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1. Welcome from President and Host

Present (31 August - 7 September)
Yvette Hardie (YH), Louis Valente (LV), Seok-hong Kim (SK), Ernie Nolan (EN), Cecilie Lundsholt (CL), Manon Van de Water (MV) (- 6 Sept), Roberto Frabetti (RF), Daniel H. Fernández (DF), Bebe de Soares (BS), Sue Giles (SG), Kaatje De Geest (KG), Tatiana Bobrova (TB), Stefan Fischer-Fels (SF), Kenjiro Otani (KO)

Present (2 - 7 September)
François Fogel (FF), Pamela Udoka (PU)

Non-EC-members that join the meeting later on:
• Hisashi Shimoyama, Mayako Kawasaki Morimoto, Katsunari Morita, Haruna Maemura, Yukari Hayashi, Akane Kataya, Nao Miyauchi (Japan)
• Jonathan Chapman (USA)
• Gonzalo Moreno (Spain), observer open EC-meeting
• Ewa Piotrowsla (Poland), observer open EC-meeting
• Dalija Acin Thelander (Serbia/Sweden), observer open EC-meeting
• Julia Heße (Germany), observer open EC-meeting
• Eulalia Ribera (Spain), observer open EC-meeting
• Dr. Rasheedat Aliu Liman (Nigeria), observer open EC-meeting
• Dr. Eunice Uwadinma-Idemudia (Nigeria), observer open EC-meeting
• Emilie Robert (France), observer open EC-meeting
• Yannick Boudeau (Belgium), fundraising working group member and observer open EC-meeting (YB)
• Hosts from Norway, Ketil Kolstad (KK) and Theis Irgens (TI)

1. Welcome from President and Host

YH welcomes the EC and thanks ASSITEJ Norway for hosting the Artistic Gathering and this EC meeting.
KK and TI welcomes the EC to Kristiansand. There will be around 600 international professionals in attendance (about 200 of them are the artists and workshop hosts). There will be a group of Nordic-Baltic young people participating in the festival; the EC will meet them during the final Artistic Encounter.

2. Apologies & Welcomes

FF, TB, SFF, KO and PU will be arriving later.
3. Proposal and Approval of Agenda

The EC reviews the agenda, day-by-day. Some items might be moved around, because of people arriving late or guests attending the EC meetings.

CL proposes to have a chat about translations during the EC meetings. There was a decision to allow KG’s notes to be available to all who would like to see them, as she takes the minutes. This allows people to read as well as listen.

RF would like to add some points, for example in relation to the Creative Europe application. He asks whether we are going forward with the network funding application now that we are not going forward with the project application. The problem is that these calls for application happen infrequently and not every year. The network application is easier from a procedural point of view, but it is also a lot of work.

Another point RF would like to add is how to help the weaker members, struggling to pay the membership fees.

YH says that this will be discussed in the policy working group.

RF also adds that some budget work needs to be discussed.

RF says that projects like the solidarity fund and the #takeachildtotheatre should have a stronger connection to the national centres.

YH suggests that we have the conversation about the Creative Europe application on Saturday.

There will be some livestreaming in cooperation with Howlround and Dialogue. Livestreaming of certain events during ASSITEJ gatherings could be discussed in connection to the webinars that TYA USA will present.

4. Review of EC Participation at AAG2019

The EC reviews the proposed schedule for the week.

MV reminds the EC that the ITYARN schedule is not included in the EC’s time schedule and asks some EC members to be present at ITYARN sessions.

5. Declare conflicts of interest

YH asks whether EC members have possible conflicts of interest to declare. LV says that the Creative Europe might have some potential conflicts of interest. Should a potential conflict of interest pop up later, the EC members can announce it before starting the discussion.

6. General Reports

6.1 President’s Report

YH has been very busy with the Cradle of Creativity. She presents a short report. (See Addendum A) She elaborates on the NOREC exchange project, a collaboration between several African national centres and Norway.

There is an exciting proposal for a World Congress in Cuba in 2023. YH asks the EC to have a look at the National Centre Handbook, and the questionnaire.
6.2. Secretary General’s Report

LV presents his report. (See Addendum B)

He reports on the performance submissions for the World Congress in Tokyo. YH says that there are some workshops and presentations that had applied for the performance programme. We should make sure that these get taken into account when putting together the professional programme, and not just disregard them because they are not performances.

The EC should review the submissions for the professional programme during this EC Meeting. YH suggests looking at it on Sunday at the end of the session. The EC members should review the proposals before that.

YH elaborates on the Next Generation programme in Japan. Mr. Shimoyama would like a non-verbal performance as a result of the Next Generation programme, while the Next Generation programme often has been a collection of workshops, seminars and sharing and connecting between the group - a mix between rehearsing and a delegate experience of the festival.

Action KG: add a question (checkbox) about choosing a performance track

MV adds that there is a contact person from Japan for the magazine and a contact person for the ITYARN conference. CL asks whether there is a contact person for the Artistic Encounters.

LV elaborates on the Chiden proposal for fundraising. LV says they will have a meeting with them and ASSITEJ China, and will report back to the EC.

LV explains that he has reached out to individual members that have not been in touch and haven’t paid their membership fees. Some of them have not replied (after three attempts), and if the EC members do not have another way to reach out to them, their membership should end.

Action SG & SK: contact PETA to ask whether they want to continue as an individual member.

Action YH: contact Chinamibia, and propose to connect them with another Namibian that attended the Cradle of Creativity

LV explains that he has had conversations with ASSITEJ Cuba about hosting the Congress in 2023. SK suggest that they should host an EC meeting there.

YH points out that the constitution should be reviewed to deal with cross-country memberships (being a member of multiple national centres).

6.3. Treasurer’s Report

RF presents the treasurer’s report. (See Addendum C)

He specifies that the “next period” is the time between this Gathering and the Congress.

RF asks the EC members and working groups to prepare budget estimations for the next meeting in Quimper, so that any excess can be “transferred” to other projects or areas.

RF stresses that the feedback on the Take a child to the theatre campaign from Italy is that it should be elevated to an international level as well.
The EC discusses how the beneficiary of the Take a child campaign should be chosen. YH would like to see an open call, and that the voting process would also be opened up (with an option to donate more).

CL asks whether we could gather money for ASSITEJ through Facebook fundraisers.

**Action**  KG: research if ASSITEJ could receive money through a Facebook fundraiser.

*Result of research: Currently not possible unless we change the location of our organisation to a different country (not Denmark; for example Italy) and ASSITEJ would need to be registered as a nonprofit or charitable organization (with a charity registration document issued or approved by a government entity).* [More info here](#)

### 7. Working Group Reports

#### 7.1. Publications & Promotions Group

MV presents a report (not written).

**Presentation of 2019 magazine**

The last proofread by the working group did not happen due to Norwegian holidays. But a magazine without any mistakes is an unreachable goal anyway. The magazine looks really good, the matte finish works very well and the binding is very nice.

The articles mostly fit in with the topic of "Confronting the present", except for maybe one which is more “this is what is happening in our country in TYA”. There are a lot of fairly opinionated articles, which is good to create some debate, for example, during the gathering.

The EC discusses ways to distribute the physical magazine to as many of our members.

**Report on WTD 2019 campaign**

SK shares some of the Korean experiences of creating the video.

Since FF is not present yet, these points haven’t been discussed yet: Documentation of AAG 2018 & 2019 / Promotion of Congress 2020.

#### 7.2. Projects Group

CL presents the projects group report. (See Addendum D)

**Practical work on planning engagements for ASSITEJ Artistic Gathering**

See the [time schedule for the Artistic Encounters](#)  

**Discussions towards activities in 2019 and 2020**

There have been more Skype sessions.

They also want to look at the Next Generation placements.

**Regional workshops including proposals for workshop leaders.**
7.3. Policies, Protocols & Fundraising Group

YH presents the report. (See Addendum E)

YH reminds the EC that there have been some changes in the awards nomination process. If an EC member is from the same country/national centre/network, this EC member cannot be on the voting committee for selecting the award winner. The EC should then find external people, that will need to come to France in December.

**Action** all EC members: inform yourself whether your national centre/country/network is going to put forward a candidate.

A discussion about this selection procedure follows. The working group will look at this issue during their session.

The working group presents their ideas for the National centre handbook session. It should engage the audience / participants of the session to go and discover the handbook. They invite other EC members to come with ideas. They might also want to livestream this session.

8. Review the 2017-2020 working plan

YH reviews the working plan, what have we accomplished and what should we pay more attention to. (See Addendum F)

If we had to meet with the general assembly tomorrow, YH thinks we could say that we have been working on each of the points, but the degree to which we have been successful is varied. Some means have had very concrete results, others we have aspired to or researched without concretely accomplishing something.

What are we going to give forward to the next EC, and what are the items that perhaps should be dropped (due to these and those reasons)? We should give a qualified feedback. We should also create job descriptions for the different EC roles.

**Action:** YH and Policies group to create job descriptions for the different EC roles.

There is some discussion on continuity versus innovation.

We all have to work on the working plan 2020-2023 and present it for the General Assembly. There is a short discussion about the “Open space” format used at the previous General Assemblies in Cape Town and Warsaw.

9. Regional reports

There is no time to go into the regional reports right now. YH also thinks that it is enough that we receive regional reports only once a year.

LV suggests that collecting membership fees and the national centre report form could go hand in hand. However, this time it would be good to have reports again in December. We will look at the form, and see if we can send it out at the same time as the other assembly documents.

**Action:** Prepare the members survey
10. Network reports Items of Business

10.1. IIAN
SG presents the report. (See Addendum G)

10.2. ITYARN
MV says that ITYARN will have a meeting here in Kristiansand and will report back after that. (See Addendum H)

10.3. Next Generation
EN hasn’t received anything from Nina by now.

[We received a report later during the EC meeting. See addendum I]

10.4. Small Size Network
RS reports very shortly on Small Size. Small Size would like to be mentioned as a full member in some way, and also be tagged in articles on the website that only really relate to Small Size members.

10.5. WLPG
EN presents the report. (See Addendum J)

10.6. Young Dance Network
BS will take over the role of liaison to the network from now on. BS presents the report. (See Addendum K). There is some confusion around the fee they would be paying to become a member of ASSITEJ.

11. Focus on MIRAI Festival and 20th ASSITEJ World Congress 2020
(KO, TB / HS, MM, KM, KA)

YH welcomes the Japanese delegation. We will now discuss the status of the World Congress.

Mr. Hisashi Shimoyama introduces the people working on the congress: Mayako Morimoto, Nao Miyauchi, Katsunari Morita, Kataya Akane, Yukari Kamiyara

The new president of ASSITEJ Japan Katsunari Morita greets the EC.
11.1. Japan to report on progress so far

MM presents the plans for the festival so far. She presents the report on progress. (See Addendum L)

MM asks for input from the EC on the delegate package prices.

MM shows the presentation. (See Addendum M)

The EC discussed how the international community could take part in the nationwide leg of the festival.

Questions & Remarks

YH suggests that we could arrange a hotel deal, available only for a very short window of time. MM asks what timeline YH was thinking about.

YH and LV say that people will be planning their trip ahead of time, so many delegates will be interested in booking hotels earlier.

HS says that when we could do this in October, the hotels would probably be very interested.

LV says that it is important to create a concentrated event, where people are gathered in “small” areas as often as possible.

LV asks whether there is any connection made to UNESCO in Japan. The theme of the festival really fits with the UN’s Convention on the Rights of the Child.

11.2. Funding and venues

11.3. Artistic Programme

11.4. Seminars, Symposia, Workshops, Conference

11.5. Next Generation Programme

ASSITEJ Japan and the MIRAI festival would like to add an online element to the ASSITEJ auction - to organise an online before the Congress. EN asks when the end of this online auction should be. ASSITEJ Japan says the online auction and live auction would end at the same time. The idea would be that the auction is simultaneously live and online.

11.6. Promotion & Magazine

11.7. Artistic Encounters & Open Space

12. Working groups

(Policies and Protocols Working group meets Japanese delegation, review and sign MOU)

13. Memberships and Member requests

13.1. New Member Applications

13.1.1. La Plaza (Peru)

They were hoping to start a national centre in Peru. LV pointed out that they should start by applying to become an individual member so there is time to gather practitioners outside La Plaza so that the
national centre becomes a collective project where all practitioners in the field are invited to be part of the process. LV presents the application for individual membership from La Plaza, Peru.

BS says that she knows the work of La Plaza, and they are serious and have relevant activities on offer. She will meet them in Chile soon.

**VOTE:** EC approves La Plaza as an individual member. Unanimous (2 absent)

### 13.2. Renewal of Individual Membership applications

#### 13.2.1. ŻiguŻajg International Arts Festival for Children & Young People

LV explains that they are an existing individual member from Malta. LV has asked them whether they could become a national centre. They state that there are not enough registered companies or other potential members to form a national centre.

YH says that Malta is a tiny country, almost like a city. Their festival is an international one that they are often in contact about. MV asks whether they could be granted individual membership for one year. LV suggests to give them the individual membership for three years to avoid needless filling out of forms.

**VOTE:** EC approves of ŻiguŻajg’s renewal of individual membership.
Unanimous (2 absent)

### 13.2.2. Babec Theater Bitola

Their membership has already been approved in Montevideo.

### 13.3. National Centers never Activated or with 4+ years of arrears

### 13.4. Membership requests

#### 13.4.1. ASSITEJ Ecuador

LV introduces the request.

**VOTE:** The EC agrees to write a letter of endorsement for the project presented in the request.
Unanimous (2 absent)

### 13.5. Dealing with National centre gatekeepers: strategy

LV put it on the agenda, to make sure we keep working on this.

YH suggests we should look at the individual membership application process. We are now using the individual membership as a tool to get around gatekeeping issues. It is highlighting the issues, but we are not always finding a way through.

The EC discusses the degree of regulating principles of board member elections in the national centres. YH points out that there is no clear guidelines for expulsion or suspension of members. RF says that the constitution is not precise. LV says that this is something for the policy working group to discuss, but it is not easy to judge from a meeting room.
BS stresses that we should find a way to use our image of a network, that members need to respect the generosity of opportunities that ASSITEJ stands for. We should become more involved when companies alert us that they do not have access to their national centre. Maybe the next dramaturgy could revolve around these concepts of generosity and sharing.

— OPEN EC MEETING —

Open EC participants:
• Jonathan Chapman (USA)
• Gonzalo Moreno (Spain),
• Ewa Piotrowsla (Poland),
• Dalija Acin Thelander (Serbia),
• Julia Heße (Germany),
• Eulalia Ribera (Spain),
• Dr. Rasheedat Aliu Liman (Nigeria)
• Dr. Eunice Uwadinma-Iademudia (Nigeria)
• Emilie Robert (France),
• Yannick Boudeau (Belgium),

YH welcomes the EC and the people that wanted to take part in the open EC meeting. She explains that being on the EC involves a lot of voluntary work; only the Secretary General and secretarial staff gets paid (for which they have to raise the funds).

YH presents the different working groups as they currently stand. Policies, protocols, and fundraising working group, the Promotion & Publications working group, and the Projects working group.

She explains that the EC would like to create job descriptions, to give a better understanding for people wanting to join the board. Certain skills will be lost when our current board changes in Tokyo. Certain roles require certain skills and qualities. It is a position of service and hard work, and at the same time it is a position of great privilege to serve the organisation.

14. Specific items of business

14.1. Procedures & timelines General Assembly

LV reminds of the deadlines of the candidacies. Every national centre and network (full member) can propose an EC candidate before the 18th of February 2020. According to the constitution, we need to receive the candidacies 3 months before the General Assembly. Then, the ASSITEJ members will be informed about the candidates so they can reflect on who they will vote for. Candidates will have the possibility to present their candidacy in person during the General Assembly.

As a candidate, it is important to be there for the entire Congress and also after elections, the EC will have meetings. So practically, departing will be May 25th.

14.2. Procedures & timelines awards

The call for Awards has been launched. LV presents the awards.

Artistic excellence selection procedure: Three EC members and two outside people who are invited to come in to assist with the decision making.
The lifetime achievement: is the rest of the EC. EC members will be excluded if candidates are from their country / national centre.

**14.3. Webinars (Jonathan Chapman)**

JC explains that TYA-USA is trying out webinars. They wonder how they can open up the webinars to the international community.

A webinar is a mix of a Skype call and a panel discussion. There could be a powerpoint presentation as part of the webinar, and you could see the people presenting (on the panel). TYA USA is paying for the subscription to the online tools, so there would not be any additional costs.

Topics might be:
- Migration and TYA in different regions, perhaps expanding on the workshop Spain, France and Italy presented.
- Safe space

LV stresses that is very important to think about these technological ways of sharing within the ASSITEJ community, in relation to sustainability and equal access to the activities of ASSITEJ.

SG asks who would be asked to be part of the panel discussions. JC says they could come from within TYA-USA but that they also invite people from outside.

TB points out that subtitling and other means of accessibility would be good too. So-called “Watch Parties” would be great to organise as well.

EN suggests that we could test out the platform during the next EC meeting in Quimper. JC suggest going forward with one international webinar somewhere in March. The timezones is another issue to think about.

**14.4. Child Safety (Sue & Jonathan Chapman)**

SG explains that ASSITEJ would like to implement a Child Safety strategy in the association. She has put together a draft for how it works in her company but also how it could be adapted for ASSITEJ. We are working around the UN convention of the rights of the child. She says that there are trainings available for organisations, because it is legislated now in Australia.

YH asks whether the constitution itself should be adjusted to implement this or whether there should be a separate document.

JC explains that the most prominent TYA theatre in the US has gotten into a child safety scandal, back when the theatre was founded. This issue has created a debate about child safety within TYA, but also about legal responsibilities etc. Now, many theatres are asking TYA-USA as a national centre to take leadership and gather best practices to be a guideline. TYA-USA is in the midst of these conversations about creating policies.

EN adds that TYA-USA might also be approached by the press, and it would then be good to be prepared. It sent a ripple not only for the child safety issues itself, but also how we communicate outwards.

SG presents the draft. (See Addendum N)

CL is looking forward to the discussion, because there are a lot of cultural differences to be taken into account. TB also agrees that theatre is a place of provocation. LV points out that ASSITEJ works on a
different level than a producing theatre group, and that we should bear that in mind. EN says that we might not have the same contact with children as producing artists; however we do also invite children to actively take part in our events, e.g. Day 4 of the Encounters.

RF wants to discuss this point by point, and would like to open the discussion up to the national centres. Also the presidents and chairpersons should sign and support this document.

SG says that this is only an offer. We could come up with a statement of principles.

YH says we should make it as simple and accessible as possible. This is the spirit of our work, this is the safe space we want our work to inhabit. It would be a great tool to give to the national centre, just to open up the discussions.

JC stresses that it is important to be proactive.
PU says that is important to create awareness.

FF thinks that as ASSITEJ International we should keep a broad perspective on child safety; it is not only about sexual abuse. It is important that we state what is not acceptable, and to show that we have a policy.

LV agrees that having the policy in place is good as a means of inspiring members to behave according to the policy.

JC asks about potential actions undertaken when an ASSITEJ member would violate the policy, if there could be expulsion or other consequences. This would be the case according to the current constitution.

15. Working plan 2020-2023 (initial conversation)
We want to open the conversation here, and then formalise it on the next EC meeting in Quimper. Then we can pass it on to the next EC, who can decide to what degree they want to stick to the proposed working plan, respecting the constraints it includes that it has been approved by the General Assembly

YH introduces and presents the working plan. (See addendum O)

Currently, there is a line on supporting the WLPG distribution of texts, this could be expanded to a bigger engagement of the networks in other ways.

FF says that he would like to see a meeting with the representatives from the networks. At this point, we don’t really know who is who in relation to the networks.

MV agrees that it is sometimes hard to keep in touch with some of them, for example Next Generation.

SF says there should be a continuous stream of communication between the networks and the EC. We should find a mechanism to secure continuity.
MV says that they are working a bit like national centres, so they are quite independent and autonomous. Some networks also do not like to exist in service of ASSITEJ. MV says we know more about what is going on in the networks than what we know about the national centres.

RF says there is also a lack of communication between the networks and the national centres.
YH says that the idea of the champions from IIAN could perhaps be implemented for all the networks, so that all networks would be represented in the national centres, like we have within the EC.

JC adds that it is still quite confusing for him as a national centre’s director, to see how the networks relate to the national centres, and the EC.

YH says we should create a FAQ page on the website.

BS says we should take care of also strengthening the national centre’s position, otherwise the networks could potentially be eliminating the need for national centres, for example in Latin America.

MV asks what it means for a national centre to have a network representative. For her, it is clear that a network should have a similar status as the national centre. It is very diverse, it defeats the purpose of the networks when we want to have national centre representatives and vice versa.

JC says that it is all about creating communication flow. For TYA USA members, it is already difficult enough to explain the concept of ASSITEJ.

RF is interested in knowing who is joining the networks: are they members of national centres?

FF says that there are certain different cultural points of focus, and those are perhaps represented in the networks. The national centres are still the ones working on advocacy for the TYA field in their country.

RF adds that in the international context, there could be certain points of conflict between ASSITEJ and the networks (for example when Small Size and ASSITEJ are applying for a Creative Europe network fund).

SF says the opposite of François. If a national centre wants to know what the international challenges are for a TYA researcher, a kind of champion system should still be encouraged.

SF says the projects group has been talking a lot about translation. Not only of text and words, but communication in general in the global village. How can we put this issue in the center? This is the same for the other points of inclusivity/accessibility and child participation. SF says that translation is part of inclusivity as well.

SG says that we should work towards a strategy, as we have now seen and agreed on the value of focusing on these topics. Now we need to concretize.

YH says that sustainability is definitely one topic that should be added to the list.

JC asks if the EC could illustrate what is meant by these three focus points. He understood the focus on translation more on the content (supporting playwrights and exchange etc) but now hears that it is more about how translation is approached within the organisation.

YH says that there are often many layers to these topics, both applying to the life of the organisation and to the actual TYA field.

JH says that this layering is very interesting, and questioning the organisation on sustainability means questioning sustainability in art production.
LV says we should start thinking about it now, more proactively.

SF says sustainability is also about fair cooperation.

BS says that there will be many paradoxical situations, and we will be faced with questions from others as well.

RF says we should approach an expert on this.

CL says that she is very glad that JH mentioned transformation design, because this is a very interesting concept.

Emilie Robert (France) says that travel for work is not the main contributor to carbon emissions.

LV says that the three A’s should be in focus for ASSITEJ: artistic exchange, access and advocacy. ASSITEJ is currently big on artistic exchange, but not as much on the other A’s. ASSITEJ should develop our work on access and advocacy, which perhaps could go hand in hand with a focus on sustainability.

EN also wants to add the issue of sustainability of the organisation. Financial stability and risk analysis.

SF says the idea of an ASSITEJ Academy could be put on the agenda again.

YH says that the University of Agder is engaged with a Creative Europe project which could be applied to our idea of the ASSITEJ Academy (i.e. an online space for sharing and learning).

YH sums up that we have discussed access, sustainability, advocacy, fair cooperation, transformation design.

FF says we sometimes don’t give the physical encounters enough credit for what they do to create a shared idea of TYA in ASSITEJ. We should continue concentrating on the issue: TYA. Someone putting on a show for a live audience should be celebrated throughout our communication. We might be losing our core, we are forgetting to define ourselves as performers. Building something magical with the audience. Opportunism is a danger.

YH concludes this was an interesting discussion, and invites the EC to think further on these concepts.

16. Report backs from the Working Groups

16.1. Publications & Promotions Group

(See Addendum P)

16.2. Projects group report

SF presents the projects working group progress. (See Addendum Q)

The first point is the Artistic Encounters in Kristiansand:
On Friday, the projects group will have a three hours encounter. It will be a hierarchy-free creative brainstorming and we need the help of all the EC members to facilitate these free groups. We need to make an introduction, so we should meet at 8:30 to prepare this.

The working plan:
Could we put the Open space and the Artistic encounter together on the first day in Tokyo?

YH responds that the Artistic Encounter is really a room for discussion of the artistic practice itself, not the life of the association. SF says that talking about the working plan equals talking about the artistic practice.

RF and FF have some comments. YH suggests that we move forward with preparing the working plan, and we can still make the decision on this later (December at the latest).

CL presents the last point, the networks. The projects working group is proposing that the networks could adopt the three-year dramaturgy in some way.

BS says that it would be a great way to increase the interconnection between ASSITEJ and its networks. LV agrees that it would create synergy and put the networks forward, and he thinks they will be happy to have a dialogue about it, but an obligatory implementation might not be the way to go. There should be space for their own projects. BS thinks that there is room for at least one project within the dramaturgy. SF underlines that the dramaturgy is open for interpretation; it can easily be adapted for their own interests.

YH sees a potential for the networks interacting with the dramaturgy more closely during the gatherings and congresses. She also points out that the concept of having a dramaturgy might be thrown out by the new EC. BS says it would give the networks a sense of ownership.

SF adds that there will be a group of youngsters attending the Artistic Encounter, opening a discussion about sustainability.

LV thanks the project group for a great encounter today.

16.3. Policies, Protocols & Fundraising Group report

RF has shared the latest Creative Europe draft with the working group. RF and YB have skyped with Alex Byrne, who is very excited and on board. RF has spoken to Brigitte Dethier, who will be available as the second artistic director because she will by then be a freelance director rather than the artistic director of JES in Stuttgart. We have also discussed with Dialogue - The Community Performance Network for the dissemination, so the partners are becoming more and more defined. The two directors share the idea that this project is to support ASSITEJ.

There have also been discussions around applying as a network, instead of a project application. The network grant would be the best in terms of financing and supporting ASSITEJ.

LV says we should go forward with the project application.

YH suggests that we perhaps could use some money as an investment in ourselves, sponsoring the writing of the application.

EN asks whether the plan is to vote again on the continuation of the Creative Europe application or on something else?
LV says we will vote on the second director Brigitte Dethier. At the last EC meeting the EC accepted to proceed with the application and to include Alex Byrne as one of two artistic directors.

SF says some words about Brigitte Dethier. She is the founder and artistic director of JES.

**VOTE:** the EC approves of Brigitte Dethier as the second director in the Creative Europe project application.

SF asks how much is available in the budget, to be discussed and moved around.
YH says that you could find this information in the treasurer’s report.
CL says that RF had said that there could be some budget moved from one topic to another.

CL asks whether the current treasurer is going to propose a budget for the period after the Congress.
YH says that the current treasurer will have to prepare this proposal, because it will be voted on by the General Assembly.

The working groups should take a look at the budget and propose concrete requests.

**17. Ratification of online votes**

**17.1. Reimbursement of travels**

Reimbursement of travels (Pamela Udoka, Daniel Fernandez)

The EC by online vote accepted the reimbursement of travels by Pamela Udoka, Daniel Fernandez

**VOTE:** the EC approves the ratification of the online votes.

**18. Any other Business**

**19. Closure & thanks**

YH thanked the EC for an intense and productive EC-meeting and ASSITEJ Artistic Gathering and closed the meeting.