

**AESOP Council of Representatives Meeting,
12th April 2013, Gdańsk University of Technology**
MINUTES

Welcome address. Speaker: Thomas Matta, Treasurer (ThM)

Introducing of the CoRep Agenda. Speaker: ThM

Discussion: The Treasurer welcomes everyone and introduces the ExCo to the CoRep.

The letters from Gert de Roo (GdR), AESOP President and Izabela Mironowicz (IM), AESOP SG explaining their absences are being read out.

ThM briefly describes the agenda of the meeting.

Debate:

AESOP 'going international' - Is AESOP going global supporting GPEAN, investing in its bilateral relationship with ACSP or doing both? Position paper is available.

Moderator: Andrea Frank (AF)

AF would like to make this an interactive debate, so she encourages the CoRep to make their statements. AF tells the history of AESOP going international – a brief summary of collaboration with other planning associations and the joint congresses around the world.

Discussion: Pantelis Skayannis (PS) says that if the common congress with ACSP every 5 years is problematic for AESOP it is a good idea either not to have it, or to have it compensated with something else. For example, a memorandum about AESOP and ACSP participating in each other conferences and allowing acceptance at a membership rate. GPEAN in general is very important, because it connects the various continental planning associations. PS suggests embracing GPEAN, but questions the location of the congress. This location should rotate on equal and democratic basis.

Eduardo Cáceres – there have been economic crashes recently, which makes the question “where” even more crucial; furthermore we need to keep in minds that teachers’ salaries are low, and their available budget can be a serious problem.

Gerhard Schimak (GS) – in his opinion AESOP congresses become massive, so small universities cannot house it. GPEAN is more important than ACSP, so maybe it is not necessary to have joint congress every five years.

Economic issues should not be such a huge problem and maybe the financial situation will change in the next five years, so once every 5 years a global congress abroad is not a bad idea.

Ela Babalik-Sutcliffe – agrees with PS and GS that it is essential to support global conference and GPEAN, but admits that fees last time were extremely high. Anyway, economic issues should not be more important than benefits from international cooperation, furthermore it may result in new members. We should choose places we could afford.

Maros Finka – AESOP should not exclude schools, but it is true that congresses are rather expensive.

AF injects that in recent GPEAN discussions the idea has been proposed that Thematic Groups could and are becoming more global, and that GPEAN is considering to launch an e-publication to further facilitate knowledge exchange amongst planning education associations; global crisis affects us but there is also a lot of value in learning from others for example how other schools cooperate with NGO and others.

Paulo Silva – AESOP should develop connections and networks, and maybe look for more spontaneous relations with others. Fees should be lower especially when we are thinking about cooperating with Africa.

Kristina L. Nilsson (KLN) – international cooperation is essential but we should not favour Americans than others.

Maybe AESOP could do a parallel congress, although it is hard to manage with so many things and meetings.

AF – concludes that there is a support for GPEAN, not so much support for ACSP and this issue should be considered carefully. AESOP also benefits while attending other’s congresses, but we need to discuss further with

Americans how to keep interacting (and others).
<i>Summary:</i> GPEAN is considered to be important for AESOP, more than the joint congress with ACSP. AESOP should think of how to solve this problem. Basically, AESOP should go global but taking the consequences into consideration as well.
CoRep Elections. GPEAN Representatives: presentation of both candidates, followed by voting
<i>Discussion:</i> AF what it entails to be a GPEAN representative: to represent AESOP interests at a global forum, etc. Thomas Matta introduces the candidates: Ela Babalik-Sutcliffe and Paulo Silva. The voting proceeds. There are 14 votes for Ela Babalik-Sutcliffe and 8 for Paulo Silva.
<i>Summary:</i> Ela Babalik-Sutcliffe is a new GPEAN Representative
CoRep ratifications
<i>Discussion:</i> KLN informs about the new committee chairs – Karina Pallagst as chair of the Best Published Paper Prize Committee and Lia T. Vasconcelos as chair of the Excellence in Teaching Prize Committee. ThM presents the recommended Financial Auditors: Louis Albrechts and Andreas Voigt. Both are accepted by the CoRep.
ThM presents new members. There are 6 new schools: 3 full members and 3 associate members. Full: Department for Urban Sustainable Development (Perm National Polytechnic University) Full: School of Spatial Planning (Dublin Institute of Technology) Full: Faculty of Architectural Sciences, Department Urbanism and Spatial Planning (Artesis - Antwerp University Association) Ass > Full: Department of Urban and Regional Planning (Gdansk University of Technology) Ass: Research Centre Technology - Area Development (Windesheim University, Zwolle NL) Ass: Department of Environmental Sciences and Engineering (New University of Lisbon) All the new members are accepted by the CoRep
<i>Summary:</i> CoRep ratifies new members and new officials.
Forthcoming events – EUSS 2013 Madrid, HOS Hamburg 2014, EUSS 2014 Tours
<i>Discussion:</i> KLN briefly informs about forthcoming events, not going into details: what, when, and where is happening.
Update of the forthcoming joint AESOP ACSP Congress 2013, Speaker: Gerhard Schimak
<i>Discussion:</i> GS provides information about the Congress in Dublin. He says that everything is going very fine and there were a lot of abstracts submitted. Papers with data about the congress, provided by Zorica Nedovic-Budic and IM, are being reviewed.
<i>Summary:</i> AESOP is optimistic about the Congress 2013.
Presentation of AESOP Congress 2014 (Speaker: Luuk Boelens, Chair of LOC)
<i>Discussion:</i> Luuk Boelens gives an interesting and rich ppt presentation which shows the university, the city, the transportation system, the concept of the congress schedule, the practicalities, the fees, the LOC, the PhD Workshop, etc. Eduardo Caceres complains that the tracks are the same as everywhere else, and there is nothing creative and new while planning conditions are changing. Vincent Nadin (VN) answers that there is a lot of continuity due to issues which must be continued, but for example there is one new track and the organizers are still looking for ideas. Verena Peer says that YA would like to play a role in the congress and use it – for example for YA assembly. VN answers that the organizers will of course talk with YA about the PhD workshop and other possible activities. PS (Pantelis) points out that new tracks will need new track chairs, and we need to think of how to attract people to participate. Luuk Boelens ensures that there will be cooperation on tracks between local and AESOP chairs. ExCo accepts the tracks.
<i>Summary:</i> Luuk Boelens gives an impressive presentation of Utrecht as place of Congress 2014, the discussion is intense, but quite optimistic.
Aesop YA Report. Speaker: Verena Peer
<i>Discussion:</i> VP presents the YA report. She informs about the activities the YA took part in, the workshops they

conducted, and the booklet series. There were no questions from the audience.

Summary: The report is optimistic and approved by the CoRep

Treasurer Report. Speaker: ThM

CoRep's approval of the AESOP budget 2013

Discussion: CoRep is given the copies of the budget for 2013 and the final statement of 2012 (copies from the files repository amended after the ExCo meeting). ThM presents briefly the documents and explains very shortly most of the subsections. There are no questions to the Treasurer. The statement for 2012 and the budget for 2013 are accepted and approved. Nobody voted against any document.

Summary: The report for 2012 and the budget for 2013 are approved.

AESOP Congress 2015: presentation(s) of the bids by Prague & Lisbon, followed by voting

Discussion: Presentation of Prague bid by Karel Maier; the topic: planning and responsibility. Presentation of Lisbon bid by Jose Ferreira; theme: crossroads: meeting opportunities and expectations. The voting proceeds. There are 13 votes for Prague and 10 for Lisbon. Prague will host the Congress in 2015. GS feels that this competitive approach is unproductive and could cause a lot of bad feelings especially if like in the recent past some schools loose out multiple times in a row. Thus, he proposes in the case that there are two equally good quality proposals (and little difference in the votes) both should be offered to host the conference in consecutive years and that CoRep should offer that Lisbon could host the congress in 2017, if Lisbon does not choose to withdraw within the next 1,5 year.

The proposal receives mixed reactions. Ela Babalik-Sutcliffe asks what will happen if we have three or more applications – GS answers that we should make more criteria about how we handle a very good application. GS asks if CoRep accepts the proposal, but ThM and KLN caution that such a decision requires proper discussion and consideration of any possibly consequences of setting such a precedent.

Maros Finka suggests we can decide about this simple case now and talk about the principle in Dublin.

Zeynep Enlil says that we need to think carefully about what “small difference between votes” mean (1 vote, 2 votes?) before we introduce such procedure.

There are voices that this decision should be postponed till CoRep meeting in July in Dublin.

Vincent Nadin (VN) interjects that CoRep should be careful with ad hoc changes and should follow the procedures.

No matter what the difference is, AESOP should not manipulate and modify procedures after the fact. .

ThM and KLN initiate a voting “who is for postponing this decision to Dublin?” There are 18 votes for postponing this decision, and 5 votes against. This issue needs to be put on the agenda for Dublin.

Maros Finka says it will not be the same, because in Dublin there will be different people in CoRep.

KLN says that AESOP must start with principle, and that we need a proper debate in Dublin.. We must not forget that there may be other candidates who would like to apply but they missed the opportunity and are excluded. So this decision needs to wait.

Summary: The Congress in 2015 will take place in Prague. The voting and decision procedure will be reviewed in Dublin

Topics addressed by CoRep members to be discussed

A first step in response to the outcome of question 9a of the President's Questionnaire regarding the CoRep's actions and initiatives

Discussion: There are many issues CoRep would like to discuss; these are:

- Why there are so few people from certain countries attending, (for example) France or Spain. There are many schools from these countries and few people here... is this a language matter?
- The debate about the bids.
- The status of the planner in different countries.
- The so-called slow planning
- What shall we do during the meeting? (Karel Maier points out that this is not up to CoRep to debate this, CoRep is a decision-making board.)
- The issue of going global should be discussed contextually. Where is AESOP going to? AESOP is not present in many important meetings and is being marginalized. What about getting funds? What is the AESOP authority and how to build it? When AESOP authority is stronger, then it has the power to influence. Proposal: debate the future of AESOP.

– What is the potential of AESOP and how to use it? What is the potential of planners and educators? It is costly to meet together, so we should do something essential.

- Luuk Boelens says that decision made by the CoRep from his country is actually not his, because he has no idea what the CoRep decided, so basically the CoRep does not represent the country. Maybe this way of “representing the country” should be reconsidered?
- Planning field is in a weak position and some schools are threatened in their existence. What can the association do and how can AESOP strengthen the position of planning, lobby and create awareness in EU?
- Why are HoS and CoRep meetings day after another and not together?
- To dedicate more time to discuss and maybe have more time for CoRep.

KLN initiates a voting “who wants to have more time for CoRep?”. There are 14 votes for extending the CoRep session.

Summary. There are many diverse issues that CoRep would like to discuss. But first of all the CoRep session should be longer.

AOB. Speaker: ThM

The members must be reminded about the calls for papers. The Treasurer closes the session and invites everyone to the Welcome Reception.