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Dear Jos, dear colleagues,

I am answering to your mail as a founding member of ERA not as one of the RCE-coordinator.

I am disappointed that you already started a discussion in our ERA-network without involving me and subsequently the RCE Oldenburger Münsterland which were member of ERA from the beginning on. What are you doing contradicts to our standards of transparency and democracy. That is a pity.

The starting point of ERA was to bring together all RCEs which are willing and able to cooperate on a european level. Furthermore ERA should be open for other multistakeholder-networks to make us more visible to the EU-bodies. Our activities focussed on being pro-active in order to get funds and to share ideas.

In your letter, you wrote that the informal coordination (What do you mean by this? ERA, Jos´activities or OPEDUCA-meetings?) was not acknowledged by UNU-IAS. I am wondering why you complaining about this. At that time we decided that all RCEs are free to decide how and with whom they want to affiliate. We do not need a permission of UNU-IAS for going ahead with ERA or any other joint venture.

Most important on our initiative and essential for our principles was not to exclude any RCE which were not able to work on the european level because of financial or any other reasons. But we do not wanted to be hold back by these RCE as well, just to go ahead with our actions and to use the energy we felt in 2013.

But since then nothing happened. ERA was inactive for several reasons.

1. Jos wanted to invite RCE Grand Rapids, as a strong member of ERA. Therefore we discussed to change the name because ERA was not focussing on european cooperation anymore. Finally we had not decided it.

2. Thomas from BENE Munich, as I remember, was distant to some crucial aspects of our activities (e.g. collaboration with big enterprises vs. Alternative trade organisations) and needed more time to discuss this point in his RCE.

3. I, myself, tried to clear the difference between OPEDUCA and ERA.

4. The members of ERA where paartly overwhelmed with work and could not be active as they want to be.

Nevertheless, I am happy to be part of ERA and hope that there are no new commitments which I should have to know and which could change my mind and make again a discussion necessary in RCE OM.

Last but not least I suggest to skip all side blows on what happened in Okayama. As you know I do have a different view on the outcomes of the meetings. Concerning the spontaneous meeting on wednesday afternoon I was a part of the meeting only by accident. I was not invited officially. Looking back, do you think it was an ERA-meeting? If so, why did you not recognize that some RCE were not-attendant? But it is not productive to put these point in our focus. It is time-consuming and in my view rubbish.

We should focussing our future discussions in a line with the guidelines of our positioning paper on function and goals of our collaboration and coming back to action.

Your letter causes some confusion among the european RCE. I received requests of several RCEs. So I am sure you have sent the letter to different european RCEs seperately. Because I do not know to which RCEs exactly, I use the official european RCE-contact list to make sure that all RCEs concerned receive my answer.

Looking forward to a fruitful cooperation.

Sincere regards

Detlev