1. The elected chair

Sven H.E. Borei (SFÖ), transforlag@heskonsult.com

2. Work programme (2011-12)

The work programme submitted to the EC in March 2010 and included with this report has not and cannot be fulfilled until the first two points have been approved. For that to occur, we have included a revised purpose and scope document expanded with one paragraph (§ 6, page 1) and a descriptive note (page 3). This document must be approved before the committee can continue its work programme.

3. Budget

The budget comments in the work programme submitted to the EC in March 2010 stand, in much because of the time taken by the FIT structure in dealing with the committee’s draft purpose and scope and since true work on an international level regarding human rights requires a budget and staff time FIT at the present time cannot supply.

4. Actions during 2010

a. Work on the draft purpose and scope document has been completed, gone one round to the FIT office, its president, and the EC. Final approval is necessary.

b. A request for assistance from a US translator/interpreter was deemed a private matter not related to the individual’s profession. The person was advised to contact the UN Human Rights office and has done so.

c. A request for intervention regarding employee exploitation in Argentina was deemed a question of employee rights, not a result of the profession of the individuals involved. The request was returned to the EC with this explanation.

5. Future operational framework

Given the highly diverse and decentralised membership of FIT, the currently tightly centralised decision-making structure, the difficulties with recruiting working members to a certain committees and the sheer distances/expenses of committee work, we recommend a structural experiment. The aim is to gain a stronger involvement from the national organisations and individual professionals without therefore dismembering FIT, a definite possibility at the present time. It could also make meetings possible in areas with geographic and cultural proximity.

From its international focus and the scrutinizing nature of its scope, the Human Rights Committee is a good place to try a new structure. The model is in part the impartial audit committees that exist in both profit and not-for-profit organisations. We suggest the following:

a. The committee chair, while appointed by the EC, need not be a member of a FIT member organisation, though he or she must be a translator/interpreter of standing.

b. The committee chair shall be appointed for a six-year period to provide continuity for work that does not lend itself to short-term familiarity or accomplishments.

c. Regional sub-committees should be formed from within the FIT membership, answerable to the international committee.

d. The international committee shall be composed of one representative (chair?) from each of the regional sub-committees plus the chair and shall have a co-ordinating, monitoring and motivational role, plus serve as FIT’s contact to other rights organisations. The committee would, of course, answer to the EC and thus to the Congress.

e. All reporting and budget rules would stand as before.

This needs to be approved in principle now, though the details can be worked out over time.