



2. What does partnership mean to you?
  3. What are the practical consequences of your observations for the future exchange of personnel?
- Motel underlines that this discussion is also important with regard to a future Policy Framework.

Rolf Noormann thanks for the invitation to speak to the MC. In his presentation he does not only express his personal insights but also the feelings of the other participants of the co-workers' meeting in July.

1. He starts by saying that the ecumenical co-workers are not really appreciated by the partner churches, only as presupposition for money. If partners had the choice they would prefer to receive the money instead of the co-workers. On the side of EMS and Mission 21, there is also little interest in co-workers' experiences. The institutions are not prepared to give the co-workers a part in the ongoing discussion process between EMS partners. Noormann doubts whether the partnership rhetoric is honest.

He has personally had rich experiences in India, but his experience in India exemplifies the above statement in many ways. Neither UCT Bangalore nor CSI were really interested in having him and his wife as members of staff. EMS seldom informed them on or included them in partnership programmes in India.

2. Partnership is expressed in documents but not put into practice. If congregations in Germany knew how their donated money is being used, most of them would immediately stop to donate. Partnership cannot be equal as long as it is based on money primarily. Self-reliance is still maintained as an important aim, but why is it applied only in terms of administration and missionary activities, but not in terms of finances? The concept of mutual trust, personal relations and friendship is mixed with a concept of financial support and business partnership which implies accountability and control. To mix both concepts is unhealthy.

Money transferred to partners does not help to equalize partnership, but it strengthens the power of the powerful in the churches, and it prevents the churches from becoming independent.

3. From independence partners would benefit. In all programmes there should be reciprocity, and all partners should contribute to programmes, not only the German churches. Money should flow only to specific projects and programmes in the partner churches, whereby clear criteria (such as used by Bread for the World) should be strictly applied.

As a second representative of the ecumenical co-workers Markus Hildebrandt-Rambe addresses the MC. He sees this opportunity as part of a constructive process which was brought about by the course in July. He sees the present crisis in the exchange of personnel as a chance for a good change.

He wants to focus on 2 issues:

1. The role of ecumenical co-workers. Up to now the issue has been discussed on an individual and psychological level, but there is the necessity for a clarification on a structural and institutional level, in which all partners are involved. Although the name „ecumenical co-worker“ shows a change in the perception from a old-fashioned missionary to the new paradigm of a „bridge-builder“, it is the question whether these bridge builders are really wanted or are predominantly seen as a disturbing factor. Are they part of the exchange or part of the transfer of resources? Up to now they are objects, but not a full and integral part of the partnership network. There is a discrepancy between ideology and reality. If co-workers speak out on critical issues such as corruption, nobody seems willing to listen to them. The alternative of a new paternalism from donors side is not viable, but a way in-between is to be found.

2. The mixture of partnership and of a „business relationship“ concerning projects and programmes is unhealthy. Although both levels cannot and should not be separated, they should be distinguished and structurally separated. Business cannot be based on personal trust only.

3. As a consequence Hildebrandt-Rambe makes three points:

- A clarification is needed: Does EMS need and want ecumenical co-workers?
- If so, ecumenical co-workers should be taken seriously as part of the partnership network.
- A clear distinction between church partnership and project partnership is needed.

As the first representative of personnel exchange between partners Kwabena Aboagye addresses the MC.

In the beginning he saw himself and his family as missionaries to South Africa, a country in transformation. He could do some reading on the Moravian Church and the historical relation between PCG and MCSA beforehand, but beyond that there was little preparation or orientation. Neither was the receiving congregation properly prepared in what it meant to accommodate a co-worker from abroad. This led to tensions. Particularly in a society which is still stratified by the Apartheid past, it was never openly discussed what it meant that for the first time a „black“ minister with a Ghanaian Presbyterian background served the „coloured“ congregation Salem.

With regard to language abilities the expectations of the congregations were too high. People immediately expected him to learn Afrikaans and Xhosa.

Furthermore Aboagye refers to the salary which doesn't allow to save a cent because of the high cost of living. At the same time people assume that - because EMS is seen as rich - the Aboagye family have enough to live and to give.

Yunita Lasut gives a report on her experience as a co-worker from Indonesia in Germany. As member of one of the teams for ecumenical and missionary services in Wuerttemberg she offers a variety of programmes and themes to congregations and schools. She experiences a great concern in the congregations about the diminishing spirituality especially among young

people. When people hear her talking about Indonesia, they start seeing their own strengths and weaknesses from a foreign angle and discover their own problems which they often have in common with the people in other countries. Lasut sees her work in Germany as a service to the German churches and people, as in past years missionaries came from Germany to serve in Eastern countries. But the emphasis has changed: Christians in all parts of the world bear a common responsibility to preach the gospel everywhere, and to share the burden of all people. Financial support can cause a feeling of superiority and inferiority, but it should be understood as a common attempt to solve common problems. When the churches in Indonesia face a crisis because of the influx of refugees, and the churches in Germany and other countries bear this with them and join hands, it is a matter of spiritual sharing. Financial aid is needed, but it is just one aspect among others, it is a vehicle and not the aim.

Lasut feels that the term ecumenical co-worker is helpful. She has an equal status to the German colleagues in her work. The term „missionary“ could imply that a church is not able to live up to its own missionary task and needs foreign experts, especially in a minority situation as in Indonesia.

Motel opens the floor for the questions. Badr would like to know what kind of expectations the German ecumenical co-workers had when they left for the partner churches. Hildebrandt-Rambe replies that he saw himself in the role of a bridge-builder. He and his wife expected to be able to contribute to the work of the church in the place where he would live and to contribute to the EMS network. Hence the disappointment that they don't play any role there. Noormann adds that for them the experience of living and working theologically in the Indian context was the main motivation.

Prakash sharply criticises the statements made by the German co-workers which reflected a post-colonial spirit. CSI/UCT are not present to voice their own point of view. The three questions should have been given to the hosting churches and institutions to take a stand. Aboagye says he has mentioned the points made here in his report to the MCSA, the PCG and EMS. Labsch would like to know how many churches have made experiences with ecumenical co-workers. Some years ago the Church of Baden was sharply accused of not having received its co-workers properly. It continuously strives to improve on that.

Motel concludes the session, expressing thanks to the ecumenical co-workers for their contributions.

Plenary Session II (November 8. 2002, 9.00 - 12.30 hrs)

### **Roll Call**

Present: as above Session I on November 7<sup>th</sup> and Chae, Heckelmann, Lee, Schneider

Chair: Motel

#### **6. Welcoming New Arrivals**

Motel welcomes Rev. Chae, Ms. Heckelmann, Dr. Lee und Ms. Schneider.

#### **7. Morning Devotion**

Siwu leads in the morning devotion, focussing on John 17:14-21.

#### **8. Adoption of the Minutes**

Motel calls attention to the minutes of the MC meeting 2001, of which all MC members have received a copy. No corrections or amendments are made.

MC 02/02 With thanks to the recording secretaries, MC adopts the minutes unanimously..

#### **9. Report of the Mission Council Chair Person**

Motel introduces his report as written for the synod, starting in the afternoon. After six years of MC chair person this is his last report and therefore he is delineating some historical developments and challenges. (Cf. Document G03)

Quack refers to the financial losses and wants to know whether the partner churches are clear about it. Schneider provides some background information referring to an increase in unemployment and reform in the tax system. Quack adds the figure of 140 000 people leaving the Evangelical Church each year.

Lamotte points to the situation in the headquarters where staff had to be reduced, at the same time tasks increased. The Working Committee is requested to convey appreciation to the EMS staff.

Plenary adopts the report and it will be presented to the synod without any changes.

#### **10. Report of the Secretariat**

Dinkelaker as the general secretary presents a brief summary of Document G04.

Labsch appreciates the report and in particular the way of presentation (2 pages per desk). She suggests adding the list of ecumenical co-workers with their respective location. Dinkelaker explains that each desk identifies the ecumenical co-workers serving in the respective churches. The German magazine "EMS-Impulse 2002/3" lists them all, nevertheless he agrees to follow up in this matter. Motel underlines that MC received the report with great appreciation.

#### 11. Annual Statement of Accounts and Balance Sheet 2001

Gieche provides an introduction, pointing to changes (less donations, less allocations, increase of expenditures in the headquarters, decrease of salary because of missing head department II) leading up to a deficit of 522 000 DM (cf. Page 2).

Lamotte is interested in understanding reasons for the high currency rates.

Wolz explains that two years in advance decisions need to be made at a time when political implications are difficult to calculate. Schneider points out that the EMS budget takes some of the risk by not counting everything in Euro.

After some deliberation by looking at various currency examples Motel points out that Commission IV will have to deal with this question on Tuesday.

Furthermore it is the synod's responsibility to approve the Annual Statement.

Prakash recommends to Commission IV to discuss how to reach more transparency and accountability since it appears to be extremely difficult to get reports from partner churches.

Schneider addresses the deficit in the guesthouse and the insufficient measures for controlling of the financial department.

The minutes of the meeting of Commission IV on 6 November are disseminated.

Badr points out, that the currency issue regarding JLSS in Lebanon is a DM-Dollar issue and not one of the Lebanese Pound.

Köhler identifies several severe problems besides the exchange problem which need to be discussed not only in Commission IV. He suggests to build up a reserve fund to counterbalance those exchange issues.

Labsch requests a motion on budget discipline. Dinkelaker points out that the system of controlling needs to be improved.

#### MC 03/02

MC takes note of the Annual Accounts 2001 and the Balance Sheet as per 31 December 2001.

The deficit of the Annual Accounts of the year 2001 amounts to DM 521.624,98.

MC agrees to allocate the deficit as follows:

Withdrawal of DM 66.014,00 out of the Reserve Fund on Restructuring (difference of net budgeting of staff inside the cost items Women & Gender and India);

Withdrawal of 33.663,34 out of the Reserve Fund on restructuring for the cost of the organisation development process of EMS;

Withdrawal of DM 405.016,32 out of the Reserve Fund for Differences of Exchange Rate;

Withdrawal of DM 17.487,84 out of the General Reserve Fund for the additional cost of the Volunteers' Programme.

The sum of all these withdrawals amounts to DM 522,172,50, that means it is higher by DM 547,52 than the amount of the deficit. The total cost of all ecumenical co-workers amount to DM 1.204.032,43, which means DM 295.067,57 under the budgeted amount of DM 1.5 Mio. . Therefore the difference of DM 294.520,05 (DM 295.067,57 minus DM 547,52) should be taken out of the General Reserve Fund and the Reserve Fund on Ecumenical Co-Workers should be increased by DM 295.067,57.

The motion is unanimously carried.

#### 12. Appointment of the Head of Department "Communication"

Ms Andrea Seefeld introduces herself by deliberating her ideas on making mission visible. Her CV is available as hand-out.

Aboyage asks for reason why she did not teach despite her training. Lamotte inquires the begin of her availability as March 1, 2003. Labsch is interested to know her view on current challenges. Seefeld wants to empower the work of mission by exploring options for online funding, networking in internet, expanding contacts to journalists.

Badr misses international experience in her presentation. Seefeld reports on various private trips and several stays in overseas.

Suanda asks why she switched from EKD to EMS? Seefeld replies with staff problems there.

Prakash wants to understand her commitment whether she sees EMS as a company. Seefeld replies by saying that church is her home.

Batti is interested to know the kind of EMS profile she wants to communicate. Seefeld addresses the forum for ecumenical learning.

Hildebrandt-Rambe asks for her view on EMS strengths and weaknesses. Seefeld addresses the product range, layout profile and corporate identity (design) as areas where some work needs to be done.

Mayer reports on Seefeld's expertise and competence visible in churchwomen structures in Württemberg where due to her competence three women's institutions were able to develop a joint internet portal. Quack also knows about good experiences in cooperating with Mrs. Seefeld.

Badr suggests for prospective appointment procedures that the respective person should have a chance to be present for a longer time.

Seefeld leaves the room.

MC 04/02            MC appoints Ms. Andrea Seefeld as head of the Department "Communication" by 28 votes in favour, 2 abstentions and no rejections.

Motel reports to Seefeld on her appointment and wishes her God's blessings for her new responsibility. Köhler makes a general statement by saying that this is the first time to observe how people are appointed. This process seems very inadequate according to the German market. He suggests to discuss it. Motel suggests to mandate the Working Committee to deal with these observations.

### 13 Report of the "Working Group on Theological Guidelines"

Labsch gives an introduction into the Theological Guidelines by delineating some historical developments. Her landmarks refer to 1991 Jerusalem, 1995 International MC, 1998 Rantepao and subsequent consultations. For two years the working group studied church documents and developed themes to be included or further developed in those guidelines. The meaning of the now- called "theological orientation" may contribute to a more recognisable profile of EMS. In 2003 in Chennai, MC will be asked to adopt the final version of the theological orientation.

Motel thanks the working group and highlights that the current version is considered a working paper. Comments and amendments will be included until the next MC. A respective letter will be sent by Dinkelaker to each church/mission regarding their view on content and position/value.

Prakash on behalf of the committee thanks Labsch for her presentation.

### 14. Report on the Basel Mission German Branch

Dinkelaker introduces the work, the written summary to be found in the handout.

The last MC had given the mandate concretely to pursue the integration of Basel Mission German Branch into EMS. During the past years various people worked hard to work out an amended constitution, in mixed committees.

At the General Meeting of Basel Mission German Branch on 26.10.2002 the amended constitution and the new agreements between BMDZ and EMS were accepted. The BMDZ decision has been made in waiting and depending on the approval of the MC.

MC 05/02            MC approves of the agreement between the EMS and the BMDZ, as adopted by the BMDZ General Meeting.  
The motion is carried with 27 votes in favour, 3 abstentions, no rejections.

## Plenary Session III (November 10th 19.00 – 21.00 hrs)

### Roll Call

Delegates:            Habib Badr, Soleman Batti, Eddy Buke, Haewon Chae, Adam Doda, Leo Duan, Susanne Hartmann, Jens Köhler, Cordelia Kopsch, Susanne Labsch, Rainer Lamotte, Dr. Hong Jung Lee, Margret Maier, Tommy Malonda, Hanna Mansour, Derrick Meyer, Herbert Opong, Gideon Pasali, Puna Wela, Dr. Jürgen Quack, Inge Schneider, Dr. Richard Siwu, Sandra Scholz, Klaus Schmid, Dorothea Schweizer, Rev. Nyoman Suanda, Dr. B. P. Sugandhar, Marianne Wagner, Karl-Frieder Walz, Rev. Ms Hiroko Ueda, Frieder Vollprecht, Rev. Eberhard Will,  
As nonvoting Member: Ms Madeleine Strub-Jaccoud

Staff:                    Bernhard Dinkelaker, Lutz Drescher, Manfred Gieche, Hiltraut Link, Andreas Maurer, Gabriele Mayer, Martin Moser, Dr. Surya Prakash, David Tulaar,

Guests:                Batti Jr., Markus Hildebrandt Rambe, Yong-Kyong Yoo, Gerhard Fritz,

Chair:                    Cordelia Kopsch

Apologies: Johannes Stockmeier, Christoph Reichel, Dr. P Knötzele

## 15. Opening

Kopsch opens the meeting with a hymn and prayer.

## 16. Constituting the New Mission Council

Kopsch declares the Mission Council duly constituted and officially opens the meeting. New members are welcomed: Susanne Hartmann, Margret Maier, Dorothea Schweizer, Sandra Scholz, Frieder Vollprecht, Karlfrieder Walz.

## 17. Election of the Vice Chairperson from among the Partner Delegates

Since the Question of the candidate is not yet clear, the election of a vice chairperson from among the Partner delegates is postponed and will be the first topic in the morning.

## 18. Review of the Synod Meeting:

Quack states that the preparation meetings for the new members in Stuttgart, Karlsruhe and Frankfurt have been good. Schweizer is happy about the high number of young people involved. Badr remarks, that the Partners were completely silent and that the concern about the partner churches was expressed through synod members but not by themselves. The question arises, how Partners can get more involved, although they do not have the right to vote. Labsch found the name tags helpful, for Siwu it was the common concern for reconciliation that has brought people together and was in the centre of the synod. Doda through the synod got to know more, what EMS is. Still the Problem of the Block Grants, on which the partner churches depend, has not been addressed. Mansour thanks for the services. Mission has to do more with spirituality than with theology. Meyer asks that the partner delegates receive all the materials that the Synod members receive. It would be good during such a meeting not only to hear about the experiences of the partner churches, but as well of the Member Churches, and what they are struggling with. Dinkelaker explains that all relevant documents are available in both languages. Copies of the EMS Constitutions are distributed to those who do not have one. Mansour tells us, that it was good to have the opportunity to speak. There is a readiness to listen and mission starts with listening. Quack reminds that in the past there were written reports on the Situation of each of the Churches involved, but it was too much paper. Wagner states it would be good to have instead of some reports some symbol that is telling something. Lee looking at the process of voting proposes, that although the Synod President might be elected only by the member churches, it would be good if the partner churches were involved in the election of the Chair and Vice Chairperson of the MC.

## 19. Composition of Commissions

Kopsch explains the way the four commissions are working and what they are dealing with. She emphasises that the commissions are doing the main work. Regarding the composition of the commissions it would be good, if there would be a good mixture of men and women, younger and older people, delegates of member churches and partner churches in each of them. Since we have a new MC, it is not necessary to remain in the same commission as before, but it would be good, to ensure continuity during the next 6 years

### MC 06/02

MC unanimously agrees to the following composition of the four commissions:

Commission I ("Common Witness")

Habib Badr, Sandra Scholz, Susanne Labsch, Dr. Hong Jung Lee, Margret Maier, Dorothea Schweizer, Dr. Richard Siwu, Frieder Vollprecht, Gabriele Mayer, Dr. Surya Prakash

Commission II ("Exchange Programmes")

Dr. Jürgen Quack, Herbert Opong, Karl-Frieder Walz, Soleman Batti, Eddy Buke, Haewon Chae, Susanne Hartmann, Gideon Pasali, Lutz Drescher, Martin Moser, David Tulaar

Commission III ("Structural Co-ordination")

Rainer Lamotte, Cordelia Kopsch, Klaus Schmid, Leo Duan, Dr. P Knötzele, Hanna Mansour, Johannes Stockmaier, Nyoman Suanda, Dr. B. P. Sugandhar Hiltraut Link, Bernhard Dinkelaker, Madeleine Strub-Jaccoud

Commission IV ("Administration and Finance")

Inge Schneider, Derrick Meyer, Jens Köhler, Adam Doda, Tommy Malonda, Puna Wela, Hiroko Ueda, Marianne Wagner, Eberhard Will, Manfred Gieche, Andreas Maurer,

## 20. Report of the working groups on the role of the ecumenical co-workers.

Badr reports that it is important to get a clear picture of the expectations of the sending and receiving churches. There has to be a clear request from the side of the receiving church. The sending churches have interest to have sort of "ambassadors"

and to have people who promote partnership after returning. The receiving churches need somebody who fills a gap. Ecumenical co-workers are a visible presence of the wider fellowship of EMS. Ecumenical co-workers interpret the situation of the receiving church to the sending church. They are bridge builders and sometimes have the task to show around visitors. It's important on the other hand, that they become part of the church and remain not a foreigner working there. It is important that they learn the language. Regarding the evaluation there should be one from the side of the ecumenical co-worker himself but as well from the side of the Institution/Church he has been working in. There have to be standards of evaluation. Some concern was raised about criticism or even moral judgement that's not addressed at the right place. There is some need to develop a spirituality of sending and receiving and to be aware of what it means to live as a stranger in another country.

Labsch reports about the group discussion on the issue of preparation and orientation, what it should mean, what it could mean. Emphasis was laid on the fact that not only the person him/herself has to be prepared, but as well the receiving institution or congregation. In course of the preparation process one should not only get informed about the receiving church, but as well as acquire information about one's own context that might be relevant in the partner churches. There should be a clear job description and terms of agreement between the sending and receiving Churches and the ecumenical co-worker him/herself. Regarding the ecumenical co-worker there should be some supervision/mentoring in the country of service by a person who is not involved in a hierarchy.

Gieche reports from the group that was dealing with the issue of partnership and money. Regarding the huge gap it is difficult to think about partnership, that does not involve some sharing of material resources but still the question arises, where the money is going. Is it used for the structure or for the poor? Transparency is needed. Self-reliance is a goal, but not easy to achieve. It is important to realise which role money plays in the respective cultures and to be aware of the historical background of partnership links. Instead of external control it will be important to strengthen internal accountability.

Drescher reports that with regard to the role of ecumenical co-worker within the framework of EMS the partners are emphasising that all the ecumenical co-workers are in a way related to the churches. They need co-workers who are ready to serve the church neither as spies nor as supervisors. The expectations of the sending and receiving churches have to be clarified before personal is sent. It would be good if the partners (represented through an ecumenical co-worker working in the sending churches) could get involved in the process of preparation. A problem might be, if too much emphasis is laid on the role of a bridge builder, since building bridges means to be related to two sides, and the result might be, that an ecumenical co-worker has no place on either side and nowhere really feels at home. Each person has to have a place to identify with. The problem has a structural dimension as well. The ecumenical co-workers want to be partners in a network of partnership. In which way can their participation be enhanced in the receiving as well as in the sending churches and within EMS structures? The group proposes that there should be a working group to work on this question and to present further proposals to the coming MC.

Plenary Session IV (November 11<sup>th</sup>, 10.00 – 11.00 hrs)

Roll Call:

Present: as above Session III on November 10<sup>th</sup>

Chair: Will

## 21. Election of the Mission Council Vice Chairperson

The partner delegates of the Mission Council have nominated Dr. Richard Siwu for the position of the vice chairperson coming from the ranks of the partner delegates. On application the election will be done by secret ballot. Siwu introduces himself as the Secretary for Ecumenical Relations and as the Vice President of GMIM, and as member of the Mission Council since 1995. He is very much committed to the ecumenical work of the EMS-fellowship.

32 MC members entitled to vote are present, thus a majority of 17 ballots has to be achieved.

MC 07/02 By 27 votes in favour and 5 abstentions MC elects Dr. Richard Siwu as vice chairperson of the Mission Council.

Siwu accepts and takes his place at the presidency table.

## 22. Election of the Working Committee

Born members of the WC are the General Secretary of EMS, the president of the synod, the chairman of the MC, and the Vice Chairperson elected by the EMS Synod.

Dinkelaker gives some explanations about the WC: From 1995 to 1998 the MC met twice a year, then the frequency was reduced to one meeting yearly. Due to the necessities of budget planning each 2<sup>nd</sup> year the MC meeting already takes place in July, thus a gap of 16 months may spread between two MC sessions. Therefore the necessity arose to establish a body for the running tasks between the MC meetings, in which partner churches should also be represented. Thus the so-called Extended Working Committee was established, in which one partner delegate out of each commission participates. The Extended Working Committee meets twice a year, the Working Committee four to five times a year.

The Nomination Committee is established consisting of M. Strub-Jaccoud, R. Lamotte, H. Opong and Lee Hong-Jung.

## 23. Policy Framework

Introduction by Dinkelaker: He refers to the proposal to rename and redefine the core programmes as mentioned in G 08. Referring to the pre-consultation of the partner delegates on November 7<sup>th</sup>, he reports as a result of the group work there that the core programmes should be linked with our vision and mission. He encourages the MC members to lay their various interests and questions openly on the table and to struggle for a common way to the future.

Maurer is glad about the discussion in the synod with regard to the framework as it pointed out important questions and problems. An issue emerging in many reactions by the member and partner churches is the one of the block grants, which means the issue of responsibilities EMS has taken over for churches in the fellowship. He apologises for the technical language of the paper which was caused by the concentration on activities. He underlines the necessity to relate the proposed policy framework to the theological concept of EMS.

Kopsch names the guiding question for the following process: Shall common programmes become the heart of EMS work? She reminds the delegates of the four proposed areas of common programmes (as rephrased in Document G 08):

1. Ecumenical Sharing of Resources in Mission and in Mutual Solidarity
2. Ecumenical-Missionary Learning: Growing in Faith and Witness
3. Services of Ecumenical Co-workers: Crossing Cultures for Joint Witness
4. The Ecumenical Volunteers' Programme: Cross-Cultural Exposures in God's Mission

One aspect of the power point presentation is missing here: Sharing our resources in mission. This task until now has only been performed bilaterally. Another aspect not mentioned yet is that of un-designated funds.

She further explains that if EMS wants to adopt these programmes as the core of its work, it means that bilateral grants will mostly be reduced in favour of multilateral programmes. With regard to the EMS Secretariat it implies a representation of the new programmes within its organisational structure. She draws the attention to the heterogeneous stage of development of the programmes and to the fact that different time tables will have to be set up for their implementation.

All Commissions are asked to present two brief statements and two questions regarding the policy framework as a result of the group work following the plenary session.

## Plenary Session V (November 11<sup>th</sup>, 14.30 – 15.00 hrs)

### Roll Call:

Present: as above session IV on November 11<sup>th</sup>, 10.00 – 11.00 hrs, with apologies from Meier and Hartmann

Chair: Will

Dinkelaker announces the result of the collection in the worship service at the Paulus Church in Hambach: 645,65 e for the Schneller Schools.

## 24. Results of the Commissions' Work on the Policy Framework

The presented questions and statements of the Commissions are viewed. The following are named:

- What is the future of the non-designated funds to the partner churches?
- We see the need for discussing a new kind of common witness, but it should be within the present administrative structure of area liaison desks.
- What means common witness through mutual solidarity? Strub-Jaccoud answers: The question is: How do we outline common criteria for our programmes? For the member churches this means: How are we able to practise advocacy? For the partner churches it means: How are we able to practise advocacy for the churches in Europe?
- We need more information about what the block grants are needed for. We need the entire picture about who receives what as a basis for future decisions. We also need to have all information about the means and priorities within the member churches concerning their contributions to EMS. We then need common criteria agreed upon in EMS as a whole.
- We are prepared for change, but we need time to adjust.
- We are not yet clear about the implications of the change.
- Do we get professional help? Check-back: What is meant by the question? It was raised in Commission IV and aims to point out that some churches will need help to converse their organization structure according to the new guidelines.
- The EVP is financed for a period of five years. How will it continue? Are there new funds? Dinkelaker answers that a new decision has to be taken at the end of this period whether the Programme continues to find priority or not. Besides some means could be provided for the programme out of reserve funds.

Further statements and questions:

- Partner churches should be urged to express their needs in missiological language.
- Not only mutual solidarity should be a goal, but also mutual challenge.
- How do we respond to all the needs while still maintaining the prevailing structure?
- How do we come to a consensus in identifying priorities by partners and members?
- What can we contribute as partner churches to the fellowship?

During the Commissions' work in the afternoon the four core programmes shall be defined more precisely. What could be the content of these programmes? What is our churches' interest in each of them? This shall serve to get a more specific picture of the programmes. Secondly a ranking of the programmes should be made. No consensus within the commissions has to be reached, only an atmospheric picture is required.

## Plenary Session VI (November 11<sup>th</sup>, 17.30 – 18.00 hrs)

### Roll Call

Present: as above session V on November 11<sup>th</sup>, 14.30 – 15.00 hrs)

Chair: Will

## 25. Results of the Commissions' Work on the Policy Framework on Wall Sheets

### Comm. I

Mayer reports: From a theological point of view the most important aim is mutual solidarity and sharing of resources. Programme 1: Sharing resources in mission in a political, economic, personal, spiritual, even prophetic and ecclesial dimension. 2. Education Programme: The contextual aspect is important, more than gospel in culture - education interdenominational and interreligious. EMS should promote contextual theological partnership. 3. EVP: Young women shall be promoted by this Programme. How can we promote special groups through this? 4. Exchange Programmes: Long term exchange is very important. The physical presence is still very important. Ecumenical Co-workers as ambassadors of EMS who can strengthen or weaken it. In their lifestyle messages of EMS are incorporated.

Ranking: Mutual solidarity 6 points  
Education 6 points  
EVP 5 points  
Exchange 5 points

## Comm. II

Quack reports: It was not quite clear to the group if the implementation of 4 core programmes would mean the closing of the liaison desks respectively a complete change of structures. It was further not clear if the aim of team visits should be only crisis management or if it could also be prevention or restoration. It was said that this support should not get high priority because other church organisations are catering for it. The Education Programme includes too many different items, this makes a ranking difficult. The EVP cannot yet be ranked as it has not been evaluated until now. The Commission stresses on the example of the Exchange Programmes that partner churches also give their contribution to programmes that often is not indicated in the budget.

Ranking: Mutual solidarity 4 points  
Education 3 points  
EVP 2 points  
Exchange 6 points  
Bilateral grants 6 points

## Comm. III

Kopsch reports that the Commission tried to define what is meant by mutual solidarity. To the Commission it means the provision of instruments, not of funds. We must take care not only to give long term priorities of commitment, but also to be able to react quickly to ongoing processes. Ecumenical learning in the Commission's definition prepares and enables exchange. Two instruments for ecumenical learning were stressed: Ecumenical co-workers and theological exchange at NEST and in Japan. The commission proposes to regard Ecumenical Education and Exchange Programmes as one core programme.

Ranking: Mutual solidarity 7 points  
Education 3,5 points  
EVP 4 points  
Exchange 2,5 points  
Bilateral grants 4 points

## Comm. IV

Köhler reports: Mutual Solidarity has got the highest priority, Exchange and Ecumenical Education are on position 2, then comes EVP. There is a lot of interest among the partner churches in mutual exchange. Therefore the information about processes and activities within the fellowship have to be provided faster and to be spread more widely to really inform the community about what's happening. The commission remarks that the process towards programmes as the heart of EMS means a big step forward. It suggests to think carefully about the next small steps to be done.

Ranking: Mutual solidarity 8 points  
Education 7 points  
EVP 5 points  
Exchange 7 points  
Bilateral grants 6 points

Kopsch points out that on Tuesday the decision will be taken on how the decision making process on the policy guidelines will be continued.

## Plenary Session VII (November 12<sup>th</sup>, 14.00 –17.40 hrs)

### Roll Call:

**Present:** as above session V on November 11<sup>th</sup>, 17.30 – 18.00 hrs,

Chair: C. Kopsch

## 26. Election of members of the Working Committee

Lamotte introduces the nominated candidates. Born Members are the chairpersons of MC, the President of the Synod and the General secretary.

The election is being carried out according to EMS constitution §9,1c. Candidates have to live in Germany.

The candidates are Susanne Labsch (Protestant Church of Baden), Jürgen Quack (Protestant Church of Württemberg), Frieder Vollprecht (Moravian Church/HMH), Jens Köhler (Protestant Church of Hesse-Nassau), Dorothea Schweizer (Basel Mission).

Quack voices that he is glad to see that so many different churches and mission societies, actually all but the Schneller Society are going to be represented. As the number of members is limited, there is no possibility for a representation of the Schneller Association. Lamotte points out that through these candidates all commissions would be represented. Labsch informs that nobody with legal expertise had been nominated, but experts could be co-opted when needed.

MC 08/02 With 25 votes in favour and 3 abstentions, MC elects Labsch, Quack, Vollprecht, Köhler and Schweizer as members of the Working Committee.

Dates for the meetings will be agreed upon later on.

## 27. Partner Delegates to the Extended Working Committee

Information on the partner delegates as representatives to the extended Working Committee in the commissions, as proposed by the respective commissions:

Commission I:	Badr
Commission II:	Opong
Commission III:	CSI is requested to nominate a candidate
Commission IV:	Meyer

## 28. Report of Commission IV

Based on the minutes of Commission IV on 12 November, the report is presented by Köhler.

### 28.1 Replacement and completion of the computer system and wiring system

The commission discussed the problem of the stability of the computer system in the Secretariat, requiring a new wiring system in 2003. Outsourcing of the EDP services would mean that all or part of the service would be provided by the church administration of the Protestant Church of Württemberg.

MC 09/02 MC agrees to finance the wiring with e 110.300€ out of the reserve fund for office equipment.  
It supports the proposal of Commission IV of partly or fully outsourcing of services, as this will reduce the cost.  
The motion is unanimously carried.

### 28.2 Immobile Properties: Purchase of Basel Mission Properties Vogelsangstrasse 62, 66 and 66a

MC 10/02 MC will decide in July 2003 about the purchase of the buildings in Vogelsangstr. 62, 66 and 66A.  
The secretariat is asked to present a separate full cost calculation including maintenance, taxes, etc.  
Apart from that a calculation for the purchase of the office building Vogelsangstr. 62 alone shall be tabled before the next meeting.  
An estimate of the development of the costs for renting the buildings shall be provided.  
The motion is unanimously carried.

### 28.3 Handling fees

Köhler explains that handling donations can mean a lot of work for the secretariat. Therefore a deduction should be made from donations according to the work required to process them.

Badr says that this becomes more and more common. Do donors need to be informed? Then they might be upset. He asks why the motion talks of 10% as the Secretariat at the same time is requested to work out a scale. Köhler responds that the 10 percent refer to the maximum that should be taken. Other institutions take up to 15%. Labsch: There is a German fundraising scale that indicates how much can be deducted from donations as handling fees by organizations. Dinkelaker asks whether this refers only to donations outside the EMS-budget? Gieche: Not only, e.g. the mailing on HIV had a tremendous result, yet high expenses, but nothing could be deducted so far. Dinkelaker notes that it is important that donations by congregations would not be effected. Labsch: The Working Committee could inform donors that 7% will be deducted in future. Köhler suggests that when a new project is being set up the amount can be named from the beginning. Schweizer suggests that the maximum deduction should be 5-7%. Badr sees 10% as very little, as others take up to 25%. Köhler says that as Commission IV did not have a real calculation yet, it suggested to deduct up to 10%.

MC 11/02 MC authorizes the secretariat to deduct up to 10% handling fees from donations according to a scale to be worked out by the secretariat and approved by the Working Committee.  
The motion is being carried with 3 abstentions.

#### 28.4 Trust and Transparency in Payments to Partner Churches

Köhler introduces Motion 5 on the auditing of Indonesian churches. The Memorandum of Understanding that was adopted by MC in 1999 improved transparency and accountability. It works well almost everywhere. As the Indonesian Churches have difficulties with the auditing of their balance sheets, it is suggested that PGI, the Indonesian Church Council, will do this and will be paid for this through the existing contribution of EMS to PGI.

Tulaar informs MC that the contribution indicated on page 20 of the balance sheet goes to Eukumindo. The other contributions contribute to programmes of institutions. All are bilateral programs. Kopsch notes that no other parts of the budget are affected. It does not affect other contributions to Indonesia. Will argues that as 197.000 e are being channeled to PGI or through PGI it should be possible to find funds within this amount to pay for the auditing. Prakash says that as normally EMS expects auditing by an independent auditor, such a decision should explicitly be put as an exception and limited in time. Batti answers that he does not any longer feel that he is representing a partner church when he reads this. If a person from the PGI will be asked to do all this, the Indonesian Churches will not be able to meet the time. Also the churches have the staff to do the audit. It should be defined who would be able to do a true audit. Will responds by saying that according to the regulations in the Memorandum of Understanding every EMS Partner Church needs to be audited by an independent auditor. MC understands that the Indonesian Churches do have difficulties with this. As high costs might be involved MC, would agree that an auditor from PGI would be paid by EMS to do this. But an audit from outside is being needed for transparency reasons. Batti responds that his question still stands: Are we partners or just receivers? Kopsch answers that the regulations of EMS have been accepted by Member and Partner Churches. This is an attempt to deal with the special situation in Indonesia. Köhler adds that this was not suggesting a new regulation but is an attempt to help the Indonesian Churches to meet an agreement that has already been agreed upon.

Kopsch suggests that the proposed procedure could be applied until the year 2006, and then it should be evaluated. She proposes to amend Motion 5 accordingly.

MC 12/02 MC accepts as an exception from the regular procedures the auditing of Indonesian Partner Churches through PGI until the year 2006. The cost of the auditing shall be covered by the EMS contributions to PGI.  
The motion is carried with 4 abstentions.

Referring to Motion 6, Köhler explains that the motion deals with the issue what to do with accruals coming from contributions that could not be transferred due to the fact that Partner Churches did not meet the requirements of the Memorandum of Understanding of. Prakash asks whether this would also apply, if there were difficulties that are not due to the partner churches. Köhler responds that such cases would not be touched. Kopsch adds, as the partner churches are informed when ever money is transferred, the churches concerned are required to inform the Secretariat in case the money doesn't arrive.

MC 13/02 MC is in line with the memorandum 1999.  
In case the required balance sheet is not sent within 12 months after closing the financial year accruals will be returned to the general budget.  
In case the required receipt of payment is not sent within six months, one quarterly payment goes back to the general budget being implemented as from 1<sup>st</sup> of January 2003.  
The motion is carried unanimously.

#### 28.5 Exchange Rate in the Payments to Partners

Introducing Motion 7 Köhler explains the problem of the deficit that is caused by the fact that EMS always bears the exchange risk when money is transferred to Partner Churches. In cases when the local currency rate increased towards the German currency, the secretariat used to transfer higher amounts in order to meet the amount budgeted in local currencies. In case a currency got weaker towards the Euro, usually transfers have been made in the German currency. Thus the EMS budget has always been affected negatively. The aim of the motion is to fill up the EMS currency reserve fund that would also in future be used only for such cases. Badr suggests that if we want to think as partners we should keep the surplus from exchange rate gains. Köhler responds that such situations are usually accompanied by inflation in the respected countries which usually increases the need of money.

MC 14/02 MC agrees to deduct 2% from the block grants to be deposited in the reserve fund for currency exchange risk as from the budget 2004/05 onwards in order to cover the currency exchange risk and carry it mutually.  
The motion is carried unanimously.

## 28.6 EMS Budget 2004/5

Introducing Motion 8 Köhler explains that this motion deals with the EMS budgetary situation as of the year 2004. In 2002 there is a planned deficit of 635000 EUR in the EMS budget, in 2003 it amounts to 786.000 EUR. At the same time the member churches indicate that due to the difficult budgetary situation in these churches a 10% cut in contributions to EMS is to be expected in the year 2004. Altogether in 2004 this would amount to a total deficit of about 1Mio EUR in a budget of 7,5Mio EUR. He explains that the commission did not feel in a position to come up with a first advice for the budget 2004/5 at this point. The help of all is needed as indicated in the motion.

MC 15/02 MC agrees that information on the budgets of partner churches and the use of EMS grants by the partner churches shall be submitted to the Secretariat by 15<sup>th</sup> of January 2003. The WC is mandated to develop criteria for the distribution of bilateral grants in the future. A sub-commission of the finance commission shall be mandated to look into the budget for "creative cuts" and prepare different options for the budget 2004/05. Commission IV shall deliberate on the proposals before the MC 2003.  
The motion is carried unanimously.

Kopsch thanks Köhler and Commission IV for their work and the helpful explanations. The commission had to address complicated matters which required time to deal with.

## 29. Report of Commission I

Based on the minutes of Commission I on November 12<sup>th</sup> the report is presented by Mayer. She explains that the first three motions of Commission I deal with the recommendations made by the International Women's Consultation in Lebanon in April 2002.

### 29.1 World Day of Prayer

MC 16/02 Mission Council acknowledges the important contribution of women in the EMS fellowship for ecumenical endeavors of EMS.  
The motion is carried unanimously.

### 29.2 Decade of Overcoming Violence

Motion 2 is being introduced. Prakash points out that the motion refers to all forms of violence, not only to violence against women as indicated in the recommendation. The motion is amended accordingly.

MC 17/02 Within the decade of overcoming violence the Mission Council urges partners and members to create more awareness about all forms of violence within the churches and therefore asks to initiate and to continue training for overcoming violence especially against women.  
The motion is carried unanimously.

### 29.3 Follow Up to the Women's Consultation

Mayer points out that Motion 3 refers to the follow up work of the women's consultation. Doda: This idea is very important, but it needs to be a special fund because we do not have funds in our budgets. Mayer points out that there are two ideas behind the motion: More transparency concerning funds and to make sure that money meant for women really reaches them.

MC 18/02 The Treasurer Consultation 2003 shall discuss the topic of "giving attention to provide funds for women's programs in every EMS church."  
MC mandates the Working Committee to explore follow up in all forms with the Lebanon consultation. Therefore the reports requested in January 2003 by all members and partners (regarding the implementation of the recommendations) shall be presented to the next MC and Synod meetings in 2003.  
The motion is carried unanimously.

### 29.4 Theme of the Year 2003

Mayer introduces Motion 4 according to suggestions of a preparatory group. Quack voices that if this was meant to be the wording of the theme he would be against it. But it could indicate a direction. Kopsch answers that this was how it was meant. Badr explains that "intercontextuality" means "in contexts" and "between contexts". It might be a new word.

MC 19/02 MC adopts the following theme for the year 2003: "Signs of missio dei today".  
It should be unfolded inter-contextually in the following aspects:  
1. Mission, 2. Bible, 3. Community, etc  
The motion is carried with 1 abstention.

#### 29.5 Gender Issues as a Cross-Cutting Task

Mayer points out that Motion 5 refers to the document "Gender Issues as a Cross-cutting Task". Creative ways need to be found to deal with it as the task has been increased while the desk has been reduced. Dinkelaker informs that Commission III also dealt with that question and would recommend not yet to install an advisory board. (Item 10 in the minutes of Com III). Kopsch asks whether this would cover the interest of Commission I. Labsch answers that she thought so as also the Theological Orientation and the Policy Framework should be considered. When the position was created, one primarily thought of Gender Issues. This should be discussed again. Doda adds as a matter of information that in Indonesia the churches will start a gender training with help of the EMS Secretariat. Badr points out that it was the intention of the commission to make sure that the Working Committee will deal with it and will present a progress report at the next MC meeting. Kopsch suggests that Dinkelaker will incorporate this into the recommendation of Commission III and Motion 5 would thus be withdrawn.

#### 29.6 EMS Project of the Year 2003

Mayer introduces Motion 6 by referring to Document I,3.

##### MC 20/02

As the EMS project of the year 2003 MC adopts the diaconal work of the Episcopal Church in Jerusalem and the Middle East, especially in the health sector and in particular the work with traumatised children.  
The motion is carried unanimously.

#### 29.7 Theological Orientation

Mayer informs that the Theological Orientation had been reviewed by the commission.

Motion 7 is being introduced. Labsch informs that the persons referred to are Schweizer, Vollprecht, Labsch, Maier and Badr. The motion is amended saying: "the members of the Extended Working Committee from Comm. I". Quack asks whether there is to be a long and a short version. Mayer answers positively. Prakash points out that the group that worked on it was thanked and it was referred to WC to see who will continue to work on it. He asks whether a new group could be constituted. Labsch answers that it was not feasible to constitute a new group between now and July 2003. Kopsch also agrees that in order to have a result by June 2003 it does not make sense to form an entirely new group. Labsch adds that the process was not to be redone. The document was being received and now there were three specific tasks to be done. Kopsch explains that the idea was that a sub-commission of Commission I would fulfill this task and suggests the amendment: "MC mandates a sub-commission of Commission I"

Quack asks that reactions from Member and Partner Churches should be included. Drescher suggests that the task to add responses from churches should be added.

Kopsch amends accordingly.

##### MC 21/02

MC receives the document "Theological Orientation" and thanks for the work done by the members of the working group.

MC mandates a sub-commission of Commission I:

- To furnish the text as a shorter version in order to promote further dialogue within the EMS congregations
- To sharpen the actual version in view of distinctive aspects of the EMS fellowship
- To include the biblical foundation of the Hebrew Scriptures
- To take into account the implications of the theological orientation for the policy frame work to present this to the following MC for adoption.

The motion is carried unanimously.

#### 29.8 Reformed.Online

Mayer introduces motion 8. Prakash: It should read "most of the partner churches".

Mayer: "...theol exchange and news" should be added. Ueda: UCCJ in Japan is a United Church, it is not reformed. Why do you only talk about reformed churches. Kopsch: The interest is to use reformed-online as an instrument of information. The amendment suggested by Prakash should be added.

Labsch: reformed-online is not confessionalistic. Lee: The interest of reformed-online cannot be limited to reformed churches only. I also carry the rewording. Prakash: Who will report to MC? Is that necessary? We leave this as an open forum. Badr: A report on the possible benefits could be given. Kopsch: Perhaps the General Secretary will bring this issue up in his report to MC.

##### MC 22/02

MC seeing that most of the partners belong to the reformed tradition urges the Working Committee to explore further possibilities of collaboration between EMS and reformed-online in the field of theological exchange and news and to give a report to the Mission Council in 2003.  
The vote is carried with 2 abstentions.

Mayer remarks that the Commission dealt with a report from the WCC and the recommendations of the consultation on reconciliation in India, which can be found in the minutes.

### 30. Report of Commission II

Quack by introducing the motions announces that the complete minutes will be issued later.

#### 30.1 Ecumenical Co-Workers

Quack refers to a paper on the role of ecumenical co-workers available in the Secretariat.

MC 23/02 MC sets up a task group for principles of the role and service of ecumenical co-workers. The task group will present a proposal to the Mission Council in 2003. The members are:  
Jürgen Quack (Chairperson Comm. II)  
Hiltraut Link (Preparation Course)  
Lutz Drescher (Secretary Commission II)  
Two Returnees: Ulrich Rapp and Dr. Rolf Noormann (will be asked)  
An ecumenical co-worker in Germany: Yunita Lasut (will be asked)  
The motion is carried unanimously

#### 30.2 Staffing List of ecumenical co-workers

Quack reports on the dealing of the Commission with the staffing list for ecumenical co-workers. Many posts have not yet been filled. But the good news is that PCK decided to take part in the financing of the Indian social worker who is to work in Korea. We are grateful and think that means should be found to express this in the budget.

Amendment: "Amity Foundation" instead of "Christian Council"

MC 24/02 a) MC agrees to advertise the post of a pastor from a member church for the replacement of Rev. Peter Fleckenstein in the Presbyterian Church of Ghan as district pastor.  
b) MC agrees to the extension of the contract of Ms. Renate Kleinhenz in China, if the Amity Foundation and Ms. Kleinhenz ask for the extension.  
The motion is carried unanimously. unanimously

#### 30.3 Healing and Reconciliation

The Motion is introduced by Quack. Kopsch asks whether the representatives of the churches concerned agree to the motion. Quack agrees. Köhler asks whether this already means a decision on the budget 2004/5.

After a discussion on the wording the motion is amended as follows:

MC 25/02 MC welcomes the plan of Korean and German working groups of EMS on the process of Healing, Reconciliation and Reunification in Korea and Germany. MC agrees that the cost for a process of three years in Germany and Korea with annually about e 9.000 will be taken from the block grants for PCK and PROK.  
The motion is carried with 5 votes against.

#### 30.4 Trilateral Partnership

The person referred to in motion 4 should be part of the list of ecumenical co-workers of EMS, and the liaison secretary should be included in the evaluation.

MC 26/02 MC welcomes the trilateral partnership between the Yong-Deong-Po Presbytery in PCK, the Volta Preybatery in PCG and the Church of the Palatinate. MC welcomes the plan of the Yong-Deong-Po Presbytery to send an ecumenical co-worker on their own expenses to Volta Presbytery. The EMS Secretariat will give administrative support to this exchange (e.g. visit by the liaison secretary and involvement in the process of evaluation).  
The motion is carried unanimously

Kopsch thanks Quack and the Commission.

### 31. Report of Commission III

Based on the minutes of Commission III on November 12<sup>th</sup>, the report is presented by Dinkelaker.

### 31.1 EMS Policy Framework

MC 26/02 MC agrees to the following steps to continue the work on an EMS Policy Framework:

1. The Working Committee shall work out proposals for the EMS budget 2004/5 before the Treasurers' Consultation to be held in June 2003 in India, based on the discussion at the present MC meeting and on the outcome of the meeting of finance secretaries of the EMS member churches in April 2003.
2. The partner churches shall be asked to give further detailed information on the utilisation of bilateral grants from the EMS budget by 15 January 2003.
3. A committee comprising C. Kopsch, D. Tulaar, A. Maurer and B. Dinkelaker shall work on the papers presented so far and present a new draft of the proposed policy framework.

The motion is carried unanimously.

### 31.2 Appointment of the Head of Department I ("Mission and Partnership")

Reichel had indicated not to take this position again, but after conversations with the MC chairperson he agreed to continue for an interim period. The Working Committee has already discussed possibilities for a permanent position.

MC 27/02 MC appoints Rev. Christoph Reichel as head of department for an interim period until July 2003. MC shall then appoint a permanent head of department. The Secretariat and the Working Committee shall work out proposals.

The motion is carried unanimously.

### 31.3 Appointment of the Deputy General Secretary

Dinkelaker explains that the term of office has usually been two years, but as Prakash's service ends only 9 month later, the Commission recommends to appoint him until then.

MC 28/02 MC appoints Rev. Dr. Surya Prakash as Deputy General Secretary until the end of his contract as India Liaison Secretary.

The motion is carried unanimously.

Mayer thanks Link and Reichel for their services as members of the Management Board.

### 31.4 Appointment of a new Secretary for Ecumenical-Missionary Learning/Youth in 2003

Link will leave the Secretariat in summer 2003. In order to avoid a vacancy the Commission tables the following motion:

MC 29/02 MC mandates the Working Committee to appoint a new Secretary for Ecumenical-Missionary Learning/Youth. Before advertising the position, the Working Committee shall evaluate the work of the desk and shall review and reshape the job description on the basis of the debate on an EMS Policy Framework.

The motion is carried unanimously

### 31.5 Renewal respectively extension of the contracts of the Middle East and Indias Liaison Secretaries

Dinkelaker introducing the motion refers to the MC decisions in Rantepao according to which 25% of the position of the Middle East Liaison Secretary is borne by the Württ Church (for the EVS Secretariat) and 25% of the India Liaison Secretary's position is taken care of by the structural reserve fund. Badr thanks Maurer for his work and indicates that NEC would be prepared to contribute 25% to the post from its block grant, in case the Württemberg Church would not continue to provide the required funds.

MC 30/02

1. Upon application by the Protestant Society for the Schneller Schools (EVS) and the Middle Eastern partner churches, the MC renews the contract of Rev. Andreas Maurer as Middle East Liaison Secretary and as Secretary of the Protestant Society for the Schneller schools (75% employment, 50% covered by the EMS budget, 25% by a subsidy), expiring at the end of 2003, for a second term of office of six years until 2009.
2. MC renews the contract of Rev. Dr. Surya Prakash (75% employment, 50% covered by the EMS budget, 25% by the Structural Adjustment Reserve Fund), expiring at the end of 2004, until 31 August 2005, with the provision of the approval by the CSI Synod Office.

The motion is carried unanimously.

### 31.6 Appointment of members of the EMS Synod

Dinkelaker informs that the Commission felt that more criteria are needed on who to co-opt to the Synod. The MC could co-opt further members in July next year before the next synod meeting.

Schweitzer asks what does the word "co-opt" mean? Dinkelaker and Kopsch explain that the MC has the right to co-opt synod delegates as voting members who could represent specific perspectives and bring in their experience. Quack expresses regret for the fact that Prof. Sundermaier is no more a member of Synod. Kopsch replies that it is intended to find someone like him.

#### MC 31/02

In accordance with a decision by the MC in 2001, MC co-opts Ms Luise Germer and Ms Antje Kaasch as representatives of the Youth Network/Ecumenical Volunteers' Programme as Synod members (EMS Constitution §4).  
Before further decisions on co-opting Synod members will be taken, the Working Committee shall discuss criteria and present proposals.  
Rev. Regina Schoch as representative of the Womens' Advisory Council and a representative of the Swiss Society for the Schneller schools shall be invited as guests.  
The motion is carried unanimously.

#### 31.7 EMS Foundation

Dinkelaker reports that the establishment of an EMS Foundation as a long term perspective was discussed by the Commission. A foundation could become an asset in future, after starting with a small capital. It is not a matter of a decision to be taken now, but the Commission recommends to mandate the Working Committee to work out a proposal to enable the MC to take a decision in July 2003. Badr asks about the rules for foundations in Germany. Dinkelaker replies that all depends on the constitution of a foundation that could be formulated according to EMS constitution. Gieche refers to similar rules in the USA.

Recommendation: The Commission III recommends to the MC to pursue the proposal of establishing an EMS Foundation, to consider to start with a minimal capital in 2004/5, and to mandate the Working Committee to work out a draft constitution to be presented to the MC in July 2003.

MC welcomes the recommendation.

#### 31.8 Women and Gender

Dinkelaker introduces the recommendation of Commission III and refers to Documents G09 and G 10 and to Motion 5 of Commission I (Item 29.5).

Recommendation: Commission III expresses its appreciation for the work of Ms Gabriele Mayer, Ph.D., but sees no possibility to positively respond to the request to give more human power to the EMS Women and Gender Desk (Recommendations of the Women's Consultation p.3), as within the budgetary limitations staff positions in the Secretariat cannot be extended. Referring to Doc. G 10, the Commission asks Gabriele Mayer to present some concrete ideas and projects to implement the proposal of gender issues as a cross-cutting task.

The Commission recommends to the Working Committee to evaluate the experience of the Women and Gender Desk, since Gabriele Mayer assumed office in September 2001. A progress report shall be submitted to the MC in 2003.

MC welcomes the recommendation.

Kopsch thanks Dinkelaker and the Commission.

#### 32. Preparation for the Treasurers' Consultation and the MC in India July 2003

Prakash informs that the CSI will be welcoming the treasurers in Mangalore in the region where the work of BM started in 1832. MC will take place in Chennai, formerly Madras, which is accessible through almost all international airlines. A small committee in the EMS Secretariat is preparing for the Treasurers' Consultation. Arrival should be on the 21<sup>st</sup> of June 2003, the opening will take place with a church service on the 22<sup>nd</sup>.

#### 33. Information on travel arrangements

Moser gives information on the travel arrangements for MC members leaving by train.

#### 34. Closing

With a brief vote of thanks Kopsch officially closes the meeting at 17.40 hrs.

#### 35. Closing Devotion

The closing devotion is held in the chapel of the Sacred Heart Monastery.

Stuttgart ,.....

Lutz Drescher  
Christine Grötzinger  
Andreas Maurer  
Gabriele Mayer  
Christoph Reichel  
Bernhard Dinkelaker  
Recording Secretaries

Cordelia Kopsch  
Chairperson