

MINUTES OF THE WORLD SUBUD COUNCIL MEETING

CHRISTCHURCH 3rd and 4th JANUARY 2010

ATTENDEES:

WSA Chairlady..... Osanna Vaughn
WSA Deputy Chair..... Frederic Richard
ISC/WSA Exec. Officer..... Garrett Thomson
ISC/WSA Exec.Vice-Chair Maya Bernardes
WSA Treasurer..... Samuel Simonsson
WSA Secretary Julia Hurd
External Relations Coord.... Amalia Rasheed

Zonal Representatives:

Zone 1/2..... Renata Peek
Zone 3..... Reinbrand Visman
Zone 4..... Valentin Willecke
Zone 5/6..... Lateef Dada Bashua
Zone 7..... Luke Penseny
for Mariamah Flores
Zone 8..... Machrus Garces
Zone 9..... Elisa Sanchez
Caballero

International Helpers:

Area I: Asmaniah Fraval, Judy Gibb, Robert
Goonetilleke, Dahlan Simpson
Area II: Heloise Jackson, Farah Czwiernia,

Hamidah Jelman, Andrew Holloway, Jorge Guerin,
Lavasir Nordrum

Area III: Dorotea de Arenas, Sarah Becker,
Shoshanah Margolin, Emmanuel Aronie, Paul
Roberge, Mattheus Kaslan

Affiliate and Activity Coordinators:

SDIA Chairman.....Sharifin Gardiner
SICA ChairpersonOlivia Moyano
SYAI CoordinatorRhyana Blakeley\
SES ChairpersonSachlan Fraval
SIHA CoordinatorMaxwell Fraval
MSF Chair.....Olvia Reksodipoetro

Others :

Incoming Zone 9 Rep.....Mauricio Castillo
SDIA EDVirginia Thomas
Education Fund CoordKumari Beck

Apologies:

Area I International Helper:
Raina McKechnie
WSA Accountant:
Leonard van Willenswaard

1. WSC reviewed the attached agenda and schedule for the Congress. There was a review of how the zone councils function at Congress and how they interact with the working parties. Specific dates were assigned for the WSC meetings including the meeting with MSF and the SDIA boards.

2. Samuel gave a brief financial report for the WSA, which included the most up-to-date Congress budget and projections. Samuel reported that there had been a very recent donation of USD 207,000 from the BSBRAT.

3. Garrett reported that he had written to the WSC asking the WSC to approve a conditional grant from the WSA to Subud RD Congo for USD 15,000 towards the purchase of a Subud house in Kinshasa. (Letter attached GT.998). The grant would be conditional on MSF approving a grant from MSF to RD Congo for the remaining amount of around USD 40,000 and on Subud RD Congo satisfying all the conditions of the MSF. The grant was approved from WSA for USD 15,000 subject to these conditions.

4. The attached draft MOU between SDIA and WSA was discussed with members of the Board of Trustees of SDIA present (attachment GT.987 version 7).

5. It was agreed that clause 10 with regard to cooperating for fundraising would be reworded after the Congress working party had come to an agreement about joint international fundraising.

6. Clauses 13, 16 and 17 were noted as problematic and it was agreed that Amalia Rasheed and Valentin Willecke and two members of the SDIA team would work on rewording these clauses possibly as a preamble to the MOU. What was needed was to define what the affiliation of SDIA to WSA meant and what its purpose was.

7. There was some discussion of the need for a single three-way MOU between WSA-MSF and SDIA.

8. SDIA had asked for core funding from MSF and this needs approval of the WSA directors in their joint meeting with the MSF board later during the Congress. Virginia said that it made more sense for MSF to fund the service costs of SDIA than to fund projects directly, given that SDIA has developed ways to monitor its support for projects.

9. Garrett reported on the recent letter that explains the proposal to Congress with regard to the Wisma Subud Heritage project. Garrett explained that the WSA was supporting the process initiated by local stakeholders but without financial liabilities from the WSA. It was agreed that it was important to consider alternatives to UNESCO heritage status as ways of preserving the integrity of Wisma Subud.

10. There was a discussion of the relative merits of the proposals for the 2014 Congress. It was reported that Subud Indonesia wanted to propose Rungan Sari to host the 2014 Subud World Congress, but that no actual proposal had yet been received. It was agreed to postpone the discussion until Garrett had spoken with the delegates from Indonesia in order to ascertain whether there was a proposal or not.

11. It was agreed that the meeting of the incoming and outgoing WSC could focus on the following themes:

- a) How the outgoing team worked harmoniously
- b) Lessons learned from the period
- c) Limitations of our work

It was agreed to have sharing sessions in smaller groups, mixed by function.

12. The attached draft MOU between WSA and MSF (dated 19th December 2009) was presented. The following amendments were approved:

For zone 9 the document should not mention the issue of the WSA board of Directors because this is a distinct issue that needs to be discussed independently of the MOU.

For zone 4, the phrase “subject to consultation with national bodies” needs to be added twice to the section on fundraising. Subud Germany has sent a proposal in this regard.

Countries of zone 4 insist that the WSA Board has the right to dismiss the MSF board.

There is an inconsistent wording: sometimes the document refers to the branches of MSF and sometimes to the affiliates of MSF. It was noted that the word ‘partner’ has legal validity.

To grants: “The MSF board and officers will consult with the relevant members of the WSC and WSA executive and with the Subud national body when...” add ‘WSA affiliate’

In the document there are a few references to the future formation of an MSF executive. Since this is already formed, the wording needs to be altered.

In the implementation section, it needs to be clear that the MSF bylaws cannot be changed until the Subud World Congress of 2014.

13. It was agreed that the new version including the above amendments would be circulated to the zone councils for zonal input.

14. Garrett reported on the WSA archives. The original audio tapes were supposed to be moved to Memnon, a professional archive service in Belgium, for evaluation towards the beginning of December but a series of miscommunications had prevented this. A new date will be set with the Sillem’s for the move.

15. The attached WSA mission statement was discussed (GT. 980 version 6). The following changes were suggested:

- a) There was some discussion as to whether WSA was an umbrella organization. It was agreed that the wording could be “an encompassing network organization”
- b) The meaning of Susila Budhi Dharma could be added
- c) The idea that Subud is open to all people irrespective of sexual orientation
- d) The negative claims can be replaced with positives
- e) Rather than ‘exercise’ we could use the words ‘inner training’ and ‘spiritual practice’
- f) In some regards, WSA is a service organization, although it is not only that
- g) The document could include the idea of human talent
- h) At certain points, the document is too tentative
- i) With regard to the phrasing about a peaceful world, the wording is too pretentious
- j) The last paragraph could be put earlier under the mission title
- k) Need the idea that the WSA represents Subud globally
- l) Need the point that the WSA is an NGO

The attached is the seventh version of the document containing these changes (GT.1004).

16. The minutes of the WSC meeting held in Poio Spain in 2009 were agreed (attachment 8).

ATTACHMENTS:

1. Congress Agenda
2. Delegate Program
3. Kinshasa House Grant
4. WSA-SDIA MOU draft 7
5. WSA-MSF MOU December 19, 2009
6. WSA Mission Statement v6
7. WSA Mission Statement v7
8. 2009 World Subud Council Meeting Minutes, Spain

MINUTES OF THE WORLD SUBUD COUNCIL MEETING

CHRISTCHURCH 7th and 8th JANUARY 2010

ATTENDEES:

WSA Chairlady..... Osanna Vaughn
Incoming WSA Chair Luke Penseny
ISC/WSA Exec. Officer..... Garrett Thomson
ISC/WSA Exec.Vice-Chair Maya Bernardes

Outgoing Zonal Representatives:

Zone 3Reinbrand Visman
Zone 4Valentin Willecke
Zone 5/6Lateef Dada Bashua
Zone 7Mariamah Flores
Zone 8Machrus Garces
Zone 9Elisa Sanchez Caballero

1. There was a discussion of the procedures at plenary sessions of Congress: delegates to sit together and vote by hand. There was also a discussion of the helper working party which ends at 6.00 pm instead of 4.30 pm; this means that delegates have to leave the working party early to attend the zone meetings.
2. Subud Indonesia had submitted a request to be considered a few days before Congress, but had not had time to submit a full proposal, to host the Congress in Rungan Sari. Members of the Indonesian delegation attended the WSC meeting to answer questions about their proposal.
3. The WSC felt it had not enough information to verify the viability of Rungan Sari as a possible venue for the 2014 Congress. WSA policy since the 1997 World Congress has been that countries would be tested only given their viability to host congress. For this reason, WSC could not recommend that Indonesia should be tested. Garrett agreed to speak to the Indonesian delegation about this.
4. This meant that congress had two options. One would be to ask Indonesia to submit a proposal for the 2018 Congress; the other for this Congress to ask WSC to make decision with regard to location of 2014 Congress in few months' time, after Indonesia has developed a full proposal. However, postponing the decision as to the location of the 2014 Congress may affect negatively Norway's proposal, since the BCC may need to be booked in three month's time.
5. Five countries had proposed themselves to host the 2014 congress: Brazil, Canada, Colombia, Mexico, and Norway. Garrett explained the process whereby the WSC had tried to assess the viability of the proposed sites according to at least, but not exclusively, four criteria: adequate venue; cost of venue; strength of team; ease of obtaining visas for delegates. Each country submitted a full proposal which was summarized to a matrix format so each proposal could be comparable and each matrix was made available on the WSA org website (attachments 1 - 5). Attached summaries were also presented to Congress (see attachment 6).
6. WSC felt unable to rank the proposals according to the four criteria, but reviewed each proposal carefully and had some general assessments of the outer strengths and weaknesses of each proposal.

Brazil: Inexpensive venue. The local team needs supports from rest of Zone 9, Airfare to Brazil costly.

Canada: Very good venue. More expensive than Brazil, but comparable in price to Mexico & Norway for venue; strong team; could be visa problems.

Colombia: Inexpensive venue; problem with logistics since the main hall has to be used for latihan and plenary. Possible transportation problems from Amanecer to hotels because not within walking distance; Amanecer is our own Subud site; congress expenses could develop center. But WSA directors had different views of the relevance of this as to where Congress should be.

Mexico: Venue very good. Hotels and congress venue close by. Venue cost similar to Canada, but there are more accommodation options, which are less expensive. Local team needs support from other groups, which are nearby.

Norway: Venue is a little more costly if more people attend; food and accommodations slightly more expensive than Mexico. Team small but strong; there may be visa problems.

7. It was agreed to ask the international helpers to test the inner qualities of each site against a benchmark for the inner qualities needed to host the 2014 World Congress and also to ask the international helpers to not recommend one country but rather to leave the decision to the delegates.

8. On the evening of the 7th there was an open-ended discussion of the relations between SDIA and WSA, which did not result in a conclusion.

ATTACHMENTS:

1. Congress Matrix: Brazil
2. Congress Matrix: Canada
3. Congress Matrix: Colombia
4. Congress Matrix: Mexico
5. Congress Matrix: Norway
6. Congress Matrix Summaries

MINUTES OF THE WORLD SUBUD COUNCIL MEETING

CHRISTCHURCH 10th and 13th JANUARY 2010

1. On the 10th January, the outgoing and incoming WSC met informally to share according to the format established by the WSC. Osanna introduced the new WSC.
2. On the 13th the WSA board of directors met with the MSF board. The WSA directors had appointed as trustees of the MSF: Samuel Simonsson, Lawrence Fryer, Shyam Wadhara.
3. At the meeting, there was present: MSF: Samuel Simonsson, Lawrence Fryer, Olivia Reksodipoetro, Hannah Baerveldt, Ismana Haryono; WSA outgoing: Mariamah Flores, Reinbrand Visman, Valentine Willecke; WSA incoming: Luke Penseneay, Paloma de la Viña, Robiyan Easty, Harvey Peters, David Hitchcock, Pavel Mudarra Michelena, Mauricio Castillo. Quorum of seven incoming WSA directors noted.
4. It was agreed as a process that the attached outline MSF budget for 2010 could be approved as an interim budget, subject to a final and more detailed budget being received within 90 days (7-0-0). The attached outline interim budget was agreed in principle.
5. MSF presented the 2008 MSF audited accounts to the WSA board for approval. The incoming WSA board felt unable to approve the accounts at this time and it was agreed that the WSA would send one vote to the MSF before 10th April.
6. Bapak Legacy Fund: it was anticipated that the fund would reach \$1 million by 2011. However, prior to that date and below the \$1 million mark, the fund specifies that in order to spend the interest income, the approval of the WSA directors would be needed. The fund currently has a value of around \$400,000 and earns about 3-4% or around \$10,000. The MSF board would prefer to have the interest accrue. However, after careful consideration, the WSA directors agreed that the MSF board would have the discretionary power to use the interest income from the fund if needed as part of the annual MSF budget.
6. There was discussion of the draft WSA-MSF MOU (see ATT5Jan3-4_WSA-MSF MoU draft Dec19-2009 from previous WSC meeting).

ATTACHMENT:

1. MSF 2010 Budget