

July 17, 2004

Peter Lehmann

Report of my board member activities

General board issues

- Planning of a General assembly in Poljce, Slovenia, for April 2002
- Participation at board-meetings, telephone conferences, internet-board-meetings, see the list in the internet.
- At the board-meetings meetings have been arranged with Paradoks in Ljubljana, with the board of the Klientenbond, with the Vienna FAPI, with the Berlin "Für alle Fälle (For all cases) e.V. and a meeting with the residents and staff of the Berlin runaway-house.
- A domain-address was bought, own space at a provider was hired. The website was done, worked over and, after asking the mailing-list participants and discussion in the board, a new design was agreed (2001).
- Speaking for ENUSP and introducing it in Germany for example on mailing lists all the time.
- Asking people and organisations for donations to ENUSP.

European Level

- Together with the board-colleagues attempts to influence policy at a European level and maintaining contacts with other international organisations active in the mental health field. Contacts and collaboration have been set up with the World Health Organisation (WHO), the European Union, the European Disability Forum, Mental Health Europe/Santé Mental Europe (the former European Regional Council of the World Federation for Mental Health), Geneva Initiative on Psychiatry, European Patients Forum, Hamlet Trust etc.
- 2002-2003: European Patients Forum meetings in Luxembourg and Brussels (representation of ENUSP as founding member)
- 2001 Conference *Coping with stress and depression related problems in Europe*, organized by the World Health Organization, the European Commission and the Federal Ministry of Social Affairs, Public Health and the Environment (Belgium), Brussels
- Actions: Fighting the Bioethical convention (Called "White Paper") until now. Lecture at the MHE conference in Rotterdam (2001)
- Participation at the MHE conference in Nova Gorica in Slovenia, May 2004, and beside, negotiations with leading members of WHO, Hamlet Trust, the new chair of MHE Claude Deutsch, other MHE officers, members of other countries' participants
- Participation at an Empowerment conference in Prato, Italy (2003)
- Participation at an antipsychiatric conference in Piacenza, Italy (may 2004)

National level actions in Austria, Germany, Switzerland, Luxembourg

- Negotiations with the German State's Secretary Dr. Volker Beck to take action against the "White Paper on the protection of the human rights and dignity of people suffering from mental disorder, especially those placed as involuntary patients", composed by the Working Party about psychiatry and human rights, a subordinated institution of the Steering Committee on Bioethics of the Council of Europe" and juridical discriminating people with psychiatric diagnoses (2002)
- Meeting with the referent of the German "Behindertenbeauftragten" to prepare a Pan-European literature competition in EYPD 2003 (result: national competition)
- March 2002, Ried, Austria: Organisation of a regional meeting of (ex-)users and survivors of psychiatry together with Austrian (ex-)users and survivors of psychiatry
- Supporting Oase (until 2004, proposing them as best practice modell)
- Representing ENUSP at PMS conference in Geneva (2003), running a workshop about ENUSP and the benefits of cooperation (mostly professionals came)
- February 2002: organisation of a symposium at the German conference of the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Verhaltenstherapie in Berlin with international speakers about self-help and empowerment
- 6//2002 Welcome-words at a congress near Koenigs Wusterhausen (Brandenburg, Germany)

Special cooperation topics

- Conflict with Clientenbond chair

In July 2002 a registered letter of the Commission came, where they told ENUSP, that the final balance of the 1999-grant (Luxembourg congress) was not sent, that supportive papers was not sent, so the final payment was rejected, and the prepaid money was demanded back. This would have meant a loss of about 35000 Euro.

To our luck this letter came shortly before our Berlin board-meeting. Paul brought all the letters and e-mails, and in the night between the board-meetings Paul and Gabor and Kerstin and I went through all the material, and we found out, that the Commission had asked again and again for the final report and the supporting documents, but Clemens had always sent the staff again, the Commission had had already. We could convince afterwards, that the Commission had made a mistake, when they send all the time to the ENUSP-address at Clientenbond, and not to Berlin to the new address. This gave the chance to convince the leader of the antidiscrimination-department of the Commission in a phone talk, to give us another 3 weeks to bring all the papers, data, reports etc. In short time the Luxembourg report got ready, we organized the supporting documents, wrote a financial report, and saved a lot of money. As Paul, as it was told, was not allowed by Clientenbond to search and send all invoices to the ENUSP Desk to include them in the financial report, about 10000 Euro were lost. It was money, which was lent by the Clientenbond.

Afterwards there were discussions between Clientenbond, who wanted ENUSP to reimburse this money. It was on the one hand money, which was not reimbursed, because it was not told by ENUSP, for which purpose it was spent. This was not pos-

sible, because Clientenbond did not show the invoices. On the other hand it was money, which was paid for people from countries outside of the European Union, and this does not accord to the rules of the grant.

The new board of Clientenbond asked us to pay this money back, which we rejected. Clemens, supported by Paul Fijn, never had the task to spend money for issues not according to the contract. There was no reason for ENUSP board for suspect, because we trusted the Clientenbond, when their former board employed Clemens, and he was announced to us as an experienced accountant, supported by Paul, the treasurer of Clientenbond. Both had managed the expenses of the Luxembourg conference, the ENUSP board had had good reason to trust both that they did it in a competent way. Different money sources did not give any reason for sorrow. When the board got knowledge of the difficulties, it got active at once and help to rescue about 30000 Euro; a lot of outstanding money was reimbursed to Clientenbond, and more could have been saved, if the new Clientenbond board would have been cooperative with ENUSP desk and board in a minimum way. The announcement of a legal case was not answered any more, as the Clientenbond did not answer ENUSP board letters. So the contact between ENUSP and the Clientenbond chair is not optimal currently, which is quite sad regarding the support of the former Clientenbond.

- MHE: Negotiations about a common organisation (2002) to apply for European Commissions Coordination grants; failed, because MHE chair Leo de Graaf did not consider the special situation of ENUSP with the half board of citizens outside the European Union, whose travel costs would not have been reimbursed, and because of a dominating role of MHE.

