

# Decisions ECG Delegates Assembly 2019

May 3-5, 2019  
Stuttgart, Germany

## Proposals

**(49) Is there any alliance coming soon with B Corps Movement or with other movements of New or Social Economy, like Circular Economy; OuiShare; Fair Trade Movement?**

**(54 + 37) (Part 1) (54) How can the Movement take international decisions by way of direct democracy? and (37, Nr. 1) Can ECG members who are not "active" also vote in ECG online voting (Online Convent)?**

**(54 + 37) (Part 2) (54) How can the Movement take international decisions by way of direct democracy? and (37, Nr. 2) Can ECG members who are not "active" also vote in ECG online voting (Online Convent)?**

**(48) Why was the certification of peer-evaluated Common Good Reports to a great extent been degraded, by renaming the Peer-Testat to Peer-Zertifikat with the inaccurate headline SELBSTBEWERTUNG (self-assessment/self-evaluation instead of peer-evaluation, as until 2018)?**

**(53) Does the ECG movement want the hubs to be generally involved in all decisions regarding their topics?**

**(52) The Delegates Assembly confirms the preliminary confirmation of the constitution of the IT hub that the EMT has taken in January.**

**(50) How we can organize, in a better form, the international communication inside the ECG movement? (From Chile Local Chapter)**

**(34) What is the appropriate role of the business-related hubs in the process of product management?**

**(56) How can the work and financial planning of the International Federation be aligned with the strategic decisions of the Movement?**

**(41) How ECG can help that the CONSUMER emancipates out of his passive role, and come to an active ECONOMIC ACTOR?**

**(61) Does the ECG movement accept these guidelines to help decide which partnerships to undertake?**

**(58) How can active members of the ecogood community get informed about important processes in time, that will have big influence on the movement? Which channel or format is the right one for that?**

**(51) Should the Hub structure be changed to make it more suitable to the actual situation and development of the movement?**

**(60) Is ECG an eurocentric movement?**

**(45) Should a new Hub ECG in Healthcare be founded?**

**(40) Does the name "Economy of the common good" adequately express the purpose and values of our movement? What is more important in the name "Economy of the Common Good", "economy" or "common good"?**

(49) Is there any alliance coming soon with B Corps Movement or with other movements of New or Social Economy, like Circular Economy; OUIShare; Fair Trade Movement?

### Original version

The original version can be found here:

<https://wiki.ecogood.org/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=38482004>

### Decision

#### Version 1

Alternative proposal:

Create an international working group

- to put together all facts and information on already existing contacts between ECG and bcorps.
- To approach future actions taking into account the different levels of relevance of bcorps in the different countries.
- Also to elaborate strategy for potential partnerships/cooperations
- To seek support from ECG Science Hub, e.g. academic papers

Members Greg Adams, Marta Avesani, Renee C. (coordination) and Roseli Goncalvez, Matt Mayer (tbd).

**Resistance: 1**

**Passive Version:**

No Working Group

**Resistance: 48**

=>Decision for Version 1

(54 + 37) (Part 1) (54) How can the Movement take international decisions by way of direct democracy?  
and (37, Nr. 1) Can ECG members who are not "active" also vote in ECG online voting (Online Convent)?

Proposals 54 + 37 (B) No. 1:  
?? were two proposals combined or not

### Original version

The original version can be found here:

<https://wiki.ecogood.org/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=38482004>

### Decision

#### Version 1

To change the group of entitled voters for online conventions from „active members“ to all „members of ECG associations“ (one person one vote).

**Resistance: 28**

#### Version 2

To change the group of entitled voters for online conventions from „active members“ to all members of ECG associations who have signed the Code of Conduct (one person one vote).

**Resistance: 21**

#### Passive Version:

Keep it as is. Only „active members“ can vote.

**Resistance: 48**

=>Decision for Version 2

(54 + 37) (Part 2) (54) How can the Movement take international decisions by way of direct democracy?  
and (37, Nr. 2) Can ECG members who are not "active" also vote in ECG online voting (Online Convent)?

### Original version

The original version can be found here:

<https://wiki.ecogood.org/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=38482004>

### Decision

#### Version 1

The movement will develop the technical pre-requisites to hold online conventions with the possibility of decision making by vote.

The International Federation of the ECG movement is called upon to support this project, including financial support

- (a) according to the general budget
- (b) with high priority.

The first online convention with a binding vote should take place before the end of 2020. The Delegates Assembly authorizes a project group to take on this subject. It reports twice a year to IF, EMT, associations and internal Newsletter. Jan Oppor takes the lead.

**Resistance: a) 16 b) 35**

#### Passive Version:

No working group.

**Resistance: 64**

=>Decision for Version 1 with (a), but without (b)

(48) Why was the certification of peer-evaluated Common Good Reports to a great extent been degraded, by renaming the Peer-Testat to Peer-Zertifikat with the inaccurate headline SELBSTBEWERTUNG (self-assessment/self-evaluation instead of peer-evaluation, as until 2018)?

### Original version

The original version can be found here:

<https://wiki.ecogood.org/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=38482004>

### Decision

#### Version 1a

Rename „self-assessment“ to „group-assessment“

#### Version 1b

keep it as it is (= passive version)

Resistance: a) 0 b) 76

### =>Decision for Version 1a

#### Version 2a

Use the point system for audits **AND** peer evaluations, with a clear differentiation in design of certificate => realized and published by the Consultants Hub **within 2 weeks with a one month period** for strong resistance from other groups (only design of the certificate)

#### Version 2b

Product Development Team builds up a team with important stakeholders to decide these questions as soon as possible, max. 3 months

Resistance: a) 19 b) 19

Second vote: Resistance: a) 22 b) 35

#### Passive version

steps system for peer evaluations, point system for audits

Resistance: 55

### =>Decision for Version 2a

(53) Does the ECG movement want the hubs to be generally involved in all decisions regarding their topics?

### Original version

The original version can be found here:

<https://wiki.ecogood.org/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=38482004>

### Decision

#### Version 1a

The hubs **should be consulted** for all decisions made regarding all of their topics inside the whole movement (incl. hubs, chapters, individuals, EMT)

#### Version 1b

The hubs **should be consulted** for all decisions made regarding all of their topics inside the whole movement (incl. hubs, chapters, individuals, EMT)

The answer **timeframe** (1. feedback) should be given **within max. 2 weeks** and a qualified answer in a mutually agreed upon timeframe.

#### Version 1c

The hubs **have to be involved in** all decision regarding all of their topics and **must deliver** a qualified answer in a reasonable timeframe

**Resistance: 1a) 40 1b) 27 1c) 60**

#### Passive Version:

No regulation concerning consultation of hubs.

**Resistance: 52**

=>Decision for Version 1b

(52) The Delegates Assembly confirms the preliminary confirmation of the constitution of the IT hub that the EMT has taken in January.

### Original version

The original version can be found here:

<https://wiki.ecogood.org/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=38482004>

### Decision

#### Version 1

Original Version, plus title of proposal has changed!!

**Resistance: 0**

#### Passive Version:

There is no IT hub (anymore).

**Resistance: 95**

=>Decision for Version 1

(50) How we can organize, in a better form, the international communication inside the ECG movement? (From Chile Local Chapter)

### Original version

The original version can be found here:

<https://wiki.ecogood.org/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=38482004>

### Decision

#### Not a Proposal: Information only

International Communication Team (part of Communication Hub) is in place and will continue working:

Our Ideas:

- Online Meeting to continue improvement (Zoom)
- Online Training for using Wiki
- International internal newsletter (summary of news)
- Encourage all to share results in English
- Prioritize Wiki Content that needs translation to English
- New staff positions (Spanish and English mother tongue) to improve international internal communication
- Encourage all to respond to emails within 3 days (can just be confirmation)
- Make important information more easy to find on Wiki/Jira

=>No decision made



(34) What is the appropriate role of the business-related hubs in the process of product management?

### Original version

The original version can be found here:

<https://wiki.ecogood.org/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=38482004>

### Decision

#### Version 1a

Roles as defined in the attachment of the proposal (34), which is linked in the Wiki with the proposal.

There is a core team. There is a product matrix which defines who is involved, consulted or informed.

Every time there is an update people will/are being informed through the Newsletter.

**Resistance: a) 9**

#### Passive Version

Roles remain as they are.

**Resistance: 43**

=>Decision for Version 1a

## 94 Delegate Votes after the break

(56) How can the work and financial planning of the International Federation be aligned with the strategic decisions of the Movement?

### Original version

The original version can be found here:

<https://wiki.ecogood.org/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=38482004>

### Decision

#### Version 1

Most important: The DA mandates a working group to design a transparent and participative budget process. Results of the working group shall be reported in detail at next DA (coordinator to start the group: Johanna Doná)

#### Version 2

Every year the DA develops and prioritizes its strategic focuses.

#### Version 3

Every year at the DA, the EMT presents the strategic focuses for the current year together with the budget.

#### Resistance: 1

#### Passive Version:

Version 1, Version 2 and Version 3 are not happening.

#### Resistance: 68

=>Decision for Version 1, 2 and 3

(41) How ECG can help that the CONSUMER emancipates out of his passive role, and come to an active ECONOMIC ACTOR?

### Original version

The original version can be found here:

<https://wiki.ecogood.org/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=38482004>

### Decision

#### Version 1a

Give more attention and visibility to the „active consumer,, within the ECG and create a working group „consumer“ for this topic, coordinator will be Rainer Müller.

Target is to motivate people to act as a “prosumer”.

#### Version 1b

Give more attention and visibility to the „active consumer,, within the ECG. And support the creation of a hub „consumers”.

**Resistance: 1a) 25 1b) 81**

#### Passive Version

No working group, no hub.

**Resistance: 26**

### =>Decision for Version 1a

#### Version 2a

Create an **additional category** „consumers” on the website.

#### Version 2b

Create a **sub category** „consumers” to individuals on the website.

#### Version 2c

Replace individuals by „consumers” on the website.

**Resistance: 2a) 58 2b) 48 2c) 84**

#### Passive Version:

No category for “consumers” on the website.

**Resistance: 13**

### =>Decision 2 for Passive Version

(61) Does the ECG movement accept these guidelines to help decide which partnerships to undertake?

### Original version

The original version can be found here:

<https://wiki.ecogood.org/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=38482004>

### Decision

#### Version 1

Original Version

**Resistance: 0**

#### Passive Version

No guidelines.

**Resistance: 74**

=>Decision for Version 1

(58) How can active members of the ecogood community get informed about important processes in time, that will have big influence on the movement? Which channel or format is the right one for that?

### Original version

The original version can be found here:

<https://wiki.ecogood.org/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=38482004>

### Decision

#### Version 1

We, the "working group democracy", coordinated by Jan Oppor, provide a data table in the central internal section of the ECG wiki that will contain the columns "process type", "group and link", "date of decision", "topic", "created at" and "created by". This table should be completely in English.

**No vote taken, only information provided.**

#### Version 2a

Everybody who is involved in the following processes **SHOULD announce this in the table:**

- Internal jobs advertisements
- Internal budget decisions (automatically)
- Decisions in point of services and projects (automatically from PPM or SPM)
- Any product of the development team
- All other processes with a big impact to the movement
- All other processes you want to announce (as you wish)

#### Version 2b

Everybody who is involved in the following processes **MUST announce this in the table:** Like in a)

**Resistance: a) 9 b) 38**

#### Passive Version

No such table in the wiki.

**Resistance: 47**

**=>Decision for Version 2a**

(51) Should the Hub structure be changed to make it more suitable to the actual situation and development of the movement?

### Original version

The original version can be found here:

<https://wiki.ecogood.org/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=38482004>

### Decision

#### Version 1

Hubs are international with either sub hubs or not. One hub at the highest level has one vote at the Delegates Assembly.

**Resistance: 11**

#### Passive Version:

Hubs are international and have no official sub hubs.

**Resistance: 30**

#### Version 2a

Sub hubs must be limited to one national area.

#### Version 2b

Must be limited to one language area.

#### Version 2c

Can choose if national or in language area.

**Resistance: 2a) 61 2b) 59 2c) 14**

#### Passive Version:

No definition/regulation of sub hubs.

**Resistance: 51**

#### Version 3a

Install a working group to define the details. Coordination by Dorit Binder.  
Mandated to decide

#### Version 3b

Install a working group to define the details. Coordination by Dorit Binder.  
Prepares proposal for the next DA/online convent

**Resistance: 3a) 42 3b) 13**

**Passive Version:** No working group.

**Resistance: 60**

**=>Decision for Version 1, 2c, 3b**

(60) Is ECG an eurocentric movement?

**Original version**

The original version can be found here:

<https://wiki.ecogood.org/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=38482004>

**Decision**

**Version 1:**

ECG is a global movement.

**Resistance: 0**

**Passive Version:**

It remains as it is.

**Resistance: 39**

=>Decision for Version 1

(45) Should a new Hub ECG in Healthcare be founded?

**Original version**

The original version can be found here:

<https://wiki.ecogood.org/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=38482004>

**Decision**

**Version 1:**

Working group instead of hub. Coordination by xy ?

**Resistance: 0**

**Passive Version:**

No working group.

**Resistance: 42**

=>Decision for Version 1



(40) Does the name "Economy of the common good" adequately express the purpose and values of our movement? What is more important in the name "Economy of the Common Good", "economy" or "common good"?

### Original version

The original version can be found here:

<https://wiki.ecogood.org/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=38482004>

### Decision

#### Version 1:

Change the name (worldwide) to: "Movement for the common good"

**Resistance Points: 87**

#### Passive Version:

Leave the name as it is.

**Resistance Points: 0**

=>Decision for Passive Version