

**MINUTES**  
**ECPC General Assembly 2010**  
**7 March 2010, Antwerp**

**In preparation of the General Assembly (GA):**

- Invitation to GA was sent to ECPC members on 7 February 2010, incl Agenda
- Reminder was sent on 2 March 2010 to all members, incl identical Agenda, copy of the Audited Account 2008 and Audited Accounts 2009

**Agenda ECPC GA 7 March**

- § Item 1: Welcome & Confirming the Agenda
- § Item 2: Report of ECPC Activities 2009/2010 & Priorities 2010
- § Item 3: Approval ECPC Accounts 2008
- § Item 4: Approval ECPC Accounts 2009
- § Item 5: Introduction of Nominees for ECPC Board Elections
- § Item 6: Questions and Answers and Any Other Business

**Minutes General Assembly 7 March 2010**

***Agenda Item 1: Welcome & Confirming the Agenda***

1. Tom Hudson, ECPC President and Chair of the GA (TH), opened the GA at 13:00 welcoming all participants present. TH stated that the ECPC GA is a business meeting with an agreed agenda to be followed and that ECPC has legal obligations, e.g. to get approval for the ECPC accounts.
2. TH started to introduce the "Housekeeping rules" when Roberto de Miro stood up and said the Italian delegates present represented 18 Italian member organizations and wanted changes to the agenda.
3. A lively discussion started, with various statements from members about the request to change the agenda. Several members demanded to follow the agreed GA agenda as it stood and discuss any additional proposals under Item 6: Any Other Business.
4. Elisabetta Iannelli (EI), Francesco de Lorenzo (FL) and Roberto de Miro (RM) were insistant and determinedly vocal in order to force their proposal to change the agenda. The Chair tried several times to call them to order. RM insisted again that they wanted to change the agenda immediately in order to discuss the voting procedures of the forthcoming elections and change both the current Chair and Secretary.

5. The Chair and other members pointed out that according to the ECPC statutes, the agenda of a GA could not be changed without unanimous agreement of all members present. Several members asked for this discussion to be attended to under agenda item 6: Any Other Business (AOB)
6. This was not acceptable to RM, who stated that items under AOB would not be legally binding.
7. Several members disagreed with this statement and the Chair added that it is usual that any proposal under item 6: AOB could be voted upon, and of course would then be legally binding. RM did not continue to argue his point.
8. RM, again stood up and approached the Chair and this time took over the microphone. He started to read out his and the other Italian delegates list of demands. Some in the other members of the GA objected. EI got up and started shouting that as she was a previous Secretary of ECPC and as such she knew the constitution and that the agenda could be changed.
9. At 13:18, owing to the increasing disruption, the Chair took the decision to suspend the meeting because of the disorder caused by RM, EI and FL. The meeting was suspended for seven minutes in order that the three delegates could be persuaded to agree to recognise and follow the correct procedures.
10. The Chair re-opened the GA at 13:25 with a statement that he had no intention of allowing the GA to be disrupted again. He added that the meeting would now proceed with the confirmed agenda and other issues would be discussed under item 6- Any Other Business.
11. A member asked for the Dutch lawyer's opinion on the call for changes to the agenda. The Chair asked Mr. Kollen (ECPC Lawyer and expert in Dutch Association Law) to clarify the legal situation, according to ECPC statutes, for a change to the GA agenda
12. Lawyer Mr Kollen clarified that, according to the ECPC Statutes, changes to the agenda at the GA meeting are only possible if all members present agree with the change of the agenda. He further explained if there is one member present who is against the change of the agenda, then the agenda cannot be changed. (Art. 15.3 and 15.4 ECPC Statutes)
13. The Chair announced that as ECPC is a democratic organisation he would allow a vote on the proposal "the agenda should remain as it is". 37 YES votes (which included proxies) were counted. The Chair announced the result.
14. A second vote was called on the proposal "the agenda should be changed": 20 YES votes (which included proxies) were counted. The Chair announced that as there was not a unanimous agreement of all members present for changes to the agenda, there would be not changes to the agenda.
15. Francesco de Lorenzo, Elisabetta Iannelli and Roberto de Miro again disrupted the procedure and complained very loudly that they were not being heard, were not being allowed to speak and make their demands known and again insisted that they wanted a change to the agenda. They threatened that if they did not get agreement to this demand, they would withdraw their ECPC membership and defame ECPC in the outside world at the European Parliament and other partners of ECPC, that ECPC is not a democratic organisation.
16. FL became increasingly angry and stated that this is not like the democracy in Italy. His statement caused consternation amongst the members present.

17. FL made a further statement that he had concerns that the ECPC office would conduct a fair and transparent election.
18. The Chair reiterated that the GA had clearly voted to follow the agenda without amendments or changes and that ECPC is a democratic organisation which follows the rules that govern ECPC as outlined in ECPC's constitution.
19. RM, EI and FL, along with Francesco Fazio, Katia Tenore, Luminita Andreescu left the GA at 13:46, shouting their complaints again about a lack of democracy with in ECPC, because the agenda was not changed and the immediate discussion about the voting procedures for the elections would only be allowed under Agenda Item 6: AOB.
20. They had previously clearly stated that should they leave the GA meeting, their organisations would then leave ECPC.
21. There was spontaneous applause from the majority of other members when the Italian delegates announced they were leaving.
22. The Chair then continued with the meeting with the agenda as outlined and agreed. The Chair asked Jan Geissler (ECPC Director) to present the ECPC Report 2010 and Outlook for 2010.

### ***Agenda Item II: Report of ECPC Activities 2009/2010 & Priorities 2010***

1. Jan Geissler (JG) reported on the ECPC activities 2009/2010 and work priorities 2010. For details please see the "Report of ECPC Activities 2009/2010 & Priorities 2010" attached to the GA Minutes. JG made the member aware of the newly published ECPC Annual Report 2009 with many more details on ECPC's work and achievements, which was distributed to participants of the GA.
2. A member suggested ECPC initiatives for the special needs of migrants with Cancer. JG responded that he would be happy to discuss their proposal after the GA, and he would then suggest an initiative to the Board.
3. At 14:00 Luminita Andreescu returned to the room of the ECPC AGM again, after having left together with the other Italian representatives at 13:46.

### ***Agenda Item 3: Approval ECPC Accounts 2008***

1. Tom van der Wal, ECPC Treasurer (TvdW), stated that the accounts of the European Cancer Patient Coalition are regularly audited by an independent and certified auditor. The audit includes a review of the books, providing both a profit and loss sheet as well as a balance sheet of the association. The audits were done in accordance with the statutes and the accounting. After approval, accounts are openly published on the ECPC website, to create maximum transparency to the public. All financial means are guided by ECPC's transparency rules, which are also on the website.
2. TvdW presented the ECPC Accounts 2008 (see ECPC AGM report, slide 19, and/or ECPC Audited Accounts 2008 attached to the GA minutes. A hardcopy of the Audited Accounts 2008 was provided to the GA participants).
3. TvdW asked the GA for the approval of the ECPC Accounts 2008
4. 44 YES votes, 0 NO votes, with 2 abstentions. All votes included proxies.

5. The Chair announced the resolution that the ECPC Accounts 2008 were approved by the GA.

#### **Agenda Item 4: Approval ECPC Accounts 2009**

1. TvdW presented the ECPC Accounts 2009 (see ECPC AGM report, slide 21 and/or ECPC Audited Accounts 2008 attached to the GA minutes, and ECPC Report 2009 page 16/17. A hardcopy of the 2009 Audited Accounts was provided to the GA participants).
2. TvdW reported on the ANBI status (Dutch non-profit status) which was not taken care of in earlier years and not confirmed by the Dutch Tax Authorities before he became Treasurer of ECPC in June 2009. The ANBI status has now been confirmed by Dutch authorities for 2009 and 2010. As Treasurer TvdW consolidated the ECPC financial administration to one administration in the ECPC Office in Munich. He reported it was decided by the Board to close the UK financial administration done by the office of the Past President, Lynn Faulds Wood (LFW), and to close the UK bank account with all assets transferred to the ECPC bank in Netherlands.
3. TvdW addressed the GA participants informing them of his concerns regarding the financial irregularities that had taken place in ECPC's UK financial administration and that he had uncovered since taking over as Treasurer since 2009. He said that there was irregularity evident in the book-keeping. He asked Sandy Craine (SC) in her position as ECPC Secretary to outline a few issues.
4. SC explained examples that had led, and continue to lead, to confusion of some members of the ECPC Board. She presented a slide showing a current invoice dated 29 January 2010, from 'Lynn's Bowel Cancer Campaign' (LBCC) to ECPC for reimbursement for hours worked/"man days" undertaken by LFW and her office manager Mrs Siobhan Crowther, for a EU funded Research Project on Colorectal Cancer Screening Guidelines in which ECPC is the official contracted partner. SC pointed out that no contractual agreement between ECPC and LBCC existed and it remained unclear why this invoice had been sent to ECPC.
5. LFW interrupted at this point saying that she did not understand such financial actions very well and had only wanted to use the money for other screening programmes. She then focussed Jan Geissler's (JG) salary as Director and said that he had failed to raise funds in order to pay the costs of his employment as had been previously agreed. JG said that this was not true as he was not contracted to fundraise. LFW did not address the question of the invoice but continued instead to disclose the salaries of ECPC staff Michi Geissler and Denis Horgan, neither salary figures that she quoted were correct.
6. A member pointed out that staff salaries were not the issue being discussed, but rather that there was no agreement or contract between ECPC and LBCC to allow for over €39000 to be invoiced to ECPC for payment to LBCC. It was outlined that the EU colorectal screening project agreement was between the EU, IARC and ECPC, and not between LBCC or any other party.
7. LFW made no further attempt to explain why she thought ECPC should pay her organisation LBCC the invoice for €39070
8. SC added that just under 40.000 GBP are currently being withheld by LBCC staff under instructions from LFW. This considerable amount of ECPC's assets remains in ECPC's UK Bank account. No other member of the ECPC board is a signatory to this ECPC account.

9. TvdW stated that the whole ECPC board had agreed at the board meeting in Berlin, September 2009, that the UK account should be closed and all moneys transferred to the Netherlands RABO bank account.
10. Members asked to return to discussing the ECPC Accounts 2009.
11. TvdW asked the GA for the approval of the ECPC Accounts 2009.
12. 38 YES votes, 0 NO votes with 8 abstentions (all votes included proxies)
13. The Chair announced that the ECPC Accounts 2009 were approved by the GA
14. The Chair took over from TvdW and SC again and mentioned that there had been a loss of confidence in LFW by the majority of the ECPC board, due to, amongst other things, some irregularity in clarification of the UK finances. He added that this was unacceptable to a majority of board members as ECPC is a completely transparent, non-profit organisation.
15. A member asked if there could be an attempt to reconcile the differences in the board. The Chair stated that there had been several serious attempts to set up an independently mediated meeting of the board members, but there seemed to be no willingness by the minority who LFW said she represented and had communicated that all three refused to attend such a meeting of the board.
16. LFW stated that she would not attend a board meeting with voting procedures, but would only attend a 'facilitated meeting of the board members', without votes.
17. SC pointed out that this was a game of semantics by LFW and the proposal was always understood by all to be a mediated meeting of the board members as LFW had just described and was never intended by any members of the board to be a normal board meeting.
18. Another member said that the minority fraction has lost, but the majority must open the door. He added this was not meant in any way as a criticism of the board. LFW stated that she now agreed to attend a facilitated meeting of the members of the board, but only without the presence of ECPC staff or lawyers.

#### ***Agenda Item 5: Introduction of Nominees for ECPC Board Elections***

1. The Chair asked all the nominees for the ECPC Board Elections who were present at the GA to come to the front for introduction to the members present.
2. LFW refused to stand up because she said that everyone already knew quite well who she was. TH asked her to do so in the spirit of reconciliation and cooperation as one of the members had just called for. LFW then decided to join the other candidates standing in front of the GA.
3. ECPC had received 17 nominations (another two arrived after the deadline) of nominees for the elections to the ECPC Board of Directors for 2010 – 2013.
4. Current ECPC Board Members nominated again
  - Tom Hudson, ECPC President / Men Against Cancer, Ireland
  - Tom van der Wal, ECPC Treasurer / Stichting Diagnose Kanker, Netherlands
  - Heide Preuss, ECPC Vice President / mamazone, Germany
  - Simona Ene, ECPC Vice President / Sarcoma Patients Euronet Association, Romania

- Sandy Craine, ECPC Secretary / CML Support, UK
- Lynn Faulds Wood, ECPC Board Member / Lynn's Bowel Cancer Campaign, UK
- Luminita Andreescu, ECPC Board Member / ANVOLT, Italy

#### New candidates

- Kai Pilgermann, House of Life (Chairman), Germany
- Viorica Cursaru, Myeloma Euronet Romania (President), Romania
- Henk van Daele, Oncology Centrum Antwerp (Board Member, Director Operations), Belgium
- Sarunas Narbutas, OHLB Kraujas (Political Affairs Manager), Lithuania
- Jean Turner, Rarer Cancers Forum (Director), UK
- Giulio Tarro, Fondazione Terese Luigi Beaumont Bonelli per le Ricerca sul cancro (President), Italy
- Arthur Masny, Polish Cancer Patient Coalition (Founding Member), Poland
- Olga Cridland, P.A.V.E.L. (President), Romania
- Neli Hadjiyska, APOZ National Association of Patients with Oncological Diseases (Communications & Specialist program director), Bulgaria
- Francesco de Lorenzo, FAVO (President), Italy

5. One member asked whether these were the accepted candidates. JG responded that these were only nominees, and each one's eligibility as candidates was still to be decided.

#### ***Item 6: Questions and Answers and Any Other Business***

1. The Chair addressed the concerns of the Italian members who had previously left the GA that the voting cards for the elections to the ECPC Board could be tampered with by the ECPC office.
2. There was a discussion about the voting procedures for the ECPC Board elections, to be held between 29 March and 19 April 2010. It was discussed how a valid vote by ECPC members could be conducted by a neutral and independent third party.
3. One member (Erik Briers, 'US Too', Belgium) suggested that legal organisations in Belgium and Netherlands offer a service of sending ballot papers by post (registered mail), collecting the ballot papers, and also conduct a formal count of the votes.
4. Jan Geissler (ECPC Director) said that although there had never been any problems in previous elections, in order to allay the feelings expressed by the Italian members that the Munich office cannot be trusted to conduct a fair and transparent election, the GA should vote on the following proposal: "Erik Briers will suggest a procedure and an independent legal office to the ECPC office. The legal office will be contracted to send the ballot paper by registered postal mail to all full members, collect the voting forms, and to conduct the counts of the voting."

5. 41 YES votes (including proxies) for this proposal, 0 NO votes against, 0 abstentions. The Chair announced that there was a unanimous agreement on the resolution to proceed in the way proposed by Erik Briers.
6. Alongside to the discussions about the voting procedures for the board elections, two members suggested to introduce membership fees. ECPC Board and Staff will discuss membership fees internally and work on a proposal to be presented at the next GA.
7. Further discussions about how the candidates/nominees for the elections to the ECPC Board of Directors will be introduced to the voting members (ECPC full members) arose. As with previous ECPC elections an "election booklet" with the completed nomination forms and the CV's of all candidates will be made available on the ECPC website. A summary of key characteristics of the candidates (Name, Organisation, Country, Cancer Survivor, previous role in ECPC board if any) will be provided with the ballot paper sent by postal mail.
8. There were no other questions asked nor AOB raised.
9. The Chair thanked all members present, as well as the ECPC Board Members and ECPC Staff.
10. The GA meeting closed at 15:40

Minute taker appointed by the Chair: Denis Horgan and Michi Geissler (ECPC Office)

#### **Attached documents to the ECPC GA Minutes**

- § Report of ECPC Activities 2009/2010 & Priorities 2010
- § ECPC Audited Accounts 2008
- § ECPC Audited Accounts 2009
- § AGM Backgrounder Financials
- § Italian proposal "voting guidelines" (proposal neither pre-circulated nor adopted as an agenda point, attached only on request)