

6:05 PM to 8:16 PM CET , the meeting has been recorded.

Participants (voting members in green)

1.	LRPCE Chairperson:	PIP Gudrun Björt YNGVADOTTIR	in attendance
	Designated ID EF Klagenfurt:	ID Barbara GREWE	in attendance
	Second Year IDs:	ID Barbara GREWE	
		ID Jürg VOGT (also Region 2 representative)	in attendance
		ID Pirkko VIHAVAINEN (also Region 1 representative)	in attendance
	Immediate Past International Directors	IPID Mats GRANATH	apologies
		IPID Teresa DINEEN (also Region 5 representative)	in attendance
		IPID Dr. Elena APPIANI (also Region 6 representative)	in attendance
	Area Representatives:	PID Daniel ISENRICH (Region 3)	in attendance
		PID Nicole MIQUEL-BELAUD (also EF 2024 Bordeaux President and Region 4 representative)	in attendance
		PID George Th PAPAS (Region 7)	in attendance
		PID Kalle ELSTER (Region 8)	in attendance
	Programme Directors	Markus TSCHISCHEJ (EF Klagenfurt)	in attendance until 7:05 PM
		DG Vanessa HORROD (EF Bordeaux)	in attendance
	Past International Presidents:	PIP Giuseppe „Pino” GRIMALDI (IP 1994-1995)	in attendance
		PIP Eberhard J. WIRFS (IP 2009-2010)	apologies
	LEF A & A and LRPCE secretary:	PID Miklos HORVATH	in attendance
	Guests	PID Sandro CASTELLANA Chair of LRPCE ROP Revision Task Force Chairperson	in attendance
		PID Geoff Leeder (Chair) Lions Task Force Europe	in attendance
		ID Marcel DANIELS - 1st year ID	in attendance
		ID Halldor KRISTJANSSON -1st year ID	absent
		ID Danyal KUBIN - 1st Year ID	in attendance
		PCC Stewart Sherman-Kahn - Board Appointee	in attendance
		PID Dr Walter ZEMROSSER (also Europa Forum 2023 Klagenfurt President)	in attendance

1. Welcome – Chairperson PIP Gudrun

Chairperson greeted the participants. The main reason of the meeting today is to be well prepared for Klagenfurt.

2. Introductions – All (only name, title and country)

See above.

3. Apologies - A&A PID Miklos

Please see above.

4. Interim report of the Task Force to review the existing Rotation Scheme - PID Sandro – Chairperson of the Task Force

The Task Force had a meeting on August 23, they reviewed the plan prepared by Miklos. The plan is based on membership, not mathematically, but on groups constituted on language, cultural similarities. The result of the 6 groups, numbers are not identical, each group may delegate 10 IDs on a 20 year term. Two Excel sheets, one is the Grouping and the second is the Rotation Scheme proposal is proposed. We have to give opportunities to the smaller countries to delegate IDs. There were a couple of comments, like: to evaluate the growth factor of the countries over time, look at LCIF donations taking into consideration the per capital income, certain modification of the groups, guiding principles solidarity and membership.

The Task Force approved the proposal in broad lines and found it appropriate for discussion. Our system is much appreciated by other Constitutional Areas, they look to us.

Miklos:

There was an idea, once the grouping agreed upon, the group's leadership might decide on the rotation within the group.

Barbara:

Fabian and Daniel, agreed on solidarity, but it should be all the same everywhere. You could see the table prepared by Fabian, all big countries give 1 slot, but France loses 2, Italy 1. This is not fair, This should be identical.

How to make the split between MDs and Ds from Group 1 to 5, and then Group 6. Every area of 1.500 belongs automatically in Group 6, where those districts bigger than 1.000 will have a slot every 4 year, in between you can fill the gaps in discussion with Group 6. This is numbers, but also solidarity.

As far as Germany is concerned, it is OK to be together with another district, why Slovenia is a question.

Jürg:

It is not clear why for Switzerland 6 years then 9 years, then 3 years. It should be systematic.

Miklos: Decisive factor would be to agree on groups. If we accept solidarity as a guiding principle, the Group Leadership might agree on the rotation.

Barbara:

We do not know what is Group Leadership. Gudrun might tell us how it is in other Constitutional Areas and take example.

Gudrun:

Latin-America all the PIDs, CA1 in the hands of current directors and executive officers, in India, a bit like Latin America, in Oseal it is only Past presidents and current IDs. If we make a plan, it might be amended later.

The Committee for Board Representation is looking into other criteria, service reporting, donations, density of Lions, service compared to population, not only membership. Big countries have to have larger representation, but smaller countries have to have their chance also. We have to revise our plans and we should be open minded.

Geoff:

While we are relying on the leadership in a group, there might be difficulties if there is non uniform leadership representation, they might exclude a country/Lion if they think so. All the principles are OK, the system we have now works well, finetuning is always necessary.

George:

The present rules make the rotation much more difficult and complicated, as before. Board Appointees should be discussed, why they are appointed and not elected, it is time to be more democratic.

Gudrun:

We have just started the work internationally, at our next meeting we will examine the population stats. Other CAs are keen on having greater representation, maybe ours will be reduced, or not, nobody knows what will happen.

Stewart:

One concern is who is leadership, some PIDs might not know anymore the shining stars coming up, but Area Leaders, and maybe DGE Seminar Group Leaders might.

Barbara:

All these ideas, who is leadership, is too much difficult for Europe, 29 languages, 35 potential candidates. The decision to have a rotation list in Europe, which is changeable due to special circumstances, and the ID candidates are chosen and elected by the MDs and Ds. What is important is to revise the rotation every 3-4 years for Group 4, 6-7 years for the others.

General decision for group 6, what are the criteria, membership and others.

Nicole:

Thank you Barbara for specifying that France loses 2 slots, others only one, or gain 1 or more.

George:

The original disturbance in the Rotation System was caused by 3rd IVP candidates, we should state some criteria or this disturbance will be recurring from time to time. Why don't we have a rotation scheme also for IP? You cannot touch one without the other, you have to take everything into consideration (no membership criteria for International Officers, reducing the Board size, etc) and create a general system.

Miklos:

Committee members agree that the Rotation Scheme should be based on groups. The composition of the groups is another story and we would like to have your concrete proposals by mail, if you do not agree on the present proposal.

Besides membership, other factors should be taken into consideration. First of all solidarity, secondly other factors like growth, LCIF donations, international leadership experiences, density, etc.

If we agree on the groups, we should decide on how the groups divide the 10 slots. The leadership in the groups may be different from group to group. What is important is to have an agreement within the group. What we would like to have is your comments in writing.

Barbara:

It cannot be like that because in Europe we do not have an accepted leadership structure.

Gudrun:

In some groups there is a governing body, like Scandinavia, we have a Board, the CCs, with the Vice-Chairs and the support of PIDs. It can be created in other areas, too. Let me again invoke Latin-America. They have a rule, every second year it is Brazil, in between other countries. So in a given year, there might be 3 candidates. Who decide? The PIDs. Sandro and I do not consider this fair and democratic, our plan is better. We can create leadership for areas.

Daniel:

We are making it far too complicated. We had a Rotation based on membership. It should be just revised, and divide it to a larger base. The grouping is the only way, I do agree, but the composition is not proper. We have to revise the grouping and within the groups consider other factors, like donation, etc, density is not a good factor, as on this basis only small countries would send IDs to the Board.

I do not agree on Group Leadership, the LRPCE should keep this privilege and not to pass it over to others.

Pino:

The present Rotation which is based on membership should be revised, other factors might also be taken (not exactly contributions to LCIF but rather services rendered) into consideration, but membership should prevail.

The five largest MDs should represent the base of the first five groups, so Germany, Italy, France, UK and Scandinavia may be one group. The rest of countries may form 3 groups who would delegate ID sas per a rule established later.

We are considering 2026 onwards. In Group 3 Italy should have an ID at that time.

Miklos:

Reiterates that we expect concrete proposals until September 5.

Gudrun:

Confirmed that the proposals from committee members are important for the work to continue.

Sandro: Informed that committee that the next meeting of the Task Force will take place on September 18, but we need preparations

What Pino said was that Group 6 should be divided into sub-groups, Pino is requested to send his proposals in writing.

5. General Discussion on and evaluation of the work done by the Lions Task Force Europe, Job Description, Task Assignment - Chairperson PIP Gudrun

Gudrun.

This is just a discussion, a kind of summary of what has been done, we were reviewing history, and prepared a Job Description on the model of the GAT Constitutional Area Leader Job Description. Why? There was no transparency, many new IDs, even PIDs do not know what it is about, so we thought to create a document, a job description. I stress that we don't need to continue with the Task Force, but this was accepted by the International Officers, as a good initiative, because at the time there was only NAAMI, and we said we want to do something for membership. We might not need it, we might change it, we will have time until the next meeting, so let us not spend much time. Shall we continue with the Task Force, or not? If yes, how?

Some words about history: it started in Tallin as we realized that Leaders do not know much about the developments. I asked Elisabeth to take care of it and that is how it started and continued, the main goal was communication, we wanted to invite the PIDs by-monthly to inform them about developments. Why LRPCE? Because we had experience and talent.

Barbara:

Really great coincidence, I, as Vice-Chair, with Chairperson Geoff, we are working on the same issues. I was however a bit surprised that it has not been discussed with us, but it is great that from two directions we pursue the same goals.

Gudrun:

The reason why you did not yet see this document is that we have just asked Elisabeth to lay down the past. We do not know if this will be for the future. The Task Force is the baby of the LRPCE, we created it, we can continue with it, or stop it. Many IDs, PIDs asked us why only PIDs are targeted, why don't we involve young people, LEOs, etc. Let me remind you that we created it to help PIDs to be updated, to have a bigger role in Europe, to make them more internationally thinking.

It should be updated, unfortunately the COVID made it to reduce the Task Force to a once a year meeting. It is good that you also think of the future.

Pino:

PID information happens only after the Committee decided, until that time it is only gossip.

Geoff:

It is interesting that both sides have come up with the same sort of ideas. In the Job Description, all the ideas we had at the time were mentioned, but things have changed and it needs revision. The size of LTF at present is 24 members, it is much too big, it is not manageable. We both came up with the idea to slim it down. We should discuss it further and come to a decision how it should go forward, which is best for our International Association, PIDs, PIPs. It was sometimes difficult to have the relevant information that we could pass on to the LTF. I think it will be difficult to have a meeting every couple of months with the number of meetings that go on at the moment.

What is quite bothering is that we speak of Task Forces, to my mind there is only one Task Force. Are the others legitimately in place? The LRPCE should have created Sub-groups to the Task Force, that would have been legitimate. In the new Manual, the LRPCE may create task forces but you have them already. Is that correct?

Gudrun:

We had Working Groups but we felt more appropriate to call them Task Force. It is in the new Manual. Let me repeat the documents sent are only a basis for discussion and they describe how the Task Force has been conceived and acted before COVID.

What you have now is just an introduction that we can discuss more lengthily at our next meeting, you have a month to think.

Pino:

The relevant organs, be it Board, or LRPCE appoint working groups or task forces from time to time, as required, they are created when necessary and are finished when the task is over.

Geoff:

When we first put in place the Task Force, we had 3 goals: one was Membership, the second was Service Reporting and the third Donations to LCIF.

Membership continues to size down, Service Reporting remains between 37-48 %, in LCIF last year up to June 30, 2022, it represented some 10 M USD coming from 2 % of our membership. The number of donors went down, but the donations became much more important. We did very well.

Gudrun:

Lions have been very generous for the last 2 years, mainly because of Ukraine and Turkey.

Barbara:

We can finish it for now, as Geoff will prepare what we think for the future. Miklos should send it together with the Minutes, or even before, if Geoff sends it to him. In addition to the 3 points mentioned, we can add information of our PIDs.

Gudrun:

Thank you, Barbara. We shall discuss this at our next meeting. Let me reinforce the 3 things we wanted to strengthen; one was Membership, the second was Service Reporting and the third Donations to LCIF. These are the same criteria on basis of what all Constitutional Areas are judged, when delegating of IDs. We did not have 6 directors for long, some 15 years only, earlier we had 5 IDs. One thing more, you remember Daniel, the survey and information you made available to all districts in Europe offering IDs, PIDs, as speakers at their conventions. In USA, all the IDs, and even many PIDs are quite extensively used, this is not the case in Europe, sometimes not even IDs travel sufficiently to conventions. Another thing, it was Walter who said that at the USA-Canada Leadership Forum, IDs and PIDs had a booth, offering their services to districts. There are thus many ways that we can opt for in future.

Miklos:

The sending of the documents was far too late, so please do not hesitate to write your comments to us.

Daniel:

Should we not keep Geoff and Barbara in the loop? Who is now leading this?

Gudrun:

Definitely. We can do it many ways. Please remember that the appointment of the Chair is not formal at all, at the time I asked Elisabeth to Chair LTF and when she had to leave, I did the same with Geoff and I might do it to someone else in future, as this is not a formal election procedure.

Geoff:

The question is the ownership of it, we try to run it with Barbara to the best of our abilities and we appreciate the assistance we have from you and Miklos. I can send what we have to you and Miklos and you will see there are commonalities,

Gudrun:

The cooperation is very important. LRPCE has the ownership and asked – delegated to - certain people to run it. We delegated the job to you now, Geoff Leeder, so this is how it is. You have a very important role to define the future. We many times start projects, we are very enthusiastic, we do not write it down, so we thought to make available some documents to remind the past, how it started, the practice, how it evolved and the future, how we would like to have it, IF WE WANT TO HAVE IT. If we want it, how we want it, with whom, how big, etc.

Geoff:

It is anyhow a very good document.

Gudrun:

Thank you, please do not hesitate to send any comments you have.

6. Discussion of a EF policy to allow or not parallel positions (EF Official and International Office candidates) – the follow-up on the discussion deferred – Chairperson PIP Gudrun

A topic we had several times if it was right that our official positions in Europe are so big, they should not be in parallel to any other positions, like 3rd IVP candidate.

The International Constitution and By-Laws does not say that you cannot have positions in your own constitutional areas.

Take the experience we had lately from LCI, you cannot be candidate and group leader, or GAT Area Leader at the same time. If you are an Area leader, you cannot be endorsed for higher office.

Can the positions we have be done in a parallel way?. You cannot focus on many jobs, and when the Executive Officers appoint someone, they examine that.

In other Constitutional Areas they do not have any rules, but they do not imply candidates to other functions.

If you have comments, please share them, or think it over and write it to us.

Daniel:

We speak here about workload, and about fair or unfair „marketing” opportunities. When I am Area Leader, I have a relationship with many international leaders, I am in a position to market myself.

An EF Accountant, or the A&A do not have this „marketing position”.

I am running as a candidate, but I do not have any tasks. When I am elected, I will have them and then, parallel positions cannot be maintained. .

Gudrun:

This is not what Executive Officers think, when you have a position, you cannot run, as a candidate.

Daniel: Not only GAT, but also LCIF Area leaders are concerned when we speak about parallel positions.

Gudrun:

It is understandable now with Mission 1.5, they limit the multiple positions.

It was good to have a longer discussion that we may pursue in future, please think it over and if you have comments, please write them to us.

7. Preparations for our in-person meeting in Klagenfurt – Chairperson PIP Gudrun

Gudrun:

Who would like to give some info on Klagenfurt, Walter or Barbara?

Walter:

Things are going well, we are thankful to the Supervisory Committee, Barbara, Miklos, Daniel help us enormously.

We have many registrations, we hope to have a „before COVID-like” forum, a good sign is the number of sessions we have. We do not have any more available open slots.

Barbara:

Thank you Miklos for preparing all the resolutions and appendices. I have some issues with the first 2 resolutions. It is question of honesty to name the differences to the old document, to present the differences, to explain why.

Daniel:

What Barbara is speaking about is that at European Council I, we should present some slides.

Miklos:

3 meetings before, we decided that there will be a PP detailing all the changes. I proposed to do it, but I agree that Sandro does it as the Task Force Chair. This Manual is a big step forward. Therefore we need that all the members of LRPCE make some pre-marketing with the country representatives to help the approval of the document. This is a big step forward for our Committee, to all EF member countries in Europe, so we need the assistance of each and every one of you to help this happen.

Teresa:

It would be easy to follow the changes if they were highlighted in colour. it would be simple and we would save the presentation.

Daniel:

This is unfortunately not possible, the nature of the documents do not permit it. We could gather as a team to discuss it.

Sandro:

I agree with Daniel that the structure of the document has changed, therefore highlighting is not an issue.

We can rally the Working Group to produce this presentation.

Miklos:

Your job will be relatively simple, as you will have the meeting of the same people on September 18, so you will have two points on the agenda, the first will be the Rotation Scheme, the second the presentation on the changes.

I will prepare it though, I will send you and Daniel a paper with all the changes and if we agree, the PP can be prepared accordingly.

8. AOB – All

Barbara:

2 points:

- thank you Miklos for this long-long minutes, under point 3 there must be a mistake, and in the part dealing with LAE, according to Sanjeev's letter , we cannot use "Lions" . Let us call it otherwise.
- The other one is that I suggest to discuss an Emergency Resolution at the next meeting for the Europeans marching together at the Parade on International Convention.

George:

Because of the sudden illness of my Mother, I could not share the position of the leaders of MD117 concerning the Board's decision on provisional District 135.

The whole leadership of the MD117 vehemently discusses this Board decision (and here he reads a statement containing major parts of the letter to be sent to all International leadership, enclosed herewith).

A letter will be prepared and we request all the PIDs and IDs of Europe to help us reverse this decision.

I wanted to share this on behalf of the some 2300 Lions of MD117.

Gudrun:

We shall read your letter, we cannot do much, as this is the call of the International BoD, This is a very complicated and difficult matter.

Daniel:

I have received news from Young Lions Convent coming out of the Netherlands, with the participation of a Turkish, or Greek young Lion. My fear is that there are a number of groups that are putting themselves on the stage and causing turbulences, operating under the umbrella of LCI that we might put on the agenda and discuss next time.

Miklos:

Thank you for your very active participation. Any comments you have concerning the 2-3 major topics we had, please do not hesitate to send it to me that I will circulate to the Committee

9. Next meeting – Chairperson and A&A

Gudrun:

The next meeting has already been agreed upon at the last meeting (September 25, 2023, 6 PM CET). We are working for the future, as we are Long Range Planning Committee. Thank you for your great work and activity.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:16. PM

Prepared by: PID Miklos HORVATH A & A