

	<p>Draft Minutes</p> <p>ALTER-Net Management Board meeting</p> <p>Remote 26-27 October 2020</p>
<p>Contact</p>	<p>tscottkulfan@gmail.com</p>

Participants

1. Jiska van Dijk (NINA, Norway, MB chair)
2. Allan Watt (MB Vice-Chair)
3. Maurice Hoffmann (INBO, Belgium, Council Chair)
4. Sonja Jähnig (IGB, Germany)
5. Mart Kulvik (IAES, Estonia)
6. Philip Roche (INRAE, France)
7. Adriana Clivillé Morató (CEH, UK)
8. Marie Vandewalle (UFZ, Germany)
9. Petteri Vihervaara (SYKE, Finland)
10. Joan Pino (CREAF, Spain)
11. Juliette Young (ICEH, UK)
12. Tyler Kulfan (ALTER-Net)

Absent with notification: Andy Sier (CEH, UK)

Alternet Management Board Meeting 2020

26-27 October 2020, from lunch till lunch

Day 1:

Start meeting, official approval of minutes of previous MB meetings (Estonia, October 2019 & virtual meeting January 2020), what is expected from us in terms of preparation Council meeting (Jiska)

Jiska started the meeting at 12.30 and welcomed all those present, while voicing regret that the meeting had to be hosted virtually rather than in person in Trondheim. Ten topics and time slots are to be discussed in the course of the meeting, including updates from the prior meetings of the Alternet iNGO.

The minutes of the previous MB meetings were distributed by Tyler. The MB unanimously approved the minutes of the past meetings; these minutes will be published on the Alternet website (member site).

The Alternet Council meeting will be held 10-11 in Aveiro, Portugal, hosted by CESAM. There will be a deadline for the MB of Monday 23 November for the preparation of all documents and proposals for the Council meeting. During the next two days, proposals will be discussed, as well as the budgets proposed to Council. Following the present meeting, proposals can be adapted and updated, but must be submitted to Tyler by 23 November so that they can be shared proactively with the Council.

The 1st of January will represent the practical beginning of the new phase of Alternet with the new Statutes and the first calendar year of the Alternet iNGO. Tyler and Jiska prepared a spreadsheet showing participation and beneficiaries from the different institutes in Alternet activities during 2020; it will be further updated before being shared with the Council.

Outcome of meeting of funding members (Friday 23.Oct) with proposal on way forward to move from the Alternet network to the official iNGO, letter to the partner institutes (Maurice - briefing on outcome of meeting this coming Friday with founding members)

Maurice presented an update on the iNGO and the state of the Council and partner institutes. The new prospective member (DICAM) from University of Trento has received 23 expressions of approval and is thereby officially recognized as new effective member

Maurice stated that Wageningen-ES, formerly Alterra, was reached out to for a final statement concerning if they intend to remain in Alternet after years without payment and minimal activity. If they do not respond by Friday, they will be dismissed from Alternet as full member at the next council meeting.

The majority of present members plan to continue their membership in the Alternet Association, following the outreach of Maurice. He recommends the following procedure: it was accepted during the prior Council meeting by consensus that the Association would be founded, so it is assumed that all members will join by default. Following this present meeting, Maurice will send a mail requesting that members accept the statutes of the new Association, repeat formally who their representative will be, and ask for actual size in terms of number of employees, thereby joining the Association. It is not intended to ask for a pledge letter, as membership in the Association assumes this already.

Maurice stated that looking into the internal rules is critical. Cash contributions in very large (>100 employees), large (51-100), medium (11-50), and small (< 10) are outlined in the internal rules. Concerns about enforceability of contributions were addressed in the new rules. Participation in activities is considered to be institutional in-kind contribution and it is assumed that the number of in-kind days corresponds with the size of the institute. Another change in

rules states that members that begin as associate members must engage themselves as full members following the first year. If small institutes do not have the possibility of making cash contribution the following year, they may contribute an equivalent amount of in-kind time. Official delegation of representatives and declaration of institutes size will be shortly forthcoming.

The MB is currently composed of ten individuals. There is no statement in the MoU that election of MB members must happen at the end of the MoU. If it is decided that extra members are needed or if MB members decide that they do not wish to continue, nomination of new members may occur. The composition of the MB must be at least six members (according to the iNGO statutes); and, in contrast with the prior MoU, the decisions regarding functions of the MB is decided by the MB itself without Council input, but excluding the election of the MB chair and vice-chair (to be decided by the council).

Maurice concluded his briefing. Philip Roche joined the meeting.

Joan asked for further clarification about in-kind contributions. Maurice noted that in-kind contributions are currently concentrated in a small number of institutes and persons; monitoring in-kind contributions has been impossible to date. Initiation has not been taken to date to ensure sufficient provision of in-kind contributions; the new updates to the rules and statutes of the iNGO are to help in addressing and resolving this. Mart questions if the cash contributions and in-kind contributions conform to the size of the institute is fair across Europe, meaning that large institutes in northwest Europe may have less difficulties than those large institutes in central eastern European countries. Mart will take this up at the Council meeting (given the internal rules are not part of the statutes, changes can be made with a simple 50% majority at the council meeting). Petteri expressed that his future service as an MB member may be better served by another representative and he would like to step down. This will be further discussed during the Infrastructure agenda point. No other MB-member expressed their wish to step down, except Andy who did so some time ago already.

Marie questioned the procedure for nomination of Chair and Vice Chair of Council. It will be an open nomination procedure if Council would like to opt for this and it will be an official agenda item of the Council meeting. Marie also questioned point 5.1 of the new statutes, which states that founding members are not necessarily members of the MB. Maurice stated that the founding members title is somewhat artificial and was used for expediency of establishment of the Association; they have no official role. The founding members may be members of the MB but are not necessarily so.

Jiska is in discussion with NINA about her continued service as MB Chair. If she has to step down, she will be replaced by the vice-chair. Alternatively, an election needs to be organised at the council meeting, given the explicit role of the AC to elect a MB chair.

Now that Alternet is a legal -NGO, a treasurer is needed. There have been suggestions, but to date the appointment is unresolved. Currently, Floris van den Broeck has handled the treasurer work. The Council would need to approve Floris as a new MB member if he is to continue in this

position. Alternatively, a present MB-member can take up this responsibility with the engagement of Floris and INBO that he will be responsible for treasurer practice. Adriana will replace Andy at the end of the year; she was already voted in by council with a mail voting (4 June 2020). In the some voting procedure, also Juliette was added as a supplementary MB member for the SPI activities, in close collaboration with Marie.

By the end of the present MB meeting, Maurice will take the next step to inform Council representatives concerning the present progress.

Budget overview and update Alternet side-activities (Biodiv Partnership, PEER, others)

Jiska shared the budget overview and reviewed the items and amounts spent to date. 190,000.76 is the present credit balance according to Maurice. A VAT number should be made available by the end of the year 2020.

So far only MTA-OK and SYKE have not paid their annual contribution, in addition to WUR-EC. All have made sufficient contributions in 2018 except ERCE-UNESCO, which made up for the deficit with in-kind. WUR-EC has consistently not paid their membership fee.

The current overview only includes costs accounted for in 2020, not necessarily total costs per activity. It was noted that many activities, including the Summer School, accrued much lower costs in 2020 due to the COVID situation. Costs for the legal structure were high in 2020 but will diminish in forthcoming years. Budgets and individual activity contracts will be dealt with further during the activity agenda points.

Alternet has been involved in planning and negotiation concerning the future Biodiversity Partnership, specifically concerning capacity building and alignment with the Summer School, Eclipse support, and potential conference collaboration. This will be further addressed later on during the meeting. Aside from the BP, there has been intensive work on a MoU with PEER. Raoul Mille proposed this MoU to align work and inform each other concerning network activities. A proposal was sent to the PEER directors and there has been internal discussion. The directors have affirmed that they do wish to sign a MoU and have presented a revised proposal, which Jiska and Maurice accepted. It will be signed at the next PEER director meeting in November.

A mail was circulated on the Green Deal calls proactively to help ensure impact on subjects. Jiska submitted consultation on behalf of Alternet and a number of partners expressed interest in joint proposals, which are listed on the Call Exchange site.

Communication (Adriana, Tyler)

Tyler presented a communications update concerning the ongoing work and activity progress of Alternet communications. It was noted that the main dynamic activity of 2020 (in addition to day-to-day internal and external communications, social media, newsletters, etc.) has been the development and integration of Eklipse communications, often in collaboration with the communications task force of Eklipse and the C32 marketing company (financed by Eklipse). C32 has almost completed the revamped Eklipse website and once its wordpress script becomes available, Tyler will begin working with Andy, Adriana, and Agusti of CREAM to create a revamped Alternet website using the new C32 design. Tyler has already drafted the updated text content for this overhauled website. We plan to have this revamped Alternet website ready before the Council meeting.

Adriana presented an overview of her current and future work as the new Alternet communications MB meeting. She proposes sending a survey to members concerning communications needs and to send an activity proposal by November 23 2020. She wishes to revise social media strategy and create an Alternet newsletter every four months. Adriana has Andy's general communications strategy; she would like to update with more operational objectives. She is also currently reviewing Tyler's web content text drafts. Adriana also addressed the work of CREAM assembling the web and server infrastructure necessary for the hosting of Alternet website, Eklipse website, and the Eklipse database. Internal discussions will commence within Eklipse to discuss the costs and possibilities for establishing a database at CREAM.

Jiska inquired Adriana's budget proposals. Adriana suggested a proposed budget of between 6-8k but will work on revising and considerations concerning this budget with Andy and Tyler. An update of printed materials for the 2021 conference was suggested. Jiska will add a rough estimate of 6-8k to the budget spreadsheet.

Multi-Site Research (Joan)

Joan presented the two ongoing (but largely finished) projects: Multi-Lake Research of Fish Ecology and Management (led by BC-CAS) and Roadmap for a European Multi-Site Wildlife Research Infrastructure (led by INBO). In 2019, the Council granted the BC-CAS project 10k for a third year (because they had extensively shared detailed plans and updates on project progress) and ceased funding for the INBO project (no third year funding). Progress made to date was reviewed by Joan.

For the INBO project a budget reallocation has been requested for: personnel costs (originally not allowed in the project call), development costs, and publication costs in open access.

The MB agreed that there is difficulty in the MSR projects, as they tend to be a small part of ongoing larger projects and rarely adequately acknowledge the Alternet funding. The MSR is an

excellent activity that promotes integration and collaboration on original and innovative scientific work; Joan will ask for appropriate recognition within the ongoing MSRs. The call stipulates that the work done on the project counts as in-kind contribution; as such, the money should be spent on other costs beyond labor.

This raised three key questions:

- Can the money be spent differently than previously approved upon?
- Based on yes or no, is there a need for the Council to rethink the current procedure (i.e. no Alternet funding for personal costs)?
- Are we to proceed with a new MSR call in 2021?

It was questioned if the money could not be spent as specified, whether we should request the money be returned. It was agreed that until the rules are changed, there is no way for costs to be spent on personal costs. Philip suggested the possibility of extending the duration of the projects as a flexibility courtesy during the corona crisis; the MB agreed, and this message will be passed on to both MSR projects.

Joan raised whether another call should be proposed to the Council; for how many projects; and how much? It was previously 10k annually allocated per project per year for up to three years. Marie suggested that as Alternet transitions, the MSR question should be actively considered. Maurice noted that research initiatives are still considered very central to Alternet by many members and that we shouldn't close the door on MSR. Juliette suggested that sentiments should be extracted about why partners participate in the initiative of sending in a proposal and why others don't. In terms of recognition, she suggested that a policy impact element (linked with Ekliptose or a different SPI element) could be interesting and further encourage proposals. Philip recommended asserting that MSR project partners should mention Alternet in all their communications and outputs. Allan suggested promoting good examples at the 2021 conference.

Jiska stated that in the proposal to Council we could also ask why partners apply and why not. We can then map the conversation and how it progresses from there. Maurice proposed to ask the Council directly how the initiative could be improved. He also proposed potentially having thematic calls, like was previously done with AHIA. Marie agreed, stating that the theme of the call could be linked to the conference.

Science-Policy Interface (Juliette)

Juliette updated the MB on SPI-relevant activities, including the UFZ SPI Seminar in 2019. Future online seminars to build SPI capacity across Alternet member institutes (rotating between institutes, with three potentially planned for March, June, and October 2021) are

proposed. There would be an open call for hosting. Seminars would be advertised, live streamed, and include 2-3 guest speakers.

An online one-stop-shop on SPIs is proposed for the Alternet website, with the aim of establishing a state-of-the-art page for anyone wanting to understand and engage in SPI at the European level. Budget options include Alternet secretariat salary, support from a professional website designer, support from a research assistant, or support from an intern. In terms of time required, establishment of the website would likely not require massive amounts of time; regular maintenance and updating would require regular input from all those involved in the Alternet SPI activity as well as Alternet secretariat. Maurice stated that the time needed for this work and relevant to many other activities establishes clearly the need for a full-time secretariat; the work needed for communications and secretariat should be presented at the end of the Council meeting. If they do not vote for continuation of the secretariat at Council, it will compromise the ability to carry out any of the other proposals and activities. Marie further stated that launching such a one-stop-shop is a necessity for establishing Alternet as the European-level center of SPI on biodiversity and ecosystem services. Juliette stated that the budget for a web developer would be approximately 2000 Euros.

In terms of technicalities for SPI seminar hosting, it should be clearly established what the technical requirements are (i.e. software issues) so that institutes can consider this when weighing the option of hosting. Juliette stated that Eklipse hosts GoToMeeting and Zoom for up to 250 participants and that institutes could use their video conference resources. Eklipse can also offer technical services. Allan noted that the virtual summer school talks, working with Tyler and other conveners, was a success and could provide many “lessons learned.”

Eklipse (Marie)

Marie introduced the activity and progress of Eklipse as the central element of Alternet’s Science Policy Society interface activities. The work of the numerous task forces was addressed, and an overview of past Eklipse activities was reviewed. The extensive content of Marie’s presentation was shared with the MB by Tyler and this powerpoint can be consulted for further detail and information. Tyler will send the Eklipse website drafts and Candice’s spreadsheet to the MB members for input.

For the 2020 proposal, four scenarios for continuation of the Eklipse Management Body (EMB) under the umbrella of Alternet were presented. 35k allocated last year remains untouched; it is proposed that this money is carried over to 2021, again as a buffer if necessary. No additional funding is otherwise proposed. The Eklipse Management Body will be composed of Marie Vandewalle (0,5 fte), Karla Locher (0,5 fte), and Candice Pouget (0,5 fte), with Tyler Kulfan serving as Alternet Secretariat hosted by UFZ.

Four scenarios:

Option 1: UFZ continues hosting the EMB, funding for requests are received by Alternet, which pays for EMB through UFZ.

--Option 1a: Requesters pay UFZ full overhead costs.

--Option 1b: UFZ decreases its overhead costs in exchange for hosting the Alternet Secretariat.

Option 2: Alternet employs the EMB directly

--2a: UFZ continues to host EMB (guest contracts)

--2b: Alternet finds someone else to host the EMB

Maurice noted that all four members of the Eklipse and Alternet secretariat are already located in eastern Germany and that any hosting of the EMB elsewhere would require them to relocate or to hire/rebuild a new EMB. Options are still being discussed by UFZ; Marie asked for feedback on the option of all secretariat members being hosted at UFZ. Tyler will be functioning under 2b for the remainder of the year, where he is employed by Alternet but works at UFZ as a guest scientist. Maurice suggested that the best, most practical way is preferable, but all depends on how we sell it to the Council. If there are no objections, the plan is to move forward with planning how they can be practically carried out. Allan stated that an honest discussion among the MB is beneficial, but that the Council will ultimately decide.

If overheads are reduced substantially, it will likely lead to more requests which is beneficial for all. What is needed is to reduce the number of possibilities before presentation to the Council. It was acknowledged that option 2b is not preferred. Another question is how this will be communicated--as an UFZ, Alternet, or Eklipse activity. Maurice suggests that we first say yes or not to the feasibility of each option and then determine the elements to prioritize. Juliette expressed that 2b is quite risky at the current stage. Jiska agrees that 2b should be eliminated at the moment. Marie stated that she also thinks 1a is not the best option and hopes it will be eventually eliminated.

Options should be presented in terms of MB preferences. UFZ is firm on 25% European Commission requests. Because UFZ is partially funded by the government, its overhead costs are inflexible. If there is a cost at UFZ for hosting, Alternet will need to cover this cost. Maurice noted that the Council may wish to further discuss the necessity of three part-time Eklipse secretariat members and one full-time Alternet secretariat. Explaining the need for three part-time employees to support the EMB is top priority (more important than establishing how exactly we spend the 35k). Marie will further detail the need for these employees. Philip noted that cost as well as benefits and work capacity should be outlined for every feasible options before the council meeting. He suggested ranking options in order of preference.

Option 2b should either be explained as relatively infeasible or eliminated. 1a, 1b, and 2a should be considered and ranked. Maurice expressed preference for 1b, as did Marie. Marie will proceed on solving remaining possibilities and practicalities. Jiska detected general agreement in a proposed ranking of 1b, then 2a, then 1a, then 2b. 2b can be reformulated or eliminated.

Day 2:

Research infrastructure (Petteri)

The agenda items were moved and Petteri began the second day's agenda with a review of research infrastructure issues and progress from 2020, including LTER, GEO BON, and LifeWatch, in addition to Alternet itself.

Petteri noted that he has struggled to determine how Alternet can best engage with such research structures, now that they are independent and external to Alternet. He suggested that supporting data flows and provisions (through Eklipse or other means) could be a potential direction for Alternet's infrastructure activities.

The infrastructure promotional video was discussed. It is largely finished but revisions were requested by Michael Mirtl and LTER. However no revision suggestions were ever provided by Micheal despite several reminders. Petteri suggested that the remaining budget of 2500k could be used for the revision and finalization of the video. The video should preferably be shortened.

Petteri stated that after three years, it is difficult for him to contribute at a sufficient level to the MB. The directors at SYKE have suggested replacing Petteri with another SYKE colleague for taking part in the MB.

Questions to MB:

- What should we do with the video?
- How should Alternet proceed with the research infrastructure activity?
- How should we replace Petteri?

Half of the allocated 5k for the video project was used; the remaining amount will be allocated to finalize the video (with or without input from LTER).

Maurice suggested revising the video with more consideration of end-user service and linking data in societal questions. Allan stated that if Petteri cannot remain (his preferred option), he would recommend Petteri finding an appropriate replacement at SYKE. He also stated that the Alternet niche should be more focused on experimentation than monitoring. Jiska stated that she believes the infrastructure activity should be maintained in the MB. Maurice stated that he also sees value of a SYKE replacement but that partners should also be given an option to add nominees (perhaps state that SYKE has a potential replacement but that other nominations are welcome). Maurice noted that there is not a set number of MB members; CESAM was mentioned, and Allan noted the potential value in having two MB members on this subject (one from Northern Europe, one from Southern Europe). If Petteri steps back, there will be a nomination process before the Council meeting and a vote at the Council meeting.

Summer school (Allan)

Allan provided a review of the 2020 Summer School. The in-person Summer School in Peyresq was cancelled and a series of virtual aperitif talks were held. It was noted that the event brought in a high number of participants and was a success.

Proposals:

1. Summer school at Peyresq, 2021
2. Planning and budget allocation for 2022 Summer School
3. To negotiate cooperation with the Biodiversity Partnership (BP) for future Summer Schools, provisionally from 2022, underpinned by a MoU.

Allan stated the importance of the independence of the Summer School; as such, he is supportive of the BP support as long as there is a MoU. Marie agreed with the importance of the MoU and avoiding the Alternet Summer School becoming the European Commission Summer School.

The 35k budget for the 2020 Summer School was unused. The Peyresq Foundation may need to raise fees, but this will not affect the 35k allocation. Juliette asked about the cooperation with the BP, stressing the Summer School's independence as crucial to its success and added value. The BP has suggested providing 20% of funding. Allan stated that, in the context of the partnership, it would be possible to set up an advisory board separate from the conveners, who ultimately make the decisions.

The BP is offering the following:

- 2-4 Person Months support provided by Partnership partners
- 4000 euros per speaker
- 950-1800 euros per participant (depending whether or not the Partnership also pays for the registration fee)

Because the funding possibility is not clearly established per today, Jiska suggested asking for the same full 35k allocation from the Council for 2022 (the budget for 2021 was already allocated last year) in case the 20% funding falls through. Maurice stated that Alternet's activities are exceeding its income in terms of cost (annual income = 55k). External funding is thus needed. Concerns for independence should be addressed in a MoU, but extra funding should be pursued.

Allan noted that the possibility for a new summer school targeting a new user group was rejected by the BP for now. Funding would be to support the current summer school practice. Maurice stated that we should establish ourselves as the strong partner in a MoU. He suggested stressing independence not only in the MoU but also in Alternet branding and advertising. The BP could freely suggest topics, speakers, etc. so long as Alternet retains the freedom to reject suggestions.

35k will be proposed for the Summer School 2021 budget. It is furthermore proposed that the MB supports negotiations regarding development of BP support, underpinned by an MoU that establishes the independence of the Alternet Summer School current practice.

Conference 2021 (Philip, Sonja)

Sonja reviewed the outputs of the 2019 Alternet Conference, including three major paper publications including the publication of the Key Messages.

The state of conference planning for 2021 was likewise reviewed. The proposed title is “Biodiversity and Health: Time for Transformative Change?” The scientific committee has met three times to plan the conference, under the leadership of Philip. Tessa, Tyler, and Adriana are providing support in organization, advertisement, and dissemination.

The 2021 Conference will be hosted at the usual venue (Augustinian Monastery in Ghent, Belgium) from 18-21 May. It is intended that at least some plenaries will be livestreamed; further consideration needs to be given to options concerning streaming and virtual capabilities in case the conference can not be held in person. MB expressed its preference for keeping the date in May 2021 fixed rather than to postpone for reasons of physical presence.

Philip shared potential goals and outcomes of the 2021 conference. The main topic sessions include: Biodiversity and ecological health (Ana Lillebo/Philip Roche); Biodiversity and human health (Jenni Lehtimaki/Tania Ploumi); time for a systematic change of food systems (Nicolas Dendoncker); How to deal with transformative changes (Jiska/Francesca Leucci); and Actionize scientific knowledge (SPI) (Allan Watt/Marie Vandewalle). The proposed Conference presentation text has been prepared; and Philip suggested that it is now time to begin advertisement and promotion.

Juliette noted that societal engagement is missing in the conversation of transformative change and recommended intentional inclusion of this in our conference. She also recommended using the conference to push transformative change from discourse to establishing clear ideas of what changes are needed and how they may be implemented. She stated that she is willing to serve on the scientific committee. Allan noted that the conference is an opportunity to promote Alternet activities--in particular, Eklipse. A session on Eklipse should be included.

Budget: A budget allocation for 2021 is needed. To prove self sustaining as much as possible, a minimal budget should be used; the fee should be raised; and means of external funding should be pursued. It was questioned if allocation from the Council should be considered a buffer, etc. Philip noted that we should keep in mind that technical costs for live-streaming will increase the cost of hosting the conference. Joan suggested that moving funding from activities under discussion (i.e. MSR) to the conference may be beneficial. Allan stated that the fee should be raised.

Marie stated that there are three possibilities: all live-streamed, streamed with speakers at the monastery, and standard in-person with streaming. Allan agreed that laying out these scenarios should be top priority. Maurice stated that there should be a significant difference between Alternet and non-Alternet fees; he also stated the strong added value of having a standard in-person conference and that we shouldn't be afraid of postponing the conference to a later date, unless the conference theme will lose its relevance.

Tyler has been in touch with the technical staff at the Ghent Monastery and can obtain a price estimate, once the scenarios for streaming, etc. have been established and he thus requested that these scenarios and what they would require be shared with him once they are composed. Allan suggested another option: an all-virtual conference at no/low cost followed by an in-person conference as soon as possible.

A new meeting of the scientific committee will be organized soon by Philip.

Proposal: An allocation of 10k is requested, potentially as a buffer with funding support also coming through alternative means.

AHIA (Philip)

Philip reported on the ongoing AHIA projects, including the 2018 project of Per Angelstam (SLU), which is in its finishing stages; and the second ongoing 2019 project of Thibault Datry (INRAe), which is likewise in its finishing stages. An online video presentation of the AHIA has been shared, along with a substantial policy brief. The 2020 project of Bede West (UKCEH) has been started and one workshop was organized. However, there are issues related to travel and expenses due to COVID-19. They have requested a reoriented budget; a budget updated from the project has been requested but not yet received. The contract has not yet been received, either. Guidelines may need to be reconsidered, as the money is typically used for in person meetings, etc. which cannot currently be held.

5k each are yet to be sent to Per Angelstam and Thibault Datry. Marie noted that the project of Bede West should have the budget shared by Friday, 30 October. Mart questioned the status of standing issues concerning the project of Per and Alternet involvement. Philip stated that new guidelines and requirements were made in response to this project; and that, ultimately, Per's project is delivering valuable and interesting outputs. Philip questioned if the 15k should be fully requested when a new call is launched in 2021, as it is likely that in-person meetings may not be possible.

Maurice questioned if the call will be thematic or not. Philip expressed openness to thematic or open calls; Jiska suggested alignment with the conference theme. Joan noted that AHIA has

been more successful than MSR specifically because the high-impact has been achieved; and, as such, it should be maintained and promoted.

Proposal: A new call will be released early 2021 and a budget of 15k is requested. It was noted that the AHIA projects are producing valuable outputs and outcomes.

--The MB will decide on a theme prior to the call release; the 23rd is the deadline for creating a theme list

--The conference topic themes will be used as potential themes

--We will ask the council how they wish to proceed with attracting more proposals for future calls.

Call Exchange (Mart)

Mart presented on Alternet's clearinghouse mechanism, the Call Exchange. He shared an overview of interest expressed in the Green Deal calls. Tyler noted that he has recently begun uploading the clusters of new Horizon calls. He also posed that, with the website being overhauled, we will have to consider how to continue the call exchange on the new website--a similar simple grid design? Or if we are hiring a web engineer for the SPI page (the one stop shop page), would it be worth spending a bit to also create a more modern, user friendly clearinghouse mechanism?

Maurice asked if the call exchange could be subscribed to the GDPR rules. He generally advised that the activity should be approached more proactively rather than reactively by partners; and questioned how the Call Exchange should be considered in light of the new legal entity. Marie noted that this issue of legal entity will be raised by the Council in terms of consortium proposals, etc., noting that UFZ was concerned about competing with Alternet for proposals.

Proposal: Allocation of 2k for a web developer to make a modern, integrated and user friendly Call Exchange clearinghouse mechanism on the new website. Both Council members and MB members are encouraged to proactively send information to Tyler about new and upcoming calls.

Maurice stated that the MB should recommend network development to the Council. If any questions are raised in the Council on the intentions of Alternet to get active on the proposal market, we can state that this is not the case on short term. In this activity Alternet remains a facilitating organisation for its members, rather than an initiative taker--but this doesn't mean that it couldn't try to put more effort in the facilitation role. The Alternet facilitating role should aim at bringing people together with shared interest in certain calls.

Are we biodiverse enough? (Jiska)

Social event hosted by Jiska.

Wrap up and closure

A deadline of 23rd November for submitting documents and final proposals to Council was established. Jiska shared the final allocated budget document. The budget proposal was finalized with input from the MB members and can be adjusted if activity proposals are revised prior to 23 November.

A balance of 190k stands; 55k should be incoming in 2021. 168,500 will be spent on ongoing activity costs and new proposals in case Council approves the budget allocations. It should be stated that there is an intention to hire a full-time secretariat and that the 20k allocation will not be sufficient for this position. It is the position of the MB that Alternet should hire Tyler as full-time secretariat serving all activities (including Eklipse). Jiska stated that all activity proposals should stress their dependency upon a full-time secretariat in order to be actualized. Maurice will pursue an estimate with Floris of what this cost will entail but presented 53k as a cost estimate. The decision upon the Eklipse EMB funding options will have an impact on the Alternet secretariat as well. Because Council has approved a half-time secretariat per year at its Council meeting in Uppsala in 2017. Maurice suggested that it is necessary to distribute the secretariat costs across the different activities so Council can clearly see the need of changing this into a full-time secretariat.

Philip suggested proactively composing a 2021 budget. Jiska, Maurice, and Tyler will work on this. External funding needs to be further pursued. Maurice stressed how low cash is relative to intrinsic costs of in-kind contributions and that there needs to be recognition of the amount of time that is spent on Alternet maintenance by a very limited number of people. Jiska proposed that a small TF of Jiska, Tyler, Floris, and Maurice works on how to present budget practicalities. Marie suggested displaying the in-kind contributions on the budget, or on a separate budget document. Philip stated that incomes of Eklipse should be included.

The meeting closed at 13.10.

Music Game:

1. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=KGwpsdD82u8> Mart
2. (<https://youtu.be/aLnZ1NQm2uk>) Philip
3. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=MKyj6lYHfT8> Sonja
4. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=FH8vgAp4VDU> Tyler
5. <https://youtu.be/bpEmjxobvby> Jiska
6. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=BhNdXr5wey0> Allan

7. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fsAMAlaas94> Petteri
8. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=wGFk295eW9o> Marie
9. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3-Yh6rnOchs> Joan
10. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=YMYI8OW7oJE> Maurice
11. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=KyKEbumYmfc> Maurice
12. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=MJabN8VP8Gk> Juliette
13. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=eCLp7zodUil> Mart
14. <https://youtu.be/3Z5qEKxfrm8> Sonja
15. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=FwkrrU2WYKg> Tyler
16. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=wP8A9rtg0il> Allan
17. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bjjc59FgUpg> Marie
18. (https://youtu.be/A02_GJtE9yM) Philip
19. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LsvuipGq2ns> Andy
20. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=XjFsZj1aHow> Joan
21. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Jo_-KoBiBG0 Jiska
22. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=s3Nr-FoA9Ps> Petteri
23. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0uHCMt3wm04> Andy
24. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=dDHJMSTzQB4> Juliette