

Working group 1

Subject: to deal with the ideas of his Excellency Bishop Burns concerning the current situation and the future of AMI

Chairman: LtCol GS Wittkamp

Members: Representatives of the following member states of AMI: Belgium, Great Britain, Kenia, Malawi, Slovakia, Spain

2 main items:

Future of AMI

- What is AMI going to be?

The answer, in general is given by the statutes of AMI. AMI will neither be a think tank giving a razor sharp analysis nor a body merely reporting to the Vatican.

- What about the NGO status?

A possible contradiction or conflict was seen between the individual status being a member of a government subordinated body, the armed forces and the planned non governmental status of AMI. The question was asked: Does the Vatican know what he asks to the military personnel being a member of AMI?

The answer could be: The NGO status gives to AMI a formal status allowing to raise its voice e. g. in the UN and to be listened as a body providing military expertise or at least experience.

Remarks on the format of the general assemblies:

- The general assemblies should be organized in a coherent way: beginning from a overall theme, being followed by conferences to be discussed in working groups and leading to a touchable result, possibly in form of a paper which delegations can take home.
- Clear results of a GA are also needed to convince national bodies on the necessity of AMI and the need to attend its assemblies
- Thus, also the flyer should be continued providing information on the recent work of AMI as it is foreseen this year

Taking on board the proposals made by Bishop Burns

- there should be something between the general assemblies during a year
- there should be intermediate working groups which
 - o should be organized formally, beginning with a formal invitation to the appropriate Point of contact in a member state of AMI
 - o the necessity was seen to regionalize these meetings to make travelling easier and to assure the financing of the meetings
- the format of the general assembly itself:
- GAs should be shorter and more efficient – bearing in mind that individual members not always are available to spend a whole week at the Assembly
- Thus, the presentation of member states and / or organisations in its current form could be replaced by a presentation on a large paper sheet giving the necessary information and presented as a kind of exhibition during the conference and explained if needed by the respective representatives of the nations.
- The order of events during the GA could be changed: leave the cultural programme of the GA at its end could give to certain representatives who are short of time the possibility to attend at least the official and working part of the Assembly. Personal

remark: I leave it open to you to consider the question of cohesion between AMI members.

We should all be aware of some basic facts:

- AMI work depends largely on the engagements of its representatives of the different member organisations. They are asked to take on board and make live the proposals given by this working group. See Gerard Dijkers remarks on his standing working group earlier this week
- AMI is financially speaking not the most powerful body. Therefore limits are given to the format and the organisation of General Assemblies – just the way, Gerard Dijkers explained it yesterday: to get a lunch, you sometimes have to pay by a briefing.

If there isn't any opposition by the honourable assembly, I propose to hand over the proposals to the AMI EXECOM to deal with and to bear them in mind when organizing the next assembly. I myself will put the working results in a decent text which can be added to the minutes of the this years' assembly.