

IAMS

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

Monday, 7th February 2011

By Conference Call

Time of meeting is MIDDAY GMT

Minutes

Present:

Jonathan Bonk
Cathy Ross
Paul Kollman
Rose Uchem
David Singh
Mika Vahakangas
Lalsangkim Pachuau
Kenn Myamoto
Mariel Deluca Voth
Gerard Goldman
Anne Henriksen

Jon to propose if anybody has anything to say before starting the meeting.

1	Apologies No apologies	
	Minutes from 10.12.10 Item 6 ideas are needed for fund solicitation from all executive committee members Minutes were accepted. Kima moved in favour – all in favour	
2	Budget - report from David (per the materials that he sent on January 28) Actual Expenditure 2010 David Singh has sent the different accounts, the 2010 budget and the budget for 2011 by email. Certain reports need to be approved by the Executive Committee and after the formal approval a signature is needed from Jon and Cathy before the accounts can be sent to the Charity Commission. Paul mentioned that he feels inadequate to make a proper judgment but that in the past, Gerard was able to comment from his experience and therefore wanted	

Gerard's voice to be heard.

Gerard is happy with what has been presented. All Executive Members are ok with accounts.

David informed about the budget for 2010 and the actual expenditure and said that IAMS is in the positive for the first time with \$10,000 in the account. Whereas 2009 ended with a deficit of approximately \$9,000.

Budget 2011

David highlighted that the 2011 budget needs approval of the Executive Committee. Because of the conference next year, IAMS can expect an increase in income and therefore the income figure from 2010 to 2011 has been increased to \$35,000.

On the expense side the budget for the Executive Committee was increased to \$15,000 due to additional travel expenses (Cathy is going to Canada and an additional committee meeting) in 2011 related to next year's conference.

Mission Studies (Membership Fees to Brill) is budgeted as \$11,000 but should be \$5,000, which leads to an overall budget deficit of \$1200 instead of the current \$7260.

Paul asked if a revised budget could be sent to the Executive Committee (EC) after this revision

He also asked if the accommodation for AP meeting is taken care of by the people in Canada.

Gerard questioned the income of \$35,000 in grants

David informed that the total amount raised in 2010 was \$22,000

Gerard would need historical comparison to check if this will be realistic.

David said that in the 2007 budget, the total income was \$47,100 and proposed a total income of \$50,000

Cathy asked Jon and Gerard whether they were confident that \$35,000 could be achieved.

David mentioned that IAMS has a habit of being in deficit with exception of 2010, and if EC wants this trend to continue, hard work is needed.

Jon reported that the registry of organization that he had solicited from, he had heard from some of them; others indicate money will come, yet others that no money is available. He thinks the EC will have to work hard. Church

organizations in Europe don't have the kind of reserve as the past. He stresses that the EC need to work together on this and maybe review the list he has sent. He also mentioned that Ann and the hosting committee also have ideas, but it still demands working hard.

David mentioned the Catlin foundation and will check if money available.

Mika highlighted that he has tried to raise funds for a smaller conference in Sweden, but the financial meltdown has affected many of the donors. He thinks it's still difficult to raise funds in 2011 but maybe 2012 will be better.

In relations to the budget, Mika mentioned the website maintenance budget (budget expense item 5) for 2010 was \$1,400 and for 2011 it's \$5,000 and asked what the reason is that figures are higher for this year than last year.

David says figure of \$5,000 is on the high side. He is expecting a very high bill in addition to to-three invoices from the secretariat, but there is a potential for reducing the amount and if that was done, most likely it would be a positive budget.

Gerard asked if EC is meeting in 2011.

Cathy thought a meeting will take place in 2011 with whole committee.

Gerard thought it would be in February 2012.

Jon is reviewing minutes for October and there was a great deal of discussion. He suggest to leave this after the representative group meets in April.

Cathy informs that executive meeting was decided for early 2012 according to December 2010 minutes.

David asks if the IAMS Executive budget should be reduced from \$15,000 to \$8,000 figure or less than that.

Jon suggests to reduce by \$5,000 maybe \$6,000

David concludes that IAMS Executive budget will be \$9,000 and the website maintenance budget will be \$2,000. David moved and the budget was approved by all EC members.

Figures in accounts at the moment:

Pound: 14,415

Euro: 3,962

US\$: 8,809

Dep C&G Guernsey Pound 20,925

a. Allocation for study groups/special groups so that they can plan and budget

Jon says that a clear signal needs to be sent to the study groups so they know what they have to work with. He asks what was allocated to Hungary Conference.

David says he does not see anything mentioned for this purpose. There are budgets for special interest groups but nothing for the parallel groups. David says that for 2011, 5 groups are allocated a total of \$2,000 and DABOH \$5000.

If want separate budget for 2012, David can send it. \$500 for each of the 5 special interest groups. He stresses that rest of the groups have been dormant and only DABOH is active

Jon asks if anybody would make recommendation on this? Maybe Gerard? Jon wonders if IAMS should leave it at present level and let the principal parties know this is the case. EC an always come back and modify the budget.

Cathy agrees

David should rephrase heading in Budget to Special Interest Group/Study Groups. If Special Interest groups do not use the money, it can be used for Study groups instead.

Cathy mentions that Paul and she are confused as to what parallel groups are.

Kima says it really is a study group

Cathy thinks special interest groups are outside the conference.

Cathy: so are parallel groups the same as study group?

Jon informs terminology seems to be overlapping, so might be talking about the same thing.

Cathy mentions that on the website it is called study groups

Jon concludes to call all of them study groups

David sees problem that it does not dovetail with budget of 2011 to 2012.

Cathy thinks she has an extra study group and will look it up.

David proposes to continue to have heading Special Interest Group and then have Study Group in the budget at the conference.

Rose says it's important to synchronize terminology

Jon asks if Cathy can synchronize them and make sure none is left out including the ones have been part of IAMS historically. **(ACTION)**

Cathy explains that Women and Mission has changed to Gender and Mission and she considers having an Ethnic Minority one

David asks if Cathy can tell him of any additional groups and what effect it will have on the budget so it can be incorporated.

Ken mentions what he wrote in the e-mail before about presentation and asks how they deal with this sort of thing and maybe they could talk about it later?

Jon agrees that it's a discussion for program rather than budget. It's a program matter and possible a mission studies matter.

- b. Conference subsidy formula and subsidy application form (subsidy up to a maximum of \$???, not pre-paid, but re-imbursed in exchange for receipts/travel documents)

Jon says it's complicated and requires most careful thinking as per Rose's note.

Cathy informs that when some of EC are in Toronto in April, they will be with the Border Authority and maybe they can help with advice on writing letters

Jon highlights that IAMS will be the guarantor and a requirement in the US it that the letter from the institution concerns employment and that the person has it when he/she gets back. He suggests putting together a set of guidelines making it as clear as possible and asks Rose to serve on the committee and help prepare the guidelines. He thinks it will be discussed in Toronto in April at length. He asks about the maximum amount of subsidy.

Mika says that a flat amount might not be fair, since poorer countries flights might be more expensive. He suggests making some kind of combination and that it might be more beneficial that IAMS provide

lifting conference fees and costs in Canada and maybe some cost of travel within a max \$ amount.

David would like a bit more information regarding accommodation. He informs that it's easier for Briony and him to have one kind of subsidy and not one for travel, accommodation etc. He suggest maybe give 25%, 50% or 100% subsidy. It will be a book entry and will not have to give money to people, as this will be a cumbersome procedure.

Marief informs that IAMS will have to work within its limits

David informs that in the last conference, IAMS ran short of money because lots of amounts were promised which was not agreed upon before and therefore IAMS had to borrow money and then pay it back which cost a lot of money and took 2-3 months after the conference.

Ken says having read Rose's letter; the EC should be reminded that the problem is not only the poorest countries in Africa but also in Japan. The people are not rich and often there is no interest of financial support from the churches/school. In addition, in the areas where Christians are a minority also stresses that it's not just the poor countries.

Jon says it's a complex issue and asks if anybody has experience or knowledge of a centralized travel arrangement. It means that travel bookers handle the travel arrangements and that this might be easier for IAMS and also to budget for. Basically, everybody who requires a subsidy goes through the same booking agent and the ticket might be provided for them. He asks if there are travel bookers that could handle this for IAMS?

Cathy suggests Ann Chow could look into this.

Jon explains that in New Haven, they used a single travel agency and it helped to stabilize the cost considerable. He agrees to ask Ann Chow. He raises the issue that it might be sharing personal information by pdf but that it might worth it. He asks if anybody has comments on this.

Rose agrees it's worth trying

Jon will ask Ann Chow to investigate and see how it will work.

Rose highlights that with the advantage of e-tickets it helps.

Jon asks what kind of formula will be administrative possible.

Rose says that EC members need to know the cost

Cathy informs that Ann Chow is still working on the costs and hope she will be done for the meeting in April but Cathy wonders if EC members can think of criteria that can apply whatever the cost.

David asks if participants should come from academic background to attend and that two references might be needed in this case.

Mika thinks it should be mainly IAMS members to show that membership has meaning.

Jon assumes it is an academic meeting as this is the mandate of IAMs and thinks it will be members since the meeting is not open to the general public. Members gather once every 4 years and this will have direct bearing on subsidy and application for subsidy. Jon thinks priority will always be given exclusively to members.

David feels that to grant subsidy two references should be mandatory.

Jon suggests that it might be possible to think of co-sponsorship so subsidy is not the whole amount but a proportion of it and asks what other EC members think about that.

Rose suggests one of the criteria could be the quality of the paper presented. She refers to the paper itself and not just the abstract.

David asks at what point next year, the EC is going to decide on who will be given subsidies.

Rose suggests it should be 6 months before the conference before offering any subsidies.

David thinks promises only should be made when EC is absolutely sure

Jon thinks it's a rolling target and that there might have money for some. He suggests it's a formula application and that criteria deadline should be out this year and then process applications as a committee.

Maril asks if anybody knows how many subsidies were given out last year and if this information would be available from the secretariat's office.

	<p>Cathy says that secretariat can try but not give a guarantee.</p> <p>David gives the following figures from Balaton: Registration subsidy: \$11,800; Travel: \$51,350; Accommodation: \$47,855.</p> <p>Mika likes Rose’s idea of using the conference papers as criteria.</p> <p>Jon informs that at Lake Balaton, of the \$100,000 in subsidies a proportion was unbudgeted for. The Conference in Cape Town had similar problem. He likes the way Mika worked out the various components of the subsidies formula.</p> <p>Mika thinks should look from point of individual point of view. He suggests two types that people can apply for: 1) covering the whole of registration and accommodation and then if coming from poorest countries of all 2) covering the above in addition to certain of cost of travel.</p> <p>Ken asks if IAMS are going to have non-members attend the conference.</p> <p>Jon thinks the conference is primarily for members but maybe some of the sessions might be open to the public.</p> <p><u>Fund raising/solicitation</u> – per Jon’s e-mail on Dec 10 (with Financial Appeal Registry attached for our information)</p>	
<p>3</p>	<p>Mission Studies – question of editor succession</p> <p>Kima suggests two names 1) Susan Smith (NZ) – one of the associates 2) John Prior</p> <p>Kima mentions that it would be good to talk about advertisement at some point. And if possible this does not have to go to Brill but that the advert goes with the article so IAMS can get the income.</p> <p>Kima informs that a special issue will be done in 2012 to invite non-conference speakers and the EC members to write articles.</p> <p>Kima suggest to put this in his notes (also see Kima’s email from 7 Feb 2011)</p> <p>Paul thanks Kima for report. Paul suggests Cathy Ross as another person to consider.</p> <p>Kima had talked with Cathy before but she was not open to the idea.</p> <p>Paul suggests that if she stops as secretary she might be interested.</p> <p>Kima suggest to put Cathy at top and then Susan followed by John.</p>	
<p>4</p>	<p>Approve establishing Canadian and PayPal accounts, per Ann, Briony, David</p>	

	<p>PAYPAL Account</p> <p>David mentions that a third approval is needed for the PAYPAL account, as he needs to make a payment to Ann Chow. He informs that the process has already started but he needs the EC members' approval.</p> <p>Jon asks if somebody can move this. Mika moves in favor and Rose seconds motion.</p> <p>David adds that comparing amount of charges with World pay account, PAYPAL will be better with 1.9% and a fixed fee compared to World Pay's charges of 3% and VAT.</p> <p>Finally David needs approval for opening a Canadian dollar account for the funds designated for the conference. If IAMS has a Canadian dollar account it will be easier to deposit and also pay from the account.</p> <p>Paul asked David if he has asked Ann Chow about this, because sometimes Canadian events that are very international do not use Can currency but US dollar.</p> <p>David said that Ann Chow mentioned that it would be a good idea.</p> <p>Jon agrees that Ann recommended it.</p> <p>David stressed that it is not easy to open an account. The Euro Account took a long time to open.</p> <p>Mika moved it and Paul seconded it. All in favor.</p>	
5	<p>Confirm list of potential plenary speakers (incl. Bible study & worship)</p> <p>Jon informs that some speakers have been contacted and invited and has already reserved the time, but no promises has been made and others have not yet been invited.</p> <p>Jon stresses that the EC needs specific names because each EC members has specific networks. He informs there are 20 Koreans at OMSC but none specific. Jon suggests following up with concrete speakers instead of general comments on missing speakers.</p> <p>Ken informs it's not easy to find in Japan Jon asks how many speakers would EC member like</p> <p>David concludes that out of the five days of the conference, two days are spend on outings so there might be three and half days with speakers.</p>	

Jon informs that the program is not finalized and a lot of work still has to be done. He suggests 3-4 maybe five considering African, Latin America, North America and Asia.

Gerard asks when looking at the itinerary, whether this is the way the conference should be.

Jon stresses that it is not necessarily the way the conference will be.

Gerard thinks it looks short.

Jon informs the conference is from 15 – 19 August so about five and half days.

Gerard informs he has only been to one conference and that the exposure trip was a real highlight and also the church visit and thinks this should not be lost.

Jon informs that this is a project and any input the EC members have are much appreciated. He asks again to the number of speakers for the 5 ½ days.

Paul suggests four or five.

David agrees

Jon thinks EC should aim to have geographical and gender representation

Paul suggest also religious representation

Mika informs that if it's too geographically spread it will be repeating itself and suggest to have speakers complement each other in various ways. He thinks some of the presenters need not to speak to African only but have a wider point of view.

Ken think geographical representation is good. Some representing Asia alone or some (... lost in car horns)

Jon asks what about missiology of migration – story of human race and migrations is also the story of mission. He asks if anybody has a person on biblical theology of migrations.

Rose thinks that geographical representation is important, as –if African- will have inside experience on issues of migration.

Mika mentioned before different people can complement on another.

	<p>Jon suggests Cathy, Paul, Mariel provides hypothetical list & itinerary and share the list with provisional program for discussion at next meeting.</p> <p>Paul suggests setting up google docs and set it up in such a way that people can comment on this before meeting in May.</p> <p>Jon proposes secretariat office to set it up. Simple to set up.</p> <p>ACTION: Secretariat Office to set up a google doc</p>	
6	<p>Finalize our list of study groups and allocate an Exec member(s) to facilitate/coordinate each</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Paul & Ken – World Christianity b. Mika – Religions c. Mariel – DABOH d. Kima – mission journals e. Cathy – f. David – g. Gerard - <p>Ken asks if this has been discussed.</p> <p>Jon informs that it has not, but that it will need to be talked about next time.</p>	
7	<p>Study group & Special Interest Groups – dovetailing within overall program</p> <p>Arrive at a common understanding of how study groups and special interest groups will dovetail within overall program, bearing in mind that the Toronto assembly will be a smaller gathering (150 max).</p> <p>One aim should be to develop strategies and policies for future direction. There needs to be opportunity for study group conveners and core members to cross-fertilize and synergise, so that they can coordinate their work better.</p>	
8	<p>Agenda Items for April 13-15 meeting in Toronto</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Put finishing touches on application/registration forms, on-line registration. Institutional support and accountability are vital. IAMS subsidy needs to go hand in hand with institutional support. In fact institutions need to assume most expense, since they are the eventual beneficiaries of the outcomes. b. Review program with hosting committee. We need to discuss a mechanism for encouraging regional workshops and conferences between gen assemblies, and invite key institutions/individuals to take 	

	<p>the lead.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">c. Hosting committee input on worship/Bible study/musicd. Review funding raising optionse. Careful preliminary review of facilities and transportation logistics. <p>Jon: following meeting in April have EC meeting.</p>	
9	AOB	
10	Next Meeting ACTION: Secretariat Office to send May calendar to all and fill in the days when each EC member will be available.	