

NCG Onboarding Meeting

Thursday 2/07/2020

Date and Time: 18:00 Thursday 2/7/2020

Participation: Becky Boumelha, Jon Lansman, Andrew Scattergood, Alan Gibbons, Abbie Clark, Ana Oppenheim, Barry Gray, Callum Bell, Carol Turner, Charlie Bollaen, Craig Anderson, Darran McLaughlin, Deborah Hermanns, Ed McNally, Emine Ibrahim, Gaya Sriskanthan, Harriet Protheroe-Soltani, Jennifer Forbes, Leigh Drennan, Liz Smith, Matt Wrack, Mick Moore, Mike Bird, Mish Rahman, Phil Clarke, Puru Miah, Rory Maclean, Sarah Doyle, Solma Ahmed, Sonali Bhattacharyya, Tony Kearns, Tracey Hylton, John Taylor, Shona Jemphrey

Apologies:

Staff: Ollie Hill, Chloe Koffman, Rachel Godfrey Wood, Conor Dempsey, Tyrone Nicholas, Joe Todd, Emil Charlaff

Item 1: Introductions

Item 2: NEC Update and Discussion

GS raised the possibility of interim chair and nominated AS. This was agreed. JL noted productive discussions with CLPD. JL noted the trade union vote within the NEC elections and noted they had determined it was not appropriate for unions to decide who members want to represent them. JL noted they had determined that it was inappropriate for MPs to determine who represents members. JL noted within the CLGA, the importance of reaching out to the centre of the Party, noting their role in electing Jeremy Corbyn. JL noted CLPD supported a statement of principles as well as a range of candidates. JL noted issues with STV. JL noted there are nine places but with STV, the number of candidates must be considered. JL noted that standing the number of candidates that will be realistically elected is important. JL notes that candidates must equalise the number of first preferences they get so they can all be elected. JL noted the process within Momentum includes applications and selection of candidates but candidates may not be universally agreed. JL noted previous events with the NEC by-elections. JL noted the experiences of an NEC member. JL noted the significant powers of the leadership and the

General Secretary. JL noted continuing centralisation in the party structure since Blair. JL noted the difficulty of being an NEC member.

SB noted the meeting of unions in regards to the NEC. Noted disagreements around how many candidates to run. SB noted agreements around diversity of the slate, regional spread and unity. SB noted that Corbyn would support a united slate and noted this would be a great support. SB noted the unified and comradely atmosphere.

RGW noted in regards to STV, noted lack of expertise and a desire to get some modelling that we can trust to base decisions on. RGW noted the chance of this in the time frame is small. RGW noted broad consensus around not being able to win 9 places but noted uncertainty around the specific number of candidates that the left should field. RGW noted the possibility of running more candidates with the possibility of asking them to withdraw later. RGW noted the possibility of more information later. AS noted the importance of needing a strategy from this discussion.

JTa noted JL's point about union input into NEC meetings and noted that it was agreed that decisions would be made by groups and not unions. JTa noted the observer role for unions, office holders or MPs rather than a decision-making role. JTa noted that the CLGA veto would be removed and SB concurred. RGW noted that the question of the veto is relatively irrelevant. TK asked RGW about modeling to be shared with the NCG. RGW agreed.

MM noted concerns around membership consultation and asked how Momentum can involve members. MM noted that a decision should be made around who will act as negotiators. MW noted that Momentum should explain the timescale makes member involvement difficult. MW suggested some sort of explanatory statement about practical difficulties because of the deadline. MW agreed with MM about negotiators being decided. AS asked RGW if it was possible to include a statement with the NEC applications. JT answered and acknowledged the application email. JT noted that it can contain a statement from the NCG. PC noted that a united slate is the most important thing and notes that the right has deliberately decided on a short timetable. PC proposed electing two negotiators immediately. RM seconded.

AS asked for objections. CT noted that two negotiators should be elected at the end of the discussion. AS agreed.

CT noted agreement with MM and noted a separate discussion to improve democratic processes but noted there is a lack of time. MR noted the timetable and organisation of Labour to Win. MR noted that a close to the negotiating period must be established. EI noted that previous negotiations that had been entered without a final mandate or decision. EI noted the need for flexibility as well as having a clear consensus. PM asked for clarification around the meeting schedule and noted that any negotiators should be experienced with the CLGA set up due to the lack of time. RM agreed with the need for negotiators and nominated SB and AS. RM also noted what the specifics of the membership email are. JT noted that Saturday evening is the current deadline for expressions of interests. HPS asked about the possibilities of running an open primary. RGW noted that there realistically is no staff capacity and the level of information provided would be very low and participation could be low. AS asked about alternative processes. RGW noted that the candidates could be shortlisted on Saturday night. RGW suggested that an elected panel review the candidates based on a specification. Noted that there are variables which could affect this ie the size of a panel. RGW noted the atmosphere must facilitate open speech about candidates. AS suggested five NCG members to review applications and to discuss before Tuesday around the number of candidates to run.

LD asked if there was capacity to create a ballot. RGW noted the difference in capacity and the nature of the ballot in comparison to the December ballot. OH noted that TN had said that there is no capacity without hiring extra digital capacity, which may be expensive. AS noted that open primaries may not be suitable. MM seconded RM's nomination of negotiators. MM noted that a selection panel should be selected by Saturday. MM noted timescale and noted the lack of capacity in regards to open primaries. MM proposed not having a Sunday meeting and coming back on Monday instead. RM seconded. RGW noted the meeting proposal. AS agreed with a selection panel being determined on Saturday. AS suggested that the newly elected Chair may want to assess the viability of a Sunday meeting.

AS acknowledged the proposal for AS and SB to be negotiators. CT noted the continuity of negotiators is important and asked if anyone would like to nominate themselves. AS agreed. AS asked for self-nominations. MM asked if RGW could attend and RGW acknowledged that she had been previously attending. AS noted support for RGW attending meetings. AS proposed himself and SB as negotiators.

This was agreed.

AS noted the discussion of selectional panel on Saturday. AS outlined process as follows:

1. Applications
2. Short listing process (deadline Saturday night, decided by panel and may include interviews)
3. Full NCG makes decision (Monday night)
4. Take results to negotiations on Tuesday

AS noted the importance of interviews and noted that the panel may be doing interviews between Saturday and Monday. AS proposed agreeing this process. **This was agreed with a clear majority.** RGW noted normally that people doing interviews make the decision and AS noted that interviews are important. AS asked about vetting and asked if RGW could draft a proposal for vetting on Saturday. AS asked JT to include a recognition of the process in the email out to members.

Item 3: Budget Review

CD addressed the budget situation, addressed income and membership figures.

Item 4: Complaints procedure

CK outlined complaints procedure and the role of the Disputes Panel.

Item 5: Review Group Proposal

BB outlined Review Group Proposal as per the papers. BB outlined the need for a Review Group to make key budgeting and organizational decisions. BB noted the framework for deciding Momentum's future. BB noted the report to outline Momentum's current situation and highlight areas of work to overcome challenges. BB noted a review of strategic objectives. BB outlined the process of forming the Review Group and assessing Momentum's resource strategy. RGW noted that this could be discussed further on Saturday. BB acknowledged previous structure reviews. OH noted the review group's previous conclusion in Summer of 2019, which is now less relevant. RM asked if it was possible to get the previous documents regarding the 2019 review including budgets and OH agreed. DH noted that it should be led by strategy and political vision and asked about how it fits within ongoing work. RGW noted Quarterly Operational Plans as stemming from strategic objectives and are accountable to the

NCG. RGW noted objectives stemming from historical projects, NCG decisions or reaction to circumstances. JTa noted there should be union representation on the Review Group.

Item 6: Ways of Working

BB outlined existing NCG structures. BB outlined the current meeting schedule. BB outlined the methods of reporting within the NCG structures. Noted that working groups can be used for time-limited projects. RM asked about existing subgroups. DH asked how the NCG can communicate with each other. BB outlined previous attempts to communicate as a whole and noted the previous standard of taking decisions via email. BB noted NCG Officers group taking decisions when they are needed quickly. RGW noted that establishing a remit for working groups and sub-groups as opposed to the full NCG. RGW noted the balance between being a reactive organization as opposed to developing long-term strategies. CT noted that the business communication of the NCG must be separate from methods of informal communication.

BB highlighted proposals and areas that need greater oversight. BB noted suggestions around papers and meetings, comms communications, quoracy, membership communication, emergency meetings and term limits for NCG members. AC asked how the NCG has communicated previously within their regions and how they can access groups and data officers. RGW noted that the Regional Organisers have the contacts within their regions and can communicate this. GS suggested that there be continuous report backs to the members, especially given the NEC slate timetable and proposed a call on Sunday night to members. MM supported GS's suggestion and noted it should be regular. CT noted that there could be problems with this given the process is not completed. HPS disagreed and noted it would be beneficial to members. DH noted agreement with HPS and noted it could be an opportunity to establish political priorities for the NEC.

RGW revisited the actions for the NEC candidate selection and asked about the interview panel. MM clarified that this would be established on Saturday. MM noted there is not enough communication with the members. RGW noted that JT would establish a proposal for doing a call on Sunday evening. AS noted that we cannot overshare in regards to the process but it is important to establish communication with the members. AS suggested a video on STV. RGW noted that this can be taken to the video team. DH asked for clarification regarding the full NCG making a decision on candidates. This was noted to be the decision taken on Monday.

AOB