come from public government, it is not under public law. Gianluca asks that the documents about Dutch law please be sent to the Turin Legal Department to check them, since the Association will be founded under Dutch law.

Grace Proch poses a vote: **who is in favour of taking up the proposal of the NGO to provide us with the services of a Coordinator?**

17 members are in favour; 2 against; 1 abstains.

Grace Proch says that as regards the model, a lot of members said a Senior Advisor would be better, but if there was not enough money, they could do a two-step model, with a Junior Advisor first and then a Senior Advisor later when there was more money.



But she points out that they already have enough money to pay for a Senior Advisor. This was discussed a lot via email, so she suggests they go straight to vote on the three options.

Another **member** asks about the period of engagement of the NGO, and how the contract will be managed and by whom, but Grace Proch suggests they first vote on which proposal they prefer.

Grace Proch poses the vote: **who is in favour of the model of Senior Advisor and leaving to the discretion of the Board the money available to pay and to act accordingly?**

19 members are in favour; 1 against. Managing the Coordinator contract will be left to the discretion of the Board under a Senior Advisor model. Mannheim has just arrived, so will vote from now on.

Grace Proch says the second question about the Coordinator is who selects the person. The options are:

- We buy the service and the NGO finds the person
- The Board is on the Selection Committee
- A Working Group is the Selection Committee, and includes the Board and others

Wolfgang Wilhelm asks if the second choice means that the Board decides but the NGO makes the suggestions for candidates. Grace Proch clarifies that we are currently talking about who will be on the Selection Committee, whose tasks include preparing the job posting, disseminating or advertising the job posting, working through and evaluating the job posting, facilitating the job interviews and making a final decision.

Another **member** says it could make sense to have one person from the Board and one additional person from the Network who is knowledgeable about HR.

Eufemio Gianluca Truppa asks what will happen if the Coordinator doesn't work well, and Grace Proch says that is the Board's work. Gianluca asks if the Network can then be responsible legally for having chosen the wrong person. Grace Proch says the contract with the service provider can be terminated if they are unhappy with the NGO.

Florencio Chicote says that what Danny proposed was that, as the Board will have to work closely with this person, at least one person from the Board should be on the Selection Committee. And having at least one representative from the members also gives the members some weight in the decision. And the service provider should also be involved because they are the ones who will actually legally hire that person.

Sören Landmann agrees with Danny and Florencio because the Coordinator will have to represent the Network in some international or national contexts, so it is important to have someone we feel comfortable representing us.

Another **member** says the Board should just pick the Coordinator; it's one of their jobs.



Grace Proch says that everything everyone has said removes the option of having only the NGO pick the Coordinator. So, they should decide whether the Selection Committee should be only the Board or the Board plus other members.

Another **member** says that if it is only the Board, then the whole Board should be able to come to Hanover to choose the Coordinator.

Wolfgang Wilhelm says that the Board always has the members for support as needed. So, it doesn't need to be explicit because they can always ask members to help for any given decision.

Juliane Steeger says that Hanover wants to be on the Selection Committee whether they are on the Board or not.

Grace Proch poses a vote: **who is in favour of including the Board in the Selection Committee and leaving the composition of the rest of the Committee up to the Board?**

20 members are in favour; 1 absent. So, the Board will be part of and responsible for the Selection Committee.

Grace Proch says that they will now return to the issue postponed earlier: the selection of the Board members, and after that, they will move to vote on the Deed.

Paris wants to be on the list to be considered, as well as **Mannheim**.

Wolfgang Wilhelm says that he would be happy if not only northern and western cities were on the list, but also a city in the east or the south, for diversity of approaches. Grace Proch agrees and says that they should encourage other cities to apply for the next Board.

Another **member** asks if, in the revision for next year, a gender quota should be added for the Board. Grace Proch says yes, as items to specifically suggest to the revision committee to think about, we should include:

- Encouraging eastern or southern countries to join the Board
- Think about gendering the Board
- Other diversity quotas

Grace Proch says she has been informed that she must now ask each city whether they are willing to be members of the Board.

- **Is Hanover willing? Yes.**
- **Is Brussels willing?** Danny Jacqmot says, **"Yes."**
- **Is Rotterdam willing? Yes.**
- **Is Paris willing? Yes.**



- **Is Mannheim willing? Yes.**

Grace Proch says that now she must ask **who is in favour of voting for the whole package of 5 cities at once, as opposed to individually, for the Board members.**

19 are in favour; 1 against; 1 abstains. The whole package will be voted upon.

Grace Proch poses the next vote: **who is in favour of these 5 cities being on the Preliminary Board?**

20 are in favour; 1 against. These 5 cities will compose the first Board.

Grace Proch poses the next vote: **who is in favour of adopting the Deed as it is now?**

19 members are in favour; 1 against; 1 abstains. The Network can now become an Association.

Grace Proch says that now we need someone to write all the members after the meeting and say that we are forming a Revision Working Group, and say what the aims are, and that everyone is invited to join if they let the Coordinator know by a certain date that they want to be a member of the group. She asks who will already say that they are part of this **Revision Group? Turin, Vienna, Mannheim, Geneva.** Mannheim offers to write the Network members. The Working Group will decide the date by which members must indicate their interest in joining the Working Group.

Second question: do we want to have **a separate Working Group thinking about if and how to incorporate political representatives into the Network?**

Eufemia Gianluca Truppa says that for Italy this doesn't make sense because the elected official is the only sole legal representative. So, if the statute says that legal representatives or politicians cannot join the assemblies, then Italy is out.

Grace Proch says that's why it would be good if Turin could be part of this Working Group.

Florencio Chicote says he thinks it is a good idea, and they can make sure that politicians do not become part of this but can get what they want in terms of visibility, but under certain rules. So, Berlin will join the Working Group.

Grace Proch says the **Working Group will think about the model and bring a proposal to Esch. Currently in the Working Group are Turin, Berlin, and Bergen. Berlin will be the Coordinator.**

And with that we can close the first part of the meeting and have a coffee break.



Documentary Screening: *El fil rosa*, by João França (Director) and Adrià Rodríguez (Screenwriter)

Eufemio Gianluca Truppa says congratulations on a wonderful documentary. In Italy, there is still widespread institutional homophobia, and it is a very particular country, which surrounds one of the most powerful states in the world, which is run by a religious institution. On the other hand, there is an advantage in that the core of LGBTI movements for Human Rights can be less economically influenced by corporations because big companies are afraid of being associated with the LGBTI community. For instance, he saw that Fiat Group was represented at Amsterdam Pride, but they would never be at Turin Pride, even though they are based in Turin.

He also agrees that the laws are important, and Italy still does not have legal marriage for the LGBTI community, or a national anti-homophobia law. But once the law is in place, you must also begin working on media and education. Our Italian network of local governments, cities, and regions decided on the 22nd of October, 2018, that the common initiative for the 17th of May, 2019, will be education and a homophobia bill.

Another **member** also says the film was wonderful, and it is amazing to see that many struggles they have in their city, like age, sex work, education, and refugees, are also dealt with in other cities, even on other continents. So, there's a foundation of commonalities that allows us to work via social groups together to achieve things.

The idea is also wonderful that the time is now for solidarity with the trans movement and also intersex people, non-binary people, and everyone. And concerning businesses and social class, we have to acknowledge that especially in countries where persecution is stronger than in our cities, class is a very important factor in whether you become a victim, and this is something we have to work on.

Businesses could be very helpful allies, because sometimes they have more power even than diplomats, depending on the country. And we should look at when it could be helpful and when we should remain independent and address what they are doing wrong.

Adrià Rodríguez says that this issue of companies or bars that have an entry fee should be analysed. On the one hand, they are a safe space, and on the other, they are profiting. And it would be good to have safe spaces where you don't have to pay, and that are accessible to a diverse range of people and geographies. While acknowledging that the existing spaces have a place in people's lives, they can look at strategies for creating safe spaces to get to know more people.

João França says that Jordi Petit's statements are very interesting because he is one of the elders and very critical of positions taken against businesses. He lived through the beginning movements and the businesses played an important role in supporting them. So, their role can be important, but we must also question what we lose if we depend on them.

A **member** agrees and says businesses should not be allowed to get away with marching during Pride and making nice ads, but then not being responsible in countries where they operate where persecution is rampant and they have power. We have to



take into account whether they stand by their values in difficult environments as well. Do the people producing for them have safe environments? Meeting rooms are important, and sometimes companies can easily provide these kinds of spaces and it could be easier than people finding public spaces on some continents.

Meritxell Saez notes that they have been here for many hours and that perhaps they should close the session, unless people have more comments. She acknowledges that the filmmakers have many interesting things to share, but it's a bit complicated by having been here for many hours. People should feel free to express their preferences.

The **filmmakers** say that they could propose more issues for debate, but perhaps it's not necessary. They thank everyone for watching and for their feedback.

Close of session.



Day 2

- 9:30-10:00 Presentation of the Barcelona LGBTI Center (Andreu Agustín, Director of the Center)
- 10:00-11:30 3rd Working Session: Academic Input: “What is intersectionality and how can we implement intersectional public policies?” Dr. Lucas Platero. (Videoconferencing)
- 11:30-12:00 Coffee Break
- 12:00-13:30 4th Working Session: Exchange of Good Practices (4 Topics)
1. *Challenges of Gender Diversity for Local Governments*
 2. *Actions of Local Governments to Increase Lesbian Visibility*
 3. *Actions of Local Governments to Improve the Situation of Older LGBTI/LGBTI Seniors*
 4. *The Importance of Intersectionality for LGBTI Policies of Local Governments.*
- 13:30-15:00 Lunch – Restaurant “Can Culleretes”
- 15:00-16:30 Meeting with Local NGOs (3 Topics)
1. *Reproductive Rights of Lesbians: Feminist Campaign for the Right to Reproduction (Maria Rodó and Elena Longares)*
 2. *Fight Against LGBTI-phobia: Intervention strategies to guarantee the rights of LGBTI people against discrimination (Arnau Nonell, Observatori Contra l’Homofòbia - OCH) [<https://och.cat/>]*
 3. *Queer Refugees: Listening to experiences and generating services from an interseccional perspective (Rodrigo Araneda, ACATHI) [<http://www.acathi.org/ca/>]*
- 16:30-17:00 Coffee Break
- 17:00-18:45 5th Working Session: Common Projects & Conclusion (Agenda up to November 2019, Organizational Matters & Next Meetings)

Amsterdam Conference in April 2019 (Arnold ven den Broek, Amsterdam)

Information about the Amsterdam conference in April 2019, and about the information already in the folder.

A request is made to save the dates the 25th and 26th of April.

IDAHOT Exhibition of the RCN – new topic and implementation (Wolfgang Wilhelm, Vienna)

Vienna gives a summary of the past RCN meetings and exhibitions, and puts forth a few digital requirements for material that will be used in the 2019 Exhibition.

Topics proposed for the Exhibition:

- **50 years of Stonewall**
- Paris proposes: **50 Years of Pride, Thank You Stonewall**
- Zurich proposes: **After Stonewall – 50 Years of Pride**



- **LGBTIQ & Disabilities**
- **LGBTIQ & Hate Speech**
- Geneva proposes: **Making Herstory**
- Geneva proposes: **50 Years of Pride**
- Turin proposes: **LGTBI Elderly**
- Hannover and Nurenberg propose: **Lesbians*Visibility**

The first round of voting will combine all the “50 years” options in one.

VOTING RESULTS

First round

50 years of: 11 in favour

LGBTIQ & Disabilities: 1 in favour

Lesbians*Visibility: 6 in favour

LGBTIQ & Hate Speech: 0 in favour

Second round

After Stonewall – 50 Years of Pride: 14 in favour

Hannover suggests translating the 2019 exhibition into several languages, and that the board be responsible for finding a translator and sending it to Vienna already translated.

Vienna offers to send every city the information in English and each city can use and translate the information as they like.

Zurich asks, “Why do we need text?” and Vienna responds that 2 years ago we decided to add text.

Mannheim says that the text provides a lot of information behind the photos.

Geneva says that problems can arise if there are too many translations in an exhibition.

CONCLUSIONS

The Board will be responsible for the translations.

The languages provided by the network are: Spanish, Catalan, Italian, Dutch, French, Slovenian, and German.

Geneva requests a focus on the website, which is very important for visibility, and **Berlin will send this issue to the Board to resolve**.

Geneva proposes that a working group create **a publication about good practices in the member cities**. The working group will include: Geneva (leader), Zurich, Paris, Turin, and Berlin.



Next Meeting

VOTING FOR NEXT MEETING IN 2020

Cities proposed:

- Bergen
- Turin
- Mannheim

Mannheim abstains from voting.

Bergen: 17 in favour

Turin: 1 in favour; 1 abstains

BERGEN will host the meeting in 2020

PREP-MEETING 2019

Who is in favour of Mannheim hosting the prep-meeting in 2019?

Mannheim: 3 in favour

Who is in favour of Turin hosting the prep-meeting in 2019?

Turin: 12 in favour; 4 abstain

The 2019 Prep-Meeting will be held in TURIN

Other topics / organizational matters

What will happen from now until November 2019?

The **constitution of the Board** was decided at a meeting in the morning and **the chair will be Juliane Steeger from Hannover, the secretary will be Soeren Landmann from Mannheim, and the treasurer will be Anouk Erkelens from Rotterdam.**

The Board declares that the Network is now ready to open an account, with a corresponding bank account and fees, so **the Board will lead this process until November 2019.**

Juliane Steeger says that **before the end of March the Board would like to hire a Coordinator**, so before Christmas it will circulate an email detailing the job requirements. **The Board will also send info about the fee reductions, and procedures for how to communicate with the Board.**

Zurich asks if the cities' mayor or other politicians have to sign something again. The Board replies that that depends on the requirements of each city government, but they will provide an email with detailed information about that.



**Ajuntament
de Barcelona**

Direcció de Feminismes i LGTBI



**Rainbow
Cities
Network**

Angela Schwarz announces that she won't be at the next meeting because she is retiring.

FEEDBACK

Ljubljana will send the feedback survey via email within the next week.

Close of session.