

This meeting was held in Swedish. The protocol, however, is written originally in English. This meeting was held via Zoom.



Protocol for the Board Meeting of the Uppsala Association of Foreign Affairs 2020-05-10

1. Opening of the meeting

Present: Johan Bergman, Per Risberg, Miriam Lind, Rebecka Bjuremalm, Alicia Nathanson Thulin, Rebecca Rieschel, Isak Lefvert, Elliott Syrén, Melker Hörner, Karin Kristensson, Clara Alm, Rebecca Bengtsson, Embla Holmgren, Gizem Tütüncü, Sara Ölander, Joakim Ydebäck.

Absent: Ebba Berg Gorgén, Sofia Hjerpe

Authorised signatories: Johan Bergman, Embla Holmgren, Clara Alm.

The meeting starts at 15.08.

2. Election of meeting secretary (1) and adjusters (2)

The board decides to elect Ölander as meeting secretary and Alm and Bjuremalm as adjusters at 15.09.

3. Verifying the validity of the meeting announcement

The board decides to verify the meeting announcement at 15.10.

4. Follow-up of last meeting's protocol

A discussion on climate compensation was started, which can also be continued at the board meeting in June. Regarding the annual meeting was VotelT and Zoom suggestions as technical systems for the meeting. However, now only Zoom will be used, since UPF Lund has decided to withdraw from buying VotelT and therefore to split the cost with UF Uppsala. The budget surplus and what we want to do with it was also discussed. A motion has been written for this meeting regarding what to do with the surplus.

5. **Approving the agenda after addition of miscellaneous matters**

Ölander adds a matter regarding a new membership registry and one regarding the archive. Bergman adds one regarding the annual report.

The board decides to approve the agenda at 15.12.

6. **Reports from the board-members**

President and Vice-President:

Bergman has worked a lot with the operational plan. Also with the annual meeting and the meeting procedures, which there is a good plan for. A meeting secretary needs to be found. Rieschel suggests Ulrika Lundin Glans. The plan is that the whole meeting presidium will be at Office.

Holmgren has been working with the recruitment plan and policies for this meeting. Also with presidium work regarding handovers, the operational plan, etc.

Treasurer:

Has book-kept and counted on how much we will have as a surplus after all depreciations. Has worked with the proposed budget for the next fiscal year, the digitalization strategy, the treasurer checklist (lathund) and looked at the situation for grants for the next board.

Member-Secretary:

The current number of members is 1022. Has been working with the archive with Rieschel and the member appreciation plan. Has not counted on the part under 26 years since she could not export the registry from Coachhippo, but since it has been stable during the last months it should not have changed that much.

Activity Coordinators:

Risberg informs that the group has had another quarantine quiz, which trustee Adrian and Risberg held, and the quiz went well. A music quiz will be held as well. Risberg and Lind have noticed a slightly declining attendance at the meetings. Bergman rewards the group for keeping the good work up.

Head of the Debate-Club:

-

Head of Career:

The group has had the last Academy event during the week. Tütüncü is working with the operational plan. She has also attended a meeting that was put together by SAIA president Sakke, with the career group in Lund and the organization GDI and an organization in Finland, on how to develop the work in the career group. The meeting was very valuable, GDI is situated in Geneva and has contacts in the United Nations. The new Heads of Careers will be invited for the next meeting.

Head of Lectures:

Syrén and Lefvert are trying to keep the work up as much as possible. Has been in contact with the lecture group in Lund. Few people come to the meetings and there are few responses in emails. However, they are planning for a few lectures: two with the Korean ambassador, and one with Dag Blanck. Has tried sending emails to foreign correspondents but there have been few answers. The group is preparing for a scenario where the restrictions due to corona continues.

Head of PR:

Bjuremalm says it has been a bit calmer period. Has posted about the election committee's extra calls for Head of PR and Head of Debate on social media, some more lecture recordings on Youtube and a few more will be uploaded. Has re-written almost the whole checklist document. Nathanson Thulin has posted about the second quarantine quiz. Some members who ordered UF-sweaters have still not gotten theirs after another reminder, and Nathanson Thulin asks if we can sell those sweaters. Bergman thinks that is okay.

Editors-in-Chief:

The work is going well, the magazine will go to print tonight which is very exciting. Bengtsson and Kristensson will write on their checklist. The work in the group is not as affected by the corona restrictions as other groups, apart from the social part.

Web-Editor:

The work is going well. Soon the number of articles from this year will exceed last year's number.

Head of Travel:

-

UFS-Representative:

Focus has been on the SAIA annual meeting and the operational plan. Rieschel is planning for the handover weekend for the old and new UFS board. She reminds the board to send in meeting statistics. Fredrika Andersson from UF Uppsala has been nominated as LSU:s representative for the COP26 meeting. Also, Michelle Pencarski, who has been engaged in UF Uppsala, has been nominated by LSU as their EU-representative. SAIA has been in contact with LSU regarding the MUCF-grant and different scenarios, but it seems like they will meet the youth organizations' requirements.

Radio Coordinator:

Has been a bit behind in the work, but it seems like the group will be done with their work in the beginning of June. Has recorded a few episodes.

7. Economic Outlook

Alm informs that the surplus is currently at 72 000 SEK. After all depreciations and all costs that were able to be paid off, and after the last Uttryck Magazine has been paid off, the surplus will be around 40 000 SEK. It has to be decided how much of the surplus to invest and how much to leave for the next board. A motion has been put forward to this meeting with a suggestion on an amount. Alm says that it is not good to leave too much for the next board since they will have more grant money and more in the budget post Föreningsutveckling.

8. UFS

Rieschel informs that the proposed budget by UFS is good and that there is nothing specific that UF Uppsala needs to push extra for. A suggestion has been put forward to collaborate with the organisation OSCE (Organisation for security and co-operation in Europe). It is not an official lobby organisation but a civil society organisation. They have suggested the collaboration. Bergman thinks it is worth it to problematize the collaboration since UF is a non-partial organisation. Rieschel says that it is mostly about spreading OSCE: s work about security in Europe and not explicitly spread their opinions on issues.

9. Vision Committees

Digitalisation: The group has written a strategy that is almost done, Alm will share it with the board so they can give feedback. There is now a part about how every specific group can work with digitalisation, but if the board thinks it is

unnecessary Alm can delete it. The group has not had a meeting, just worked with the strategy.

Member appreciation: The group has worked with the strategy as well.

Diversification: Holmgren, Risberg and Berg Gorgén have written a diverse recruitment plan. They have also written suggestions for every specific group, but are open for feedback.

Diverse recruitment plan: see attachment A.

10. UF Operations during the Coronavirus

Bergman asks if anyone wants to follow up on this issue. Rieschel thinks the quarantine quiz by the Activity Group was great. Bjuremalm asks if we want to have an inauguration of the songbook, maybe with the trustees and active members outside. Holmgren thinks it is a good idea. Ölander thinks there might be too many people from a corona perspective.

Lind brings up that we should have an event for giving thanks to the trustees. Bengtsson thinks that it would be more fun to have it everybody together but due to the situation and the big amount of people, it might be better to have a avtackning just within the groups. Bergman agrees with Bengtsson that the amount of people might be too high even if it is under 50 people, but we can see how the situation develops. Lind suggests that Alm can look up how much money each group can get for such an event. Lind asks if trustees get diplomas, Bergman responds that they got recommendation letters and Holmgren says that the Heads of wrote something nice for them on a paper plate at the trustee event last year. Rischel says that it has never been more than 20 people at such events. Bergman thinks that it still is hard to predict and plan the event. Rieschel suggests having it on Zoom if too many people show interest. Tütüncü suggests sending out an interest sign-up.

The board in general agrees to do the event in each separate group. Holmgren thinks that a dinner or such every group for themselves would be a good idea. She and Ölander will plan it. Bergman reminds the groups to send in the document with different scenarios due to the corona development for the fall to him.

11. Motion: Updated environmental policy

Background: see attachment B, C, D and E.

Risberg and Nathanson Thulin both present their suggestions on an updated environmental policy. Risberg explains the vegetarian norm in his suggestion, that at co-arrangements where UF buys/orders the food, it should be vegetarian. When UF is co-arranger but does not buy/order the food, UF should strive to have a vegetarian alternative, but this is not mandatory. Lefvert points out that with that interpretation it goes along with what Nathanson Thulin says in her suggestion. Risberg says that when we first started this discussion, we only wanted a vegetarian norm.

Lefvert starts a discussion on what is to be seen as “directed by UF” (“i egen regi”) respectively “arranges events, gasques, meetings or similar in collaboration with other parts” (“arrangerar möten, gasquer, evenemang eller liknande i samarbete med andra parter”) in Nathanson Thulin’s suggestion. It is easier with gasques, but for example with the event arranged together with the Chilean embassy, where the embassy ordered the food (which was not vegetarian), it is more complicated. At that event, even though the Chilean embassy was invited for the event, it was not a collaboration per se. Also with more informal collaborations, the other part may want meat at the event. Lefvert thinks that with Risberg’s suggestion, that problem does not occur. Nathanson Thulin does not understand why the event with the Chilean embassy can not be seen as a “collaboration with another part”. Otherwise, we could add “invited outsiders” (“utomstående inbjudna”) to “collaboration with another part”, where we strive to have only vegetarian food.

Lefvert suggests changing “directed by UF” (“i egen regi”) to “when UF *buys/orders* the food” in Nathanson Thulin’s suggested policy. At the Chilean event for example, it was not UF that ordered the food. Lind agrees with Lefvert on that description.

Bergman summarizes the discussion that the board in general favors the description “when UF respectively another part *buys or orders*” instead of “when UF arranges an event *on their own or in collaboration with another part*”. In other words: if UF buys/orders the food, it must be vegetarian. If another part buys/orders the food for the event, it is not mandatory to be vegetarian but UF should strive to have vegetarian food.

Rieschel asks if policies can be revised with a board decision, and Bergman says yes.

Lind brings up in the suggested policy regarding single use plastics. She does not think that UF lives up to the part in Nathanson Thulin's suggested policy that "the association should strive to use single use plastics as little as possible", since UF for example uses single use plastics at our own events in Office etc. Nathanson Thulin and Risberg do not agree: it should be an ambitious policy, but it does not have to be super strict, but more something to strive for. Nathanson Thulin suggests that instead of having plastic glasses, which were used at the AW a few weeks ago, non-plastic glasses can be bought. Syrén and Lefvert agree with Lind. Lefvert agrees with Nathanson Thulin to buy "real" glasses instead of plastic ones.

The board votes on whether to include the part from Nathanson Thulin's suggestion regarding single use plastics or not. Seven were for and five against, therefore the part will be included. Furthermore, Nathanson Thulin's suggestion on updated policy will be revised regarding vegetarian food: the demand to have vegetarian food or not will be decided whether UF or another part *buys/orders the food*, instead of whether UF *organizes the event themselves or together with another part*. The board will vote on the environmental policy at the next board meeting.

The board decides to adjourn the meeting from 16.11 to 16.21.

The meeting starts again at 16.21.

12. Motion: Mandate for large purchases

Background: see attachment F.

Alm presents the motion. The suggestion is to leave around 10 000 SEK from our surplus to the next board, and invest in different necessary things for the association for up to 30 000 SEK. Earlier years, the surplus has been put in the Project Financing Fund, however there is soon too much money in the fund. Currently 80 000 SEK is there now.

Lind thinks that if Bergman and Alm are going to buy something that is not on the

list it might be good to check with the rest of the board. Rieschel suggests that formally, Bergman and Alm get the mandate to decide what to buy, but they can write on Slack if they want to check with the board. Tütüncü thinks that it would be easier if Bergman and Alm get the mandate, than for them to check with the board every time they buy something, and they are well aware of what the board needs.

The board decides to approve the motion at 16.33.

13. Point of discussion: Who to vote for at the UFS electoral meeting?

Background: see attachment G.

Rieschel as UFS-representative and Bergman as delegate for UF Uppsala will be at the UFS electoral meeting. All the local associations, including UF Uppsala, each have one vote. The nominations for the UFS board positions will be gone through and the board can discuss who to vote for.

As UFS President, Bergman is nominated. Bergman suggests that UF Uppsala will vote for him. The board agrees.

As vice-president, Christopher Andersson is nominated, and Syrén is counter-candidate. Bergman suggests to vote for Syrén. Syrén presents why he would be suitable for the position. He says that he thinks it is fun to work with organisational issues, has experience from it and thinks it would be fun to work with these questions in UFS. He wants to make the UFS network more relevant for the local associations. The board agrees to vote for Syrén.

As treasurer, Rieschel is nominated, and Rafael Rodrigo Escalera is counter-candidate. Bergman suggests to vote for Rieschel. Rieschel says that she has experience as treasurer in another organisation, and thinks that the economy will be one of the most important issues for UFS next operational year, and that there is much potential. She also wants to work with making UFS more relevant for the local associations. The board agrees to vote for Rieschel.

As Head of Communications, Melinda Nilsson is nominated, and Ken Moge kwu is counter-candidate. Bergman suggests to vote for Melinda. Bergman says that she has been Web Editor in UF Uppsala a few years ago, and is very competent. He does not know that much about Ken. The board agrees to vote for Melinda.

As secretary, Diego Annys is nominated. Bergman suggests to vote for him, and says that Diego is very competent. The board agrees to vote for Diego.

As nomination committee, Miriam Steinwall is nominated. Bergman suggests to vote for her. Rieschel recommends to apply for the post which can be done at the annual meeting. The board agrees to vote for Miriam.

As ley auditor (lekmannarevisor), Jonatan Klefbom is nominated. Bergman suggests to vote for him, and says that he is a very competent person. The board agrees to vote for Jonatan.

14. Point of discussion: Anti-discrimination policy

Background: see attachment H.

Holmgren says that an anti-discrimination policy has been discussed for a long time. Regarding the term “discrimination”, she says that earlier discrimination for educational program was included in the policy, but this part has been removed. The suggestion now is to refer to the Equality Ombudsman’s (DO, Diskrimineringsombudsmannen) definition of discrimination. Nathanson Thulin thinks that sounds good.

There is also a suggestion to have a discrimination contact person, who can be announced on Facebook so members know who to contact. There can be different types of discrimination cases that you handle in different ways: either it is structural, then a plan should be put together on how to work with the problem. Or it is personal, where the person that discriminated should face consequences. Risberg suggests having two contact people, in the case that one of them is the one discriminating. Holmgren suggests to choose two people, one discrimination contact person and one sexual harassment contact person. In a situation like Risberg mentioned, one can go to the other contact person. Risberg thinks it is important with a clear plan.

Bjuremalm raises the question if the contact people should be in the presidium. It is suggested that UFS also could have a contact person as well, in a situation where for example the president in UF Uppsala is involved in a discrimination/sexual harassment case. Rieschel asks how Lund works with these issues. Holmgren responds that Lund has a anti-discrimination policy, and an crisis

group that is chosen in the beginning of the year. The case first goes via a contact person, and then to the crisis group.

Holmgren says that according to the bylaws, all punishments toward an individual must be decided and voted on in the board. Tütüncü asks if we have a procedure, and Holmgren responds that we do not have one right now but hopefully there will be one soon. There is support in the bylaws to exclude a member from the association. Lind rewards Holmgren for her work with the policies, and also thinks that two contact people is good. Lefvert thinks there should be a distinction between for example racist comments and for example to not choose a person for a position in the association because of their skin colour. Also to make a distinction between a single action and more structural cases.

A suggestion is put forward to have a workshop about these issues. Kristensson asks for the suggested policy to be shared so that the board can take part of it.

15. Point of discussion: Sexual harassment policy

Background: see attachment 1.

The sexual harassment policy has already been discussed in the previous point of discussion.

16. Point of discussion: Advisory board

Bergman says that the idea with an advisory board has been discussed before. It is supposed to be a group of people that has been very active in UF before and could work as a support for the board with organisational questions, especially regarding bigger changes or challenges, for example with the creation of UFMUN this operational year instead of continuing with UMUN. It would also be good for the fall of 2020 if the corona restrictions continue. Rieschel adds that it can be a lawyer as well, but Bergman believes more in previous active members in the association.

Bergman does not put forward a motion or policy, but asks the board to give him a mandate to write a suggested policy for the next board meeting, and to start looking for possible candidates for an advisory board. A motion regarding approving those candidates will also be put forward at the next board meeting. Lind asks if the board's purpose only is to give advice, and Bergman says yes and adds that no board members from one year can not sit in the advisory board for

the next operational year, at least one year must have passed from being a part of the UF board. The advisory board should only give advice when they are asked for it. It is usual in advisory boards in general that the people sit for more than one year, however Bergman says he will try to work out some sort of procedure so that the same advisory board members do not sit for too long.

The board gives Bergman the mandate to look for possible candidates, but others can give suggestions as well. Rieschel suggests Niklas Wahlgren.

17. Point of discussion: Kick-out

Norreda is the suggested location for the kick-out, which is owned by the Uppsala Student union. Bergman reminds everyone to say if they can come or not. The plan is to have it after the exam period, if the board wants that. The board agrees.

18. Point of discussions: Hand-over

Bergman wants to point out that the handover is something serious and should be planned well for. A few guidelines:

- Try to have the checklists done by the first of June.
- A soft deadline is to have the handover before the 14th of June, but if that is not possible, of course it can be done later.
- If possible, have the meeting in person.

The handovers have often been done quite late previous years, which is not good. Bergman and Holmgren will put together an outline for the handover, which are simply suggestions, next week or the week after that. A tip is to start with the checklists now. Rieschel recommends to create a document to write down things to bring up at the meeting now so that you remember them. There has been discussions to have a joint “handover day” with the whole current and new board, but Bergman recommends to plan for having the handover in each individual group.

19. Miscellaneous matters

18.1 New membership registry

Ölander has had two webinars with Michal Gieda and secretaries from a few other local associations about suggestions on a new membership registry instead of Coachhippo, eBas and Cardskipper. They both seem to be smooth systems and better options than Coachhippo, regarding customer service, features, and the number of bugs. eBas is made for youth organisations, so it is adopted for MUCF grant applications which is good. Cardskipper is a bit different from Coachhippo

and eBas since the membership card is digital that you have in an app. Communication is done through the app, where you can send out reminders to renew memberships but also information about upcoming events, and there is even a feature for selling tickets. Moreover, email lists can be downloaded from the system and therefore be used for sending out newsletters via MailChimp.

The main con with eBas according to Ölander is that the feature for online payment and membership registration is not included, it needs to be bought which is quite expensive. Also, the payment would then go first to UFS and then UFS would pay it back to the local associations. This is both costly and very ineffective, and it is very important that we can register new members smoothly online, especially if the corona restrictions continue during the fall. Regarding Cardskipper, Ölander is not sure what the members will think about having to download an app for the membership card, but think otherwise it sounds like a good alternative.

18.2 Archives

Ölander and Rieschel have worked on the archive. Regarding the digital archive, they have made a suggestion on a new Drive structure for the board and presidium. There will be one folder for the whole board, that will be updated each year instead of creating a new board folder for each new board. This structure has been inspired by UFS's structure, and generally is more organised than the current structure. Included in the board folder, there will be an archive folder. This one will be structured according to Allmänna arkivskemat. There will also be a separate presidium folder, also inspired by UFS. Apart from these, the groups will continue to have a private folder as usual, that they can structure however they want. If anyone wants to take a look at the structure, they can write to Ölander.

The plan is that every year, board members go through their Drive, and either save a document in their private folder for their successor, or move it to the archive folder, or delete it. Ölander and Rieschel will start to copy documents from the current Board 19/20-folder to the new board-folder, so that in the end of the operational year the old board folder can be deleted.

Regarding the physical archive, Ölander and Rieschel have received an email from the Carolina Rediviva archive with pictures and documents over exactly what is stored there. The presidium has discussed if we want to move stuff from Carolina

to keep in our storage room instead, since it is more accessible that way, or if we want to keep most of it at Carolina since it might be more safe there, and instead set up a long term plan to make digital copies so the documents are more accessible in that way. This is however something that has to be discussed further, probably also in the next board.

18.3 Annual report

Bergman reminds everyone that they have to send their part of the annual report to him on the 1st of June the latest.

20. Date for next meeting and Fika-responsibility

The date will be decided on Slack.

21. Ending of the Meeting

The meeting ends at 17.44.

Adjuster: Clara Alm

Date/place: 2020-06-26 Uppsala



Adjuster: Rebecka Bjuremalm

Date/place: 2020-06-25 Stockholm



Meeting secretary: Sara Ölander

Date/place: 2020-06-24/Uppsala

