

**IPPF BOARD OF TRUSTEES MEETING  
Held on 25-26 November 2022 in Bogota, Colombia**

**DRAFT MINUTES**

<b>Present - Trustees:</b>	<b>In attendance:</b>
Isaac Adewole	Varun Anand, Director, Finance & Technology Division
Abhina Aher (virtual)	Mina Barling, Director, External Relations Division
Rose-Marie Belle Antoine	Fadoua Bakhadda, RD, Arab World Region
Hayathe Ayeva	Alvaro Bermejo, Director-General
Ulukbek Batyrgaliev *	Tomoko Fukuda, RD, ESEAOR
Santiago Cosio	Caroline Hickson, RD, European Network *
Surakshya Giri	Manuelle Hurwitz, Director, Programmes Division
Bience Gawanas	Sonal Mehta, RD, South Asia Region
Kate Gilmore – Chair	Claire Jefferey, Acting Director, People, Organisation & Culture Division (virtual)
Donya Nasser	Marie-Evelyne Petrus-Barry, RD, Africa Region
Sami Natsheh Aurélia Nguyen	Eugenia Lopez Uribe, RD, Americas and the Caribbean Region *
Andreas Prager	Aileen McColgan, Honorary Legal Counsel (25 November)
	Achille Togbeto, Director, Governance & Accreditation
<b>Apologies for absence</b>	Caroline Dickinson, Minute Taker (virtual)
Elizabeth Schaffer	
	<u>Sessional attendees:</u>
	Riva Eskinazi, Director, Strategic Partnership and Development (virtual)
	Amina Khan, Global Lead, Communications & Digital
	Vanessa Stanislas, Head of Safeguarding
*Virtual attendance on 26 November.	

**Welcome**

Kate Gilmore, Chairperson, welcomed everyone to the meeting of IPPF’s Board of Trustees (BoT), held in Bogota, Colombia, following the General Assembly (GA). Hayathe Ayeva, new BoT member and Trustee, who was attending her first meeting after being confirmed on to the Board by the GA, was welcomed and introductions were made.

On behalf of the Board, the Chair thanked the Director-General (DG) and staff for all their hard work in preparation for this meeting, particularly in the context of the GA.

The Chair advised that the meeting’s key focus would be feedback from the GA, and that this would feed into the Board’s priorities and Work Plan for 2023.

## 1. PROCEDURAL ITEMS

### 1.1 Apologies for absence

Apologies for absence had been received from Liz Schaffer. It was noted that Abhina Aher would be joining the meeting virtually.

The Board noted that no proxies had been received:

### 1.2 Approval of the Minutes of the previous meeting

*The Board **adopted** the Minutes of the meeting of the Board of Trustees held on 29 September 2022 as a true and accurate record, subject to the correction of one sentence under agenda item two, which should read “three year funding plan”, not “five year funding plan”.*

Progress on the action points from the last meeting was **noted**.

### Adoption of Agenda and Timetable

### 1.3 *The Board **adopted** the agenda and timetable for this meeting.*

## 2. GENERAL ASSEMBLY DE-BRIEF

The Board broke into discussion groups to de-brief on the GA. Discussions included feedback about exchanges with Member Associations (MAs) and identification of issues that could inform for the Board’s priorities and be fed into the Board’s next Work Plan. Participants’ responses to the GA evaluation questionnaire will be an important source of advice on ways to enhance future GAs in the future. However, at this early stage, key issues and learnings too were identified for the Board’s consideration.

In summary, the Board felt it was an excellent GA, with a wonderful spirit and ambience that culminated in unanimous support for the “Come Together” Strategy. In addition, Trustees shared a range of perspectives on a number of dimensions, including the following:

- **Learnings overall:**
  - The GA and IPPF’s internal dialogue, more recently and generally, have centred on internal matters. It is time to look outwards rather than mainly inwards. It would also be good at future GAs to add more cultural and contextual elements to better include, and not exclude, certain people and groups.
  - Participants tended to sit in regional or language groupings and there was not a lot of cross-regional exchange. There was also little time to interact substantially. People would have benefited from more opportunities to meet those with whom they do not usually interact. Perhaps parallel sessions would facilitate this. More space could be given for group sessions to enable more individual and group participation and more ‘down time’ too.
  - Many of the interventions from the floor came from (non-youth) men. It is difficult for many people to talk in a room of 300 people. It is also difficult to have an inter-generational dialogue when youth do not feel it is safe.

Perhaps a more proactive approach could be taken to ensure all voices are heard (i.e. women and youth), while time for smaller groups' discussion may promote more inclusiveness.

- The Youth Forum (YF) and GA seemed disconnected - some dissatisfaction was expressed by youth participants, reflecting perhaps that lack of connection. Whilst the GA was to be youth centred, there was a feeling among youth that instead youth were made to fit into the GA.
- There were difficulties finding local Arabic interpreters. If the issue had been identified in advance, experienced Arabic interpreters could have been brought in.
- Many delegates did not read the GA documents prior to the meeting.
- The Awards Ceremony could be separated from the GA meeting to make it more special, perhaps an Awards Dinner?
  
- **Procedural matters and the agenda:**
  - On appointments and confirmations: recognising that many participants do not read papers in advance, perhaps a short presentation of candidates with could be made including photo and bio.
  - Some discomfort was expressed that every vote was filmed, suggesting it was not a safe space for voting. In the future could young people be able to vote separately?
  - There was very little discussion of finances yet it was a concern for participants and a subject of discussion during coffee breaks. As is the Federation's highest decision-making body, the GA should perhaps spend more time on this.
  
- **Youth:**
  - A significant number of Youth Forum participants were not aware of the many consultations on the draft Strategy, highlighting perhaps a lack of communication also between MAs and young people. Perhaps an IPPF/GA induction is need for those who have little knowledge of the way IPPF works and its structures?
  - More broadly, it was evident that some MAs are not doing enough to capture the needs and wants of young people.
  - Most young people were not aware of the 5% of funding for MAs for youth programme funding and it would be important to ensure that this money is being spent on youth.
  - Youth also expressed a wish for tangible incentives, for instance, jobs, money or even a certificate of service. More thought should be given to youth and voluntarism.
  - We need a deeper discussion on how we are integrating youth and on safe space for youth.
  - The role of the Global Youth Lead could be more visible.
  - Perhaps a strengthening of Global Youth Network and Regional Youth Networks would help. And could the Youth Forum be held annually, rather than every three years, even if it is virtual?
  - Some Board members had dinner with young people during the GA and this direct communication worked well. Going forward the Board should continue to find ways to communicate directly with MAs and young people.
  - The Board should make a commitment to exploring the best sectoral practices to ensure IPPF is working on youth participation in the best way possible.

- **Anti-Racism:**
  - Some GA participants felt the GA discussion of anti-racism was superficial, noting that implementation is key. However, the Board's statement and the GA session were just the beginning of the work and there now needs to be regular communiques on this with the Federation at large.
  - The GA had also discussed whether the title for this change agenda should focus on 'identity' and not 'anti-racism'. However, the title of anti-racism was affirmed as a conscious and appropriate choice, given the global context.
  - The context for the Board's statement was anti-colonialism and its timing was prompted by the George Floyd movement, but that is not relevant to all countries and more diverse ways of looking at anti-racism are needed.
  - The Board has a key role to play: Should the Anti-Racism Committee be a Standing Committee?
  - A stronger Secretariat role may be needed (i.e responsibility, benchmarking and resources).
  
- **The "Come Together" Strategy**
  - Some people expressed a feeling that IPPF is moving away from its core mission. At least one participant observed that the word 'woman' was not used once during the GA and that issues such as teenage pregnancy and rights of women were not covered. "Special interest" groups such as LGBTQI were seen by some to dominate IPPF's mission and the GA. Some wondered to what extent are the donors driving the conversation, or are we influencing donors? This underscores the importance on conversations about IPPF's core mission and values (ie the Charter and Branding projects?
  - There seemed to be a lack of understanding as to whether the Strategy was a Secretariat or MA of whole-of-IPPF Strategy, which is indicative perhaps of a communications gap between the Board and MAs.
  - There is a need for greater clarity on how it will be implemented by the MAs and communication around the Results Framework.
  - We could explore introduction of an online tracker of the Strategy, to show how IPPF is progressing towards its promised results.
  - We should consider how the MA experience can connect more directly with the Secretariat. It is often said that MAs are not going far enough, but they do not always have the resources to do so. For instance, do they know how to access funds from new donors?

The DG responded to certain issues raised. He recognised that there were many different expectations of what a GA should be like. Regarding the request for more financial information at the GA, he agreed but noted that this year not all of the information was available in time. The DG also agreed that there was still very little understanding on the IPPF Charter, even after the Panel session at the GA, and this would need to be addressed. In terms of IPPF values and the seeming central focus on LGBTQI, some Executive Directors (EDs) had commented that they had found this to be helpful, in pushing the LGBTQI agenda with their Presidents and Boards. It was noted that an Induction Programme about IPPF was needed for EDs, Presidents as well as for young people. Regarding the visibility of the Board, it was the case that, thanks to the GA, MAs now had a clearer understanding of who makes up the Board and what it does.

The Chair acknowledged the importance of a clear flow of information between the MAs, youth and Regional Forums and of enabling the Board to be involved in this flow of information. The Chair also suggested that the larger discussion should be on what is happening with young people in the world today and pointed to the limits of entirely separate mechanisms for youth. DG responded that the solution was somewhere in the middle of separation versus integration. IPPF is a Federation of MAs and the concept of separation for any groups is not consistent with a Federation.

With regard to the cost of the GA, the DG advised that he had explained to some participants that the current model is cheaper than the previous model of six Regional Councils and two Governing Councils each year. IPPF also covered all participants' full costs, but this should be reconsidered for the next GA. For instance, some MAs would be able to cover their own costs. This year one-third of the budget had been funded by the Chinese. Whilst it would not be appropriate for some MAs to fund the participation of other MAs, the Secretariat could ask for non-earmarked contributions from those MAs who could afford it. For the next GA there would be more transparency over its costs.

On the basis of the small group discussions, Trustees then identified themes that would be key for its future workplan and highlighted issues for possible consideration under each:

- **The shape, agenda and approach for the Next GA**
  - Location – rationale, visa considerations, costs - signal clearly where the money is coming from
  - Enhance GA preparation – how do we help get delegates ready? Have a clear statement of expectation of participants. Consider short videos for sessions, rather than papers
  - More meaningful participation opportunities for youth
  - Less heavy agenda and more inclusive:
    - More creative meeting-methodology, a more culturally sensitive programme, with attention also to disability access
    - Facilitation attentive to who speaks, for example, in terms of gender and age
    - Bring the local community into the GA programme
    - Options for voting online
    - Fewer plenary sessions
    - More MA-designed more diverse panels and presentations
    - More interactive break-out sessions, with more time for dialogue
    - More time for questions
    - More focus on finances
    - Build in more celebration for the Awards
    - Allow time for clinic visits and perhaps down time too
- **Youth**
  - Enhance youth indicators in the Strategy results framework
  - Focus on monitoring implementing the 5% in the budget for youth – release the power without compromising accountability, audit or risk management
  - Improve information flows, listening and dialogue between the Secretariat/Board, and MAs.
  - Strengthen Regional Youth Networks

- Better induction to IPPF for youth – perhaps a short video and perhaps using the Regional Youth Forum also.
- Focus on youth staffing at the Secretariat
- **Anti-Racism**
  - Introduce More pluralism into the conversation (beyond the USA context)
  - Consider the dedicated financial and human resources available i.e. focal point in the Secretariat
  - Focus on work plan, on communications and on monitoring to help drive implementation across the Federation
- Do we need a Standing Committee?
- **Strategy Implementation**
  - The new Strategy is a big departure and phased implementation is important: we need a roadmap/business case to guide that
  - Clarify the role of the Board in Strategy implementation: we could develop a strategy to engage Executive Directors and Presidents. We could focus on youth and dedicated indicators of progress. We could focus on Fundraising
  - Reaching beyond the Federation in implementation is key. Strategic alliances with external organisations are needed. Perhaps Trustees could focus on other Boards to help bring things together? Youth could be encouraged to join other youth led organisations.
  - Consider introduction of strategy tracker
- **Principles and Values – relates to the Charter and Branding projects**
  - These projects offer the possibility of articulating IPPF’s purpose as a more inclusive, expansive agenda that brings together women, girls and LGBTQI. It can be a balancing exercise, and a commitment to more clearly reaching all, as one part of de-colonising IPPF. We should aim to clarify our language/terminology too.
  - This work is also about drawing stronger connections, and flows, from the levels of IPPF core principles to its implementation of the Strategy and on to adoption of tactics relevant to specific contexts. We should aim for drawing out practical links between core values/principles and operations, while encouraging also innovation/experimentation with new ways of acting.
  - The process for Federation wide engagement with and implementation of these projects and their interconnections should be made explicit.
  - The Board should also be clear about its own “red lines” in this context – the minimum of what must be included, for example.
- **Communication and MA Engagement**
  - We could help clarify and communicate IPPF’s structure and the roles and relationships between levels/components including Regional Forums as well as MA links with Regional Offices
  - We should also clearly convey and demoinstraet our concern with and commitment to the federation’s sustainability and global solidarity
  - We must clearly communicate to MAs our support and expectations for youth inclusion
  - We must champion, across IPPF, the anti-racism agenda, Federation-wide Strategy implementation as well as MA engagement with the Charter and Brand projects
  - In all communications with MAs, we need to be sensitive to language/diversity

It was **agreed** that based on the discussion of learnings from the GA, the Secretariat would prepare an Issues Paper, for consideration at the next Board meeting, that would also inform the Board's Work Plan for 2023.

### **Resolution to the GA from the Youth Forum**

The Board discussed the Youth Forum's resolution to the GA.

It was **agreed** that the Board would respond by sending out a clear message on where it stands on youth, in order to maintain momentum.

A draft resolution from the Board would be considered later in the meeting.

### **3. THE BOARD'S 2023 PRIORITIES, WORKPLAN AND GOVERNANCE CALENDAR**

The Board had received its Work Plan 2022/Report Card November 2022 and the Governance Calendar proposed for 2023, under paper no. BoT/11.22/DOC/3. These documents had been considered in the context of the de-brief on the GA and priorities for 2023, and they were **noted**.

### **4. POLICY AMENDMENTS AND APPOINTMENT OF THE BoT VICE CHAIR**

(All staff left the meeting for this agenda item, with the exception of the DG and the Director, Governance & Accreditation.)

#### **4.1 Approval of the already revised and reviewed policies 1.4 – ToRs of Chair and Treasurer of the Board of Trustees**

The Board had received the revised Policy 1.4: Terms of Reference of the Chair and Vice Chair of the IPPF Board of Trustees, under paper no. BoT/11.22/DOC/4.1. This item was presented by the Director, Governance & Accreditation.

The Board was advised that following the approval of the amendments to the IPPF Regulations and Procedural Byelaws by the GA on 23 November, the Board was now required to approve subsequent amendments to the above-mentioned policy. It was noted that the proposed amendments had been thoroughly discussed and reviewed by the Board at its meeting in June 2022, prior to the GA approval of the relevant Regulations and Byelaws.

The Board **approved** the revised Policy 1.4: Terms of Reference of the Chair and Vice Chair of the IPPF Board of Trustees.

#### **4.2 Approval of the already revised and reviewed policies 1.9 – ToRs Finance, Audit and Risk Committee**

The Board had received the revised Policy 1.9: Terms of Reference of the Finance, Audit and Risk Committee, under paper no. BoT/11.22/DOC/4.2. This item was presented by the Director, Governance & Accreditation.

The Board was advised that following the approval of the amendments to the IPPF Regulations and Procedural Byelaws by the GA on 23 November, the Board was now required to approve the subsequent amendments to the above-mentioned policy. It was noted that the proposed amendments had been thoroughly discussed and reviewed by the Board at its meeting in June 2022, prior to the GA approval of the relevant Regulations and Byelaws.

The Board **approved** the revised Policy 1.9: Terms of Reference of the Finance, Audit and Risk Committee.

#### 4.3 **Process for appointment of the BoT Vice Chair (taken on second day)**

The Board discussed the process for the appointment of the new Vice Chair of the Board of Trustees. It was **noted** that the procedure and timeline for the appointment of the Chair and Vice Chair was set out in the IPPF Procedural Byelaws, which were read out by the Director, Governance & Accreditation. The procedure would be led by the Chair of the NGC. It was clarified that Board members would be invited to submit nominations or self-nominations. All nominees must have agreed to their nomination. The NGC would then review all nominations in terms of skill set and duration of term of office together with other requirements set in policy 1.4. All valid nominations would be submitted to the Board for election. Board members would also take account of the importance of staggering the terms of the Chair and Vice Chair, to ensure continuity.

During discussion, some Board members were concerned that the priority should be to appoint the best candidate and that the length of their term of office should not be a barrier to their appointment. It was noted that it was not within the power of the Board to extend a Trustee's terms of office, as this responsibility rests with the GA in accordance to IPPF Regulations. Nevertheless, the NGC would keep this issue in mind when reviewing nominations.

#### 4.4 **Re-appointment of the Honorary Legal Counsel**

The Board had received a paper detailing the re-appointment of the IPPF Honorary Legal Counsel, under paper no. BoT/11.22/DOC/4.4, including the CV of the current Legal Counsel This item was presented by the Director, Governance & Accreditation.

A Board member commented that this document had not been translated correctly into Arabic and this was **noted** by the Secretariat.

It was noted that the current Honorary Legal Counsel, Ms Aileen McColgan KC would complete her first term of office on 3 December 2022. Under the Terms of Reference of the Honorary Legal Counsel, it is the responsibility of the NGC to launch a call for nominations at least three months before the expiry of the current Legal Counsel's terms of office. However, due to the heavy workload and responsibilities of the NGC, it had not been possible to begin this process in time. In order to ensure that there was no gap in service of a Legal Counsel, in consultation with the Chair of the NGC it was agreed to ask if the current Legal Counsel would consent to serve for a second and final term. Upon securing the consent of the current Honorary Legal Counsel to stand for a second term, the Board was required to consider this re-appointment.

*The Board **re-appointed** Ms Aileen McColgan KC for a second and final term of office, as IPPF Honorary Legal Counsel, ending on 2 December 2025.*

### **EXTRAORDINARY CLOSED SESSION – separate Confidential Minute**



5. **POSSIBILITIES FOR ROTATIONS OF OTHER TRUSTEE RESPONSIBILITIES: BOARD OFFICERS, COMMITTEE CHAIRS AND COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP**

The Board **noted** that each of the standing Board Committee Chairs had been requested to complete their Committees' performance reviews and put forward rotation plans of Committee members if not yet done. CFAR and the MC had indicated their plans for rotating their members. CSIP and RATC were still working on their Committees' performance reviews and rotation plans. In addition, CFAR had approached the NGC regarding the recruitment of four new members to reach its full strength of seven, which would also assist with the succession planning for the Chair. The NGC would be following up with the Chairs of CSIP and RATC, in order that an appropriate recruitment plan can be put in place. The Chair of RATC advised that there were currently two vacancies on this Committee. The Chair of the NGC advised that it was expected that the NGC would receive performance review reports from each of the Committees shortly and these would then be discussed with the Committee Chairs and with the Board Chair. From this information a skills gap assessment would be made in respect of each Committee and recruitment for vacant positions would then begin in January 2023, with CFAR vacancies being a priority.

It was noted that terms of office for Board members, Committee Chairs and Committee members were for a maximum of two terms of up to three years. However, prior service was also taken into account, which meant that not everyone was able to complete the full two terms with the current Board. It was pointed out by a Committee Chair that it does take time for committee members to become familiar with their role and to develop strong collaboration amongst each other. A Board member emphasised the need for business continuity, as well as recognising the constraints of terms of office and limitations due to prior service.

*It was **agreed** that a proposal for decision-making about Trustees' rotation on Committees would be discussed and decided at the Board's first meeting in 2023.*

**YOUTH RESOLUTION**

The Board considered a draft Board response to Youth Forum's resolution to the GA. Trustees provided robust input into the draft resolution provided.

*It was **agreed** that the Secretariat would make the changes put forward and circulate a new draft of the resolution. Subject to these amendments being made, the Board **approved** its response to Youth Forum's resolution to the GA and asked that it be circulated ASAP to all Member Associations.*

The final version was agreed electronically immediately after the close of the meeting, as follows:

*The Board of Trustees, affirming its commitment to youth-centred implementation of the newly approved "Come Together" Strategy 2028 that is also accountable to youth, emphasising that the principles of meaningful youth participation and intergenerational collaboration will guide implementation of the Strategy throughout, and determined that the IPPF Secretariat's plans and budgets are fully aligned with IPPF's youth-centred promises, requests the Secretariat to:*

- *Allocate basic core funding against specific business cases, as part of the re-aligned 2023-25 budget to be presented in Quarter 2, 2023, in order to enable the coordination and work of six regional youth networks.*
- *Ensure MA's involve youth in the design of their MA business cases*

- Take concrete steps to advance inclusion of marginalized young people in all measures under the Strategy directed to enhancing the participation of youth and youth-led accountability across IPPF and our accountability to them.
- Ensure active, diverse, youth engagement in the Federation-wide development of the IPPF Charter, in the Identity and Brand process and in efforts to widen action on our promise to an actively, deliberately anti racist IPPF.
- Incorporate youth involvement in IPPF digital communications and educational strategies including in comprehensive sexuality education.
- Utilise regional youth networks and platforms, and the Youth Consortia, to engage in learning programmes both across those regional networks and across Member Associations.
- Explore, propose, and develop mentorship opportunities to enable intergenerational growth.
- Develop tools and learning opportunities and promote sharing of best practices also from outside IPPF, to enhance the participation of youth in governance spaces.
- Establish transparent and measurable milestones and fully utilise the indicators in the results framework to monitor and evaluate progress against IPPF's youth-centred commitments under the "Come Together" Strategy 2028.

*The Board further reminds the Secretariat, and MAs in each country, that there must be safe spaces for all youth, where their participation is embraced and encouraged with safeguarding measures, training and development opportunities put in place to guarantee this.*

## 6. FEDERATION CHARTER AND GLOBAL REBRAND DISCUSSION

This was discussed in the context of agenda item 2: General Assembly de-brief.

## 7. MEMBERSHIP COMMITTEE REPORT

The Board had received the Report from the Membership Committee (MC), as detailed in paper no. BoT/11.22/DOC/7. This item was presented by Donya Nasser, Chair of the MC.

### **Suspensions and Expulsions**

*It was **noted** that on 3 November 2022 the Board had approved electronically the following decisions relating to suspension and expulsion of Member Associations.*

*As recommended by the Membership Committee, the Board of Trustees **approved** that the suspension of the Association Djiboutienne pour l'Equilibre et la Promotion de la Famille (MA of Djibouti) be continued.*

*As recommended by the Membership Committee, the Board of Trustees **approved** that Seimos Planavimo ir Seksualines Sveikatos Asociacija (the MA of Lithuania) be suspended from IPPF membership, due to a failure to meet the accreditation requirements.*

*As recommended by the Membership Committee, the Board of Trustees **approved** that the process to expel the Association Sénégalaise pour le Bien Être Familial (Senegal) from IPPF be completed.*

*As recommended by the Membership Committee, the Board of Trustees **approved** commencement of the process to expel Family Health Options Kenya from IPPF.*

As recommended by the Membership Committee, the Board of Trustees **approved** commencement of the process to expel the Family Planning Association of Bangladesh from IPPF.

### **Accreditation Review Outcomes**

The Board **noted** that the MC had reviewed the outcomes of the following two MAs that underwent an accreditation review:

- *Kiribati - Kiribati Family Health Association*
- *Vietnam – Vietnam Family Planning Association*

Noting that there were Standards with which the aforementioned Member Associations do not yet comply, and that these Associations were taking steps to remedy this, the MAs of Kiribati and Vietnam could not currently be re-accredited and would remain accredited members of IPPF, under accreditation Phase 2, with no change to their membership status.

### **Accreditation Review Follow-Up**

The Board **noted** that the MC had reviewed the progress reports of the following 20 MAs that underwent an accreditation review under the third accreditation phase:

- *Cameroon - Cameroon National Association for Family Welfare*
- *Tanzania - Uzazi na Malezi Bora Tanzania*
- *Sierra Leone- Planned Parenthood Association of Sierra Leone*
- *Mozambique - Associação Moçambicana para Desenvolvimento da Família*
- *Mali - Association Malienne pour la Protection et la Promotion de la Famille*
- *Chad – Association Tchadienne pour le Bien-Etre Familial*
- *Guinea-Bissau – Associação Guineense para o Bem Estar Familiar*
- *Niger – Association Tchadienne pour le Bien-Etre Familial*
- *Democratic Republic of Congo – Association pour le Bien-Etre Familial/Naissances Désirables*
- *Namibia – Namibia Planned Parenthood Association*
- *Indonesia - Indonesian Planned Parenthood Association*
- *Republic of Korea - Korea Population, Health and Welfare Association*
- *China – China Family Planning Association*
- *Samoa – Samoa Family Health Association*
- *Vanuatu – Vanuatu Family Health Association*
- *Belgium – Belgische Federatie voor Seksuele en Reproductieve Gezondheid en Rechten / Fédération Belge pour la Santé et les Droits Sexuels et Reproductifs*
- *Romania – Societatea de Educatie Contraceptiva si Sexuala*
- *Slovak Republic – Spoločnosť pre plánované rodičovstvo*
- *Israel – Israel Family Planning Association*
- *Nepal - Family Planning Association of Nepal*

Noting that there were Standards with which the aforementioned Member Associations do not yet comply and that they are taking steps to remedy this, they cannot currently be re-accredited. The respective Regional Offices should continue monitoring the

implementation of the follow-up action plans within the period agreed. During that period, the Member Associations of Cameroon, Tanzania, Sierra Leone, Mozambique, Mali, Chad, Guinea-Bissau, Niger, Democratic Republic of Congo, Namibia, Indonesia, Republic of Korea; China, Samoa, Vanuatu, Belgium, Romania, Slovak Republic, Israel and Nepal will remain accredited members of IPPF, under accreditation Phase 2, with no change to their membership status.

### **Update on the Caribbean Family Planning Affiliation Members' journey to Associate Membership**

The Board **noted** that just one of the five members of the Affiliation that embarked on the journey to become Associate Members of IPPF following the separation of the Western Hemisphere Region from IPPF had yet to submit its application. Its associate membership would be deferred until the Region is able to work with the organisation in preparation for its application in the future.

### **Update on the Accreditation Pilot**

The Board **noted** that the Secretariat governance and accreditation staff had carried out a pilot of the revised accreditation tools with the Thailand MA.

### **Recommendations for Re-accreditation**

As recommended by the Membership Committee, the Board of Trustees **approved** that the following MAs be re-accredited as Full Members of the Federation:

- *Planned Parenthood Association of Zambia*
- *Association Comoriene pour le Bien-Etre de la Famille (Comoros)*
- *Egyptian Family Planning Association*
- *Association Algérienne pour la Planification Familiale (Algeria)*
- *Somaliland Family Health Association*
- *Serbian Association for Sexual and Reproductive Rights*
- *Family Planning Association of Hong Kong*
- *Cook Islands Family Welfare Association*
- *Afghan Family Guidance Association*

### **Applications for Associate Membership**

As recommended by the Membership Committee, the Board of Trustees **approved** that the following organisations be granted Associate Membership of IPPF:

- *La Maternite Consciente Association Guadeloupéenne pour le Planning Familial (Guadeloupe)*
- *Colectivo Rebeldía (Bolivia)*
- *Mauritius Family Planning & Welfare Association*

The Director, Governance & Accreditation will send the Board, for its information, the Fourth Phase Accreditation Procedure.

### **Confirmation of Associate Membership**

As recommended by the Membership Committee, the Board of Trustees **approved** the renewal of the Associate Membership of the following Member Associations for the year 2022-2023:

- *Yemeni Association for Reproductive Health (Yemen)*
- *Antigua Planned Parenthood Association*
- *Dominica Planned Parenthood Association*

- *Foundation for the Promotion of Responsible Parenthood (Aruba)*
- *Family Planning Alliance Australia*
- *Papua New Guinea Family Health Association*

As recommended by the Membership Committee, the Board of Trustees **approved** that the Associate Membership of the Member Association of Iraq should not be renewed for the year 2022-2023.

The Chair of the MC assured the Board that Regional Offices continued to look for new organisations to work with, in countries where there was no longer a Member Association.

## **8. RESOURCE ALLOCATION COMMITTEE 2022 REPORT**

The Board had received the Resource Allocation Technical Committee (RATC) Report, as detailed in paper no. BoT/11.22/DOC/8. It was noted that Riva Eskinazi, Director, Strategic Partnership and Development was joining the meeting virtually for this agenda item.

Isaac Adewole, Chair of RATC, presented this report, which included reflections on the implementation of the Resource Allocation model for Streams 1, 2 and 3 in 2022. It was noted that the Committee had met three times during the year to review the resource allocation model, including the portfolio analysis for each of the three streams. The Committee Chair commented that this is an objective scheme, and it was starting to see a data-driven approach on how core funds are allocated to MAs, which had not been so transparent in the past.

With regard to Stream 1, the Committee had made some recommendations which included enhanced support from the Secretariat to MAs who will lose unrestricted core funding under the new model, and also capacity building for MAs to strengthen proposal development and business plan alignment with the Strategy 2028, as well as strengthening governance.

In reviewing Stream 2, the Committee requested greater communication on where Stream 2 is working well and recommended that more awareness be created and information shared with MAs on how to access the different funding sources. The Committee also recommended higher funding allocations for the Consortium Channel. Another recommendation was the institution of a catalytic fund focusing on building sustainable business models, including social enterprise to diversify MA income generation.

Regarding Stream 3, the Committee recommended careful analysis on how this stream links to the larger humanitarian and development portfolios, in recognition of its catalytic role in unlocking greater funding sources.

The Board was told that RATC was concerned about the quality of the proposals coming from the MAs, particularly from Francophone African countries and from the Americas and Caribbean, which could reflect capacity issues in these MAs. It was recommended that MAs have more time for the development of their business plans and that Regional Offices have oversight of the early plans.

With regard to RATC's role in 2023 and onwards, the Committee recognised that given IPPF's new focus of moving into a three-year funding cycle, there would be a limited role for RATC to have in oversight of the Resource Allocation model. RATC was

therefore recommending that it meet less frequently than in the past, probably once a year to review progress on implementation.

During discussion a concern was raised regarding the influence of donors and their values and how much this affects funding and the work of MAs. The DG responded that at the GA in 2019 there was a discussion around not leaving anybody behind. There was an issue that high income countries should not automatically move from being grant receivers. The Secretariat had invited donors to go to high income countries who are grant receivers, but there was not enough of donors who were able to support high income countries.

A Board member pointed out that the discussion of the IPPF Charter and values should include the recognition that for many MAs and their relationship with donors, the issue was that of de-colonialism.

In answer to a question about building the sustainability of MAs, the DG responded that there was a recognition in the Secretariat that it does not have the capacity to support this. However, going forward funding would be put for this to be done. The Secretariat was still considering the best way to do this and had hired a consultant who would review its capacity in this area. Some MAs had asked for a loan to help drive their sustainability. So far the Secretariat had advised that this would not be possible, but there would be a consideration going forward if this could be done in some way in the future.

*The Board **noted** the Report from RATC.*

## **9. SAFEGUARDING AND INCIDENT MANAGEMENT**

The Board had received the Safeguarding and Incident Management Report, as detailed in paper no. [BoT/11.22/DOC/9](#). This item was presented by Vanessa Stanislas, Head of Safeguarding.

The Chair welcomed the Head of Safeguarding to the meeting and thanked her for her leadership and achievements in progressing safeguarding within the Federation.

The Board was advised that in summary safeguarding and incident management issues were moving forward as they should and responses had also improved.

It was noted that there had been no incidents reported during the GA and everyone had been supported in the right way.

In terms of incident management, the cumulative number of all reported concerns received since IPPF SafeReport went live in December 2018 to the end of quarter three 2022 now stands at 270. Of these, 83% had been closed and 17% remain open. The total number of backlog cases closed in 2022 was increased to 28 and the number of open backlog concerns was now down to seven. In quarter three, 22 reported concerns were closed and 22 new concerns were reported. Of these, 72% relate to Employment and Workplace Matters, 18% to Equality, Diversity and Inclusion and 9% to Financial Wrongdoing.

The Report detailed the safeguarding training delivered in quarter three, which included Global Safeguarding Induction for new Secretariat staff and a Safeguarding Refresher course for Trustees. The Head of Safeguarding confirmed that all Trustees had now completed this course. Safeguarding Refresher training had also been launched for a

Secretariat staff and this should be completed by the end of December 2022. Safeguarding training was continuing to be delivered to MAs.

During discussion, a Board member asked how safe is SafeReport, and commented that the success of a reporting system can be measured by an increased number of complaints rather than a reduction in the number of complaints. She queried whether IPPF does have a real speak-up culture, noting that fear of victimisation silences people's voices. In response the Head of Safeguarding advised that the SafeReport system is deeply encrypted and is one of the global leaders in the field. However, silence was a concern and the aim was to see these numbers going up from people accessing services from MAs, as this would ensure that the system was reaching the right people. Having said that, it was the responsibility of MAs to take forward any complaints. Another measure in success was to look at the length of time taken to resolve issues and the outcomes. There had been a reduction in malicious and vexatious incidents which was positive.

A Trustee commented that it would be helpful to know the consequences of some incidents, at the MA and Secretariat level. The DG responded that some of the decisions taken by the MC are in fact the outcome of some of these cases, particularly around MA fraud and financial mis-management. The Head of Safeguarding added that there are many consequences which can never be shared and must remain confidential. For instance, policies and procedures will often determine actions taken. However, it was possible to report that actions have been taken, in ways which do not breach confidentiality.

In response to a question about liaising with other organisations over safeguarding, the Head of Safeguarding advised that this did happen and that IPPF also has the oversight of donors. The Federation is responsible to ensure that it is compliant with donors' requirements.

A Board member asked whether the Secretariat communicates results within the Federation and to MAs, to show what has been done and to de-incentivise these actions. The Board was advised that high level trends are shared during safeguarding training, and the Safeguarding Focal Points have some awareness of this information. Summary information is also included in the Annual Reports. Next year it was intended to build safeguarding communities and practice across MAs and regions to increase capacity.

The Board **noted** the Safeguarding and Incident Management Report.

## **10. ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

The Chair reminded Trustees to submit their Evaluation Forms, if they had not already done so.

### **Close of meeting**

In closing the meeting, the Chair thanked Trustees for their participation and discussions at this meeting. On behalf of the Board, the Chair thanked the Honorary Legal Counsel, the DG and the DLT for all their support to the Board. Sharon Tagoe in particular was thanked for her expert input into Board's operations, meetings and logistics. The hotel staff, interpreters, technical, IT support and support staff were also thanked for enabling this meeting to come together so well. In turn the Chair was thanked for leading the Board.