Minutes of a Meeting of the Board of Representatives held on Sunday 2nd and Monday 3rd August 2009 at the Hyatt McCormick Place Hotel, Chicago, USA.

Present: Charles M. T. Hanly (President); Gunther Perdigao (Secretary General); Henk Jan Dalewijk (Treasurer); Madeleine Bachner; Paul Denis, Marie-France Dispeaux, Yolanda Gampel, François Ladame, Gertraud Schlesinger-Kipp, David A. Tuckett, Alicia Leisse de Lustgarten, Plinio Montagna, Maria Paz de la Puente, Maria Inés Raitzin De Vidal, Clara Uriarte, Fernando Weissmann, Harriet I. Basseches, Fred Busch, William Glover, Arthur Leonoff, Nadine A. Levinson, Beth J. Seelig, Invited: David Coe (Director General); Simon Shutler (Finance Director), Joanne Beavis (Corporate Services Manager); Fabienne Michelet (Assistant to the President).

Leo Rangell (Honorary President) for part of the meeting.

Apologies from Wilson Amendoeira and Frederick Perlman.

Prof. Hanly welcomed the Board members to this first meeting of the new administration. He welcomed new Members to the Board. He welcomed Dr. Leo Rangell, Honorary President who was joining the meeting for a few hours.

1. Minutes of Previous Meeting: The minutes were unanimously approved.

2. Matters arising: There were no matters arising.

3. Introduction to Structures and Procedures: Each Board member was given a Board Manual to assist them throughout the term. It contained the following documents: An explanation of the structure of the IPA and role of the Board, Robert’s Rules of Order – A Quick Guide, IPA Rules (Previously Constitution & Bylaws), Procedural Code documents, Committee Mandates (current at that time) and the Current IPA Budget.

Mr. Coe encouraged feedback on ways to improve this booklet. From time to time as documents changed new pages would be sent by e-mail so that Board members could print them out and replace old versions in the document. He stressed that although Board members had been elected by their regions they should always act in the interests of the entire membership.

The Board were informed that it would be necessary for them to vote upon some policy decisions during this meeting so that the Budget and Finance Committee could begin to put together the budget for 2010.

Prof. Hanly asked that Board members to keep him informed of any problems or issues so that the Board could function as efficiently as possible.

Dr. Perdigao requested that people contact him if they have any administrative questions.

Prof. Hanly asked Dr. Rangell to say a few words to the Board. Dr. Rangell spoke about the role of Honorary Officer and welcomed the new Members to the Board. He was pleased to be able to attend this meeting at the beginning of this administration.

4. Linking of Representatives: After some discussion Prof. Hanly said that it was obvious that we should respect the differences in the three regions and that each regional group of Representatives should put forward their own proposals on how to link with their Regional Organisation.
It was also agreed that the 7 Representatives in each region should work towards creating a list of link responsibilities to the Societies in their region and send them to Broomhills so that they could be communicated to the Societies and the rest of the Board.

**Action: Broomhills**

5. **Amendment to Operating Procedures for IPA Committee, Committee Appointments:**

This proposal was put forward in order to allow Board members to be appointed as Chairs of Committees. It was pointed out that the Procedural Code had previously been changed to disallow Board members from being on International New Groups Committees because of concerns of conflicts of interest when voting in Board meetings. It was explained that if this were the case those people should declare a conflict of interest and leave the room before any vote on matters pertaining to their Committee.

Prof. Hanly explained that there would be some Committees that would not have a Board member on them because of confidentiality issues, for example the Ethics and Elections Committees.

It was generally felt that allowing Board members to be appointed to Committees would give the Board a better insight into the Committees’ work.

The motion to approve the proposed amendment was seconded and approved with 2 abstentions.

**Action: Broomhills**

6. **Mandates for Project Groups on Conceptual Integration, Clinical Observation and Outreach and Analytic Practice and Scientific Activities Committees (CAPSA):**

There was some concern about the relationship of CAPSA to other IPA Committees as some felt that the text in the document did not reflect the structure diagram that was attached.

There was much concern about the use of the term ‘Task Force’ as it had military connotations in other languages. After some discussion it was unanimously agreed that the term would be changed to ‘Project Group’.

Prof. Hanly said that it was hoped that the Chairs of these groups could begin to plan their work and report to the Board in January; the structure could be amended then if necessary.

The Project Group mandates were discussed. It was felt that the Project Groups should decide whether to create working groups and not be required to do so. It was agreed that the ‘methods of working’ should be a guide and not a requirement. The words ‘Its methods of working shall include but need not be limited to:’ were changed to ‘Its methods of working may include but need not be limited to:’.

In line with this change it was also agreed that the paragraph pertaining to budgets should be changed from: ‘Anticipated working group costs should be included in the CAPSA budget.’ to ‘If the Project Group decides to use working groups the costs of those working groups will be included in the CAPSA budget.’

It was agreed that the following sentence should be added: ‘It is anticipated that the work of the Project Group will finish with the publication of its findings.’
Project Group on Conceptual Integration: The motion to approve the mandate for this Project Group with the amendments listed above was unanimously approved. The final document can be found attached to this document in appendix 1.

Project Group on Clinical Observation: The motion to approve the mandate of this Project Group with the same amendments as approved for the previous mandate was approved unanimously. The final mandate can be found attached to this document in appendix 1.

Project Group on Outreach: It was agreed that this should be a Committee and not a Project Group. It was also felt that the Committees for which the Outreach Committee has overall responsibility should be subcommittees of the Outreach Committee. ‘Representatives’ was changed to ‘members’ in the composition of the Committee. The motion to approve the mandate with these changes was seconded and approved unanimously. The final mandate can be found attached to this document in appendix 1.

CAPSA Mandate: It was agreed that an honorary secretary should be added to this Committee as there would be a large amount of activities that would need coordinating. The mandate with this amendment was unanimously approved. The final mandate can be found attached to this document in appendix 1.

The resolution that in 3 ½ years the Board will carry out a retrospective review of all four projects so that the next administration has a comprehensive overview of the projects was approved unanimously. The final report on these projects will be submitted to the last Board meeting of this administration.

**Action: Prof. Hanly**

Dr. Dalewijk reworked the diagram of the structure of these Project Groups to give the Board two options of how it could work. The Board was in unanimous agreement that the structure should be as detailed in appendix 1 of this document.

7. *International Research Board:* The motions contained in the proposal paper submitted to the Board were discussed. There was concern about the public relations side of research and it was suggested that a public relations person be a part of the structure to ensure that outcomes where properly reported to the Membership and Societies.

The Board would be given the opportunity to direct money to certain research projects and the Committee would be asked to send regular reports to the Board on how projects are proceeding.

The Research database should be more readily available to Members and the public.

A research discussion forum on the IPA’s website was also requested.

It was also suggested that a member of the Board be appointed to the Research Board (as a nonvoting member of the Research Board) so that they could report back on the effectiveness of the structure of the Research Board.

The following motions as contained in the paper concerning the Research Committee structure where approved unanimously with the addition of the appointment of a Board members as mentioned above:

**Motion 1:** The Research Advisory Board shall be replaced by an International Research Board. The International Research Board shall be composed of a Chair, a Vice-Chair.
research and a Vice-Chair evaluation, who are internationally recognized currently active researchers, six voting members who are currently active internationally recognized researchers in the fields of psychoanalytic research represented by the Board’s subcommittees. The chairs of the sub-committees shall be ex-officio non-voting members of the Research Board.

*Mandate*

The International Research Board shall:

1. Recommend research policies, priorities and budgets as well as report its activities and the activities of its sub-committees to the Board of Representatives annually,
2. Recommend appointments to the Research Board and its sub-committees to the President,
3. Approve budgets and programmes and assume responsibility for and oversight of its subcommittees to ensure their equitable financing, to avoid duplication and to achieve co-operation whenever possible and practical,
4. Search for additional funding and other strategies to advance psychoanalytic research consistent with the best research standards in the interest of psychoanalysis as a science and a clinical practice.
5. Work with the Public Information Committee, the newsletter, journals, congress programmes etc. to disseminate research finding to IPA members and the public.

*Motion 2:* The International Research Board shall have a Committee on the Evaluation of Research Proposals and Results.

*Mandate*

The Committee on the Evaluation of Research Proposals and Results will decide which research projects will be funded on the basis of merit and relevance. The criteria for relevance will be decided by the Research Board subject to the approval of the Board of Representatives. The criteria are together necessary and sufficient. The Committee shall have a chair with expertise in at least one of the three fields of research enunciated above and will be an ex-officio member of the Research Board. There shall be a sufficient number of members of the committee with expertise in the three fields of research enunciated above to evaluate the research projects submitted in a timely way. When variations in the volume of submissions require it, the chair may appoint sufficient consultants to do the work expediently subject, in each case, to the approval of the Chair of the Research Board.

The Committee will evaluate the results of the research projects that have been approved and funded after their completion.

*Motion 3:* The Board of Representatives approves the following changes to the following sub-committees of the Research Board: the division and re-naming of the Empirical and Conceptual Research Committees into the Committee on Empirical Research and the Committee on Clinical Research.

The Committee on Empirical Research (together with the Committee on Clinical Research) will replace the existing Conceptual and Empirical Research Committee and be mandated to advance empirical research among psychoanalysts and other researchers who are interested in psychoanalysis by advocacy, by helping colleagues develop relevant projects, by facilitating co-operation and collaboration among researchers and their projects, by organizing conferences on significant results and by any other strategies consistent with sound methodological standards and substantive relevance. It is understood that research projects will vary in the relative importance of factual findings and theoretical considerations. The Committee will prepare its proposals and detailed estimates of their costs to the Research Board in good time for the Board’s preparation of its
recommendations to the Board of Representatives and its Budget and Finance Committee. The Committee shall have a chair who is an expert empirical researcher who shall be an ex-officio member of the Research Board supported by five to ten members.

The Committee is enjoined whenever scientifically and practically possible to co-operate with the Committee on Clinical Research with respect to projects and conferences.

The Committee on Clinical Research (together with the Committee on Empirical Research) will replace the existing Conceptual and Empirical Research Committee and be mandated to advance clinical research among psychoanalysts by helping colleagues develop relevant projects, by facilitating co-operation and collaboration among researchers and their projects, by organizing conferences on significant results and by any other strategies consistent with sound methodological standards and substantive relevance. It is understood that research projects will vary in the relative importance of factual findings and theoretical considerations. The Committee will prepare its proposals and detailed estimates of their costs to the Research Board in good time for the Board’s preparation of its recommendations to the Board of Representatives and its Budget and Finance Committee. The Committee shall consist of a chair who is an expert clinical researcher who shall be an ex-officio member of the Research Board and five to ten members. The Committee is enjoined whenever scientifically and practically possible to co-operate with the Committee on Empirical Research with respect to projects and conferences.

**Motion 4**
The Board of Representatives approves the replacement of the existing committee called “History of Psychoanalysis and the IPA” by the Committee on Historical, Applied and Interdisciplinary Research.

The Committee on Historical, Applied and Interdisciplinary Research will replace the existing committee called “History of Psychoanalysis and the IPA”. It will encourage, facilitate and co-ordinate, when useful, scholarly research into historical and applied psychoanalytic topics and in the theoretical analysis of findings and theories in fields adjacent to psychoanalysis by helping colleagues develop relevant projects, by facilitating co-operation and collaboration among researchers and their projects, by organizing conferences on significant results and by any other strategies consistent with sound methodological standards and substantive relevance. It is understood that research projects will vary in the relative importance of factual findings and theoretical considerations. The Committee will prepare its proposals and detailed estimates of their costs to the Research Board in good time for the Board’s preparation of its recommendations to the Board of Representatives and its Budget and Finance Committee. The Committee shall have a chair who is an expert clinical researcher who shall be an ex-officio member of the Research Board and five to ten members. The Committee is enjoined whenever scientifically and practically possible to co-operate with the other Research Committees with respect to projects and conferences.

**Motion 5**
The Board of Representatives approves the creation of the Committee on Research Education and Training

The Committee on Research Education and Training shall facilitate as required existing and new educational projects on methods of extra-clinical, clinical and historical and applied psychoanalytic research. The Committee shall have a chair who is an ex-officio member of the Research Board and sufficient members to adequately represent the three fields of research enunciated above.
8. **Community Crisis Committee**: Prof. Hanly explained that a proposal was being put together for this Committee and would be brought to them at a future meeting.

9. **Public Information Committee Mandate**: The proposed mandate was considered and approved unanimously with the following amendments: In the penultimate paragraph changing the word ‘require’ to ‘strongly encourage’ and making the last paragraph more generic so that it covers all future IPA events instead of listing current ones. It was agreed that there should also be a close working relationship between the PIC and the Website Committee with Ex-officio Membership of the Chair of PIC on the Website Editorial Committee and vice versa.

**Action: Broomhills**

10. **Functional Equivalence**: Dr. Perdigao explained that a Component Society had, at the suggestion of an Allied Centre Review Committee, accepted candidates as IPA Members under the Equivalency Criteria. It became apparent that these candidates had not been accepted by the Latin American Institute which had autonomy over training issues in the country that the candidates lived. It was therefore proposed that this kind of conflict be avoided in future by changing the Procedural Code document on IPA Equivalency under the paragraph entitled ‘Authority to Assess and Apply IPA Equivalency Procedures’ so that Component Societies may not employ the Equivalency Criteria to assess candidates trained outside the IPA without prior Board approval.

There was some concern about the implications of this change and a motion to approve the amendment with the proviso that the Education and Oversight Committee or a smaller Working Group be requested to investigate the implications of the change and to establish a procedure for Component Societies to assess IPA Members moving from another Society.

Prof. Hanly would write to all IPA Societies to inform them of this change and explain the necessity for it.

**Action: Prof. Hanly**

11. **Allied Centres Mandate**: Dr. Perdigao explained that the proposed change to this mandate was also intended to help the IPA avoid the kind of conflict explained above. A motion was put forward that this proposal be tabled until January 2010 when the Board would have time to reconsider the concept of Allied Centres. This motion was seconded and approved with 2 opposed and 1 abstention.

It was agreed that a full discussion on the role of Allied Centres and the proposed amendment to the current mandate would take place at the Board meeting in January 2010. Drs. Perdigao and Gampel will prepare a paper for that discussion.

**Action: Drs. Perdigao and Gampel**

12. **China**: Prof. Hanly explained that there were problems concerning various training programmes in China and some people were not clear as to which programmes belonged to the IPA. The main concern was related to remote analysis and it was hoped that the document approved by the previous Board would go some way to resolving this confusion.

13. **Society**: Prof. Hanly explained that recent meetings with an IPA Component Society and a new split off Study Group had hopefully ensured that both groups could now be able to focus on their development. In line with the IPA policy on Study Group payment of IPA dues, the Treasurer had agreed that the IPA Members in the new Study Group would in future pay their IPA dues directly to the IPA and not through the Society, as was usual
practice. The Component Society had also agreed to refund local dues paid for the remainder of the year to the IPA Members of the Study Group so that those members could fund the development of the new Study Group.

One Board member expressed concern that a confidential report containing various allegations had been sent to the Society to which it pertained. Prof. Hanly explained that it was necessary to give the Society the opportunity to address the allegations in the report.

Prof. Hanly informed the Board that an Exploratory Committee would be established to visit the Component Society.

The Board unanimously accepted the information given and noted what had been said and continued to bear in mind that there was more to the situation than had been heard.

14. **Election of Three Representatives on the Executive Committee**: Prof. Hanly reminded the Board that these elections were being held during the Board meeting in order to give the new Board members a chance to get to know those nominated and therefore cast informed votes.

He also said that he was aware of concerns about the workings of the Executive Committee and said that his administration would continue to be aware of the restrictions on the Executive Committee and endeavour to ensure there was no encroachment on the Board’s responsibilities by limiting the Executive Committee to the implementation of Board established policies and making sure that Executive Committee actions do not have the effect of making new policies without Board approval.

Wherever possible the Board members would be provided with background reports and be presented with relevant options rather than simply with Executive Committee recommendations for important policy issues so that, if time permits, the Representatives could discuss policy issues with their link Societies before Board meetings.

Each group of Regional Representatives had put forward one member of their group for election to the Executive Committee. Europe: Madeleine Bachner. Latin America: Fernando Weissmann. North America: Nadine Levinson. The Board members were asked to vote for or against each of the 3 names in a secret ballot. Each candidate who received a positive vote from the majority of the voting members of the Board (13 votes or more) would be elected. All three candidates were elected.

15. **Newsmagazine**: The Board were presented with a proposal from the new Editor of the Newsmagazine. It was explained that in November 2004 the Board had agreed that the IPA should move toward complete electronic publication of the Newsmagazine. Up until now it had not been decided when that would be. The Board needed to decide if they wished the Newsmagazine budget to be spent on a hard copy issue in 2009.

The motion that the IPA discontinues the printed version of the Newsmagazine completely and asks Societies to help members to print out copies was seconded and turned down with 9 for 10 against and 1 abstention.

The motion that the IPA discontinue the printed version of the Newsmagazine completely and ask Societies to help members to print out copies with the exception of one ‘special issue’ in 2010 to commemorate the 100th anniversary was seconded and approved 12 for 8 against.

Prof. Hanly will inform the Newsmagazine Editor of this decision.
Action: Prof. Hanly

16. **100th Anniversary Budget**: There were some concerns that there were no concrete projects with proposed budgets for the Board to consider.

Prof. Hanly explained that he had created the 100th Anniversary Implementation Committee to consider the proposals and support events that they are convinced have a clear objective and give good value, using local resources as far as possible.

The motion to declare the years 2010 and 2011 as the 100th anniversary period leading up to significant celebrations at the IPA Congress in Mexico City which will be defined as the 100th anniversary congress was approved unanimously.

The motion that the IPA would make US$175,000 available and would spend less if possible was approved with 1 opposed.

**Action: Dr. Dalewijk**

The Treasurer then asked the Board to approve funds for the previously agreed CAPSA Committee and Project Groups and any other Committees that may wish to meet in January in New York 2010. The motion to put aside US$50,000 for this purpose was approved unanimously.

**Action: Dr. Dalewijk**

17. **Committee on Prejudice Mandate**: The motion to change the mandate of this Committee so that it became a subcommittee of the Outreach Committee was seconded and approved unanimously.

**Action: Board**

18. **Committee appointments**: Prof. Hanly put forward proposed appointments to Committees that the Board were asked to approve. He explained that further Committee appointments would be put forward in January 2010.

**100th Anniversary Implementation Committee**: was approved with 1 opposed and 2 abstentions

**Allied Centres Committee**: Prof. Hanly said that although it had been agreed that the decision on the future of the Allied Centres committee was deferred until further discussion in January 2010, a Chair was needed to work with the Allied Centres that already existed. The motion that the initial appointment would be for 6 months and would be reconsidered in January 2010 and that no work would be carried out on the establishment of new Allied Centre projects in that time was seconded and approved with 2 in opposition.

The motion to approve all the remaining proposed appointments in one block was seconded and approved with 1 abstention.

The full list of Committees approved can be found attached to this document as appendix 2.

19. **Dates of next meetings**: It was agreed that the next meeting of the Board would be held on Saturday 16th and Sunday 17th January 2010. It was agreed that lunch would be coordinated so that Dr. Basseches could attend the NAPSAC meetings that would be held on the Saturday.

It was also agreed that the Board meeting in July 2010 would be held in Toronto on Saturday 24th and Sunday 25th July. In order to take advantage of the Board members being in
Toronto it was suggested that scientific meetings be arranged so that locals could attend. The Board would be informed about this as soon as possible so that they could book their flights as early as possible.

**Action: Prof. Hanly**

20. **Chicago Congress**: Mr. Coe reported a loss on the Congress as the number of participants had not reached breakeven.

The Board were then asked to give feedback on the Congress. Comments were as follows:

1) The translation from Spanish into English and French was sometimes poor.

2) The translation headphones were poor quality and often did not work at all.

3) It was suggested that instead of providing expensive translation which is not always good the IPA could provide screens where the papers in the other languages could be shown for people to read during the plenaries.

It was proposed that a project group be established to look into ways of reducing costs on IPA Congresses. A preliminary report should be put to the Board at its meeting in January 2010.

**Action: Prof. Hanly**

21. **Mexico City Congress**: Some members expressed concerns about the theme of the Mexico congress. Many agreed that it was not topical and would not encourage people to attend the Congress. It was unanimously agreed that the President would relay these concerns to the Programme Committee. The theme will be discussed again during the Board meeting in January 2010.

**Action: Prof. Hanly**

22. **Allied Centres**: The issue of Allied Centres was revisited. It was agreed that in addition to the paper that would be provided by Drs. Perdigao and Gampel, Drs. Ladame and Denis would put together a critique of the Allied Centres programme, Board members were asked to circulate their concerns and arguments on the topic on the Board e.mail distribution networks in order to assist them with this task. It was also requested that Broomhills put together a history of Board decisions on the subject. All three documents will be circulated to the Board prior to its meeting in January 2010.

**Action: Drs. Perdigao & Gampel, Drs. Ladame & Denis/ Broomhills**

It was also clarified that no Site Visits to existing Allied Centres should take place until after this discussion. Broomhills will write to the Allied Centre Review Committees to inform them of this and to explain the Board’s decision.

**Action: Broomhills**

Prof. Hanly closed the Board meeting and thanked everyone for their contributions.
Mandates for the Project Groups and CAPSA

Appendix 1

Project Group on Conceptual Integration Mandate

The purpose of the Project Group on Conceptual Integration is to find ways and means to enable members of the IPA to contribute to such integration of psychoanalytic theory as current reliable knowledge of psychic reality makes possible. Its goal is to substitute conceptual and clinical enquiry for chronic controversy without diminishing critical questioning and without encouraging ideological orthodoxy or authoritarianism. Its purpose is to clarify theoretical differences where logically irreconcilable differences exist and to explore directions in which their resolution might be found and to find and clarify real agreement, when it exists, despite apparent difference and even contradiction. It does not seek for or demand certainty; it is satisfied with ascertaining what is most probable on the basis of current clinical knowledge. Its aim is not to promulgate truths about psychic reality but to find ways and means to promote the broadening and integration of knowledge about psychic reality by psychoanalysts.

The Project Group will be made up of a chair and two members from each region.

Its methods of working may include but need not be limited to:

a) a survey of the literature on the subject with a view to selecting and formulating topics for work and to prepare a select bibliography that can be up-dated including works on the nature of an integrated psychoanalytic theory;
b) a continuing survey of incompatibilities in basic concepts and contradictions in theories;
c) the use of working groups to enquire into specific conceptual issues on the model of the EPF working parties but with methodologies and tasks as required by the overall objectives of the Project Group;
d) such consultation and collaboration with the working party committees of the EPF, FEPAL and NAPSAC as may, from time to time, be mutually beneficial;
e) consultation and collaboration with the International Research Board
f) consultation and collaboration with Congress Scientific Programme Committees of the IPA, EPF, FEPAL, NAPSAC and APsaA;
g) such consultation and collaboration with the editors and editorial boards of the psychoanalytic journals as may, from time to time, be mutually beneficial;
h) organization of conferences when justified by results and the unavailability of other equally effective communicative alternatives.

It will be the responsibility of the Project Group to plan, organize and implement some or all of these strategies, to facilitate them and to exercise oversight over them and to develop methods for the reporting, recording and publishing of results. It is anticipated that the work of the Project Group will result in a publication of their findings.

It will be the responsibility of the Project Group to provide an annual report on its work to the Board of Representatives and such interim reports as may from time to time be required by the Board.

It will be the responsibility of the Project Group to propose an annual operating budget to cover operating costs to the Budget and Finance Committee that is timely and in sufficient detail. If the Project Group decides to use working groups the costs of those working groups will be included in the CAPSA budget.
**Project Group on Clinical Observation Mandate**
Clinical observation remains the factual foundation of psychoanalytic knowledge. However, at present psychoanalysis has an abundance or even superabundance of theory and a paucity of theory testing observations.

The Project Group on Clinical Observation has a twofold purpose: 1. to explore how clinical observations are being used, how they can be used and how they can best be used to test interpretations and theories; and 2. to experiment with testing hypotheses and theories by means of the methods of observation available to clinical psychoanalysis.

It shall be made up of a chair and two members of each region.

Its methods of working may include but need not be limited to:

a) a survey of the literature on the subject with a view to selecting and formulating topics for work and to prepare a select bibliography that can be up-dated;
b) an enumeration of scientific and logical methodological issues in clinical psychoanalysis;
c) the use of working groups to enquire into specific methodological issues on the model of the EPF working parties but with methodologies and tasks as required by the overall objectives of the Project Group;
d) such consultation and collaboration with the working party committees of the EPF, FEPAL and NAPSAC as may, from time to time, be mutually beneficial;
e) consultation and collaboration with the International Research Board
f) consultation and collaboration with Congress Scientific Programme Committees of the IPA, EPF, FEPAL, NAPSAC, APsaA, Brazilian Federation and component societies.
g) such consultation and collaboration with the editors and editorial boards of the psychoanalytic journals as may, from time to time, be mutually beneficial;
h) organization of conferences when justified by results and the unavailability of other equally effective communicative alternatives.

It will be the responsibility of the Project Group to plan, organize and implement some or all of these strategies, to facilitate and to exercise oversight over them and to develop methods for the reporting, recording and publishing of results. It is anticipated that the work of the Project Group will result in a publication of their findings.

It will be the responsibility of the Project Group to provide an annual report on its work to the Board of Representatives and such interim reports as may from time to time be required by the Board.

It will be the responsibility of the Project Group to propose an annual operating budget to cover operating costs to the Budget and Finance Committee that is timely and in sufficient detail. If the Project Group decides to use working groups the costs of those working groups will be included in the CAPSA budget.

**Committee on Out-Reach Mandate**
The purpose of the Committee is to address the chronic problems of decreasing analytic practice and decreasing numbers of candidates, particularly of candidates in the young adult range. The Committee will make an inventory of successful projects and will make these ideas available in accessible form to all societies in the IPA. The Committee will encourage the development of strategic planning groups in each component society which will evaluate
these projects to determine how they might be adapted to meet local needs as well as generate new ideas. As effective innovative projects are developed by local societies, the Committee will make them, and information about how well they are working, available to all societies.

The Committee will focus on out-reach activities that involve the larger university community as well as the training programs of all major mental health professions. The goal is to interest the brightest, most creative and idealistic individuals in psychoanalysis during their university years. In general, the Committee will seek out ways to improve the image and the knowledge of psychoanalysis in the communities served by our component organizations through education and psychoanalytic projects beneficial to the community. Whereas the Public Information Committee will seek to publish information to these communities about successful psychoanalytic out-reach projects, the local strategic planning groups will design and implement out-reach projects with the help and support of the Committee on Out-reach.

Composition:
The Committee on Out-Reach shall consist of a Chair two representatives from each region and the Chairs of the Committees attached to the Committee.

Method of working:
The Committee will:

a) Help interested component societies to develop strategies that will increase the number of patients seeking psychoanalytic treatment.

b) Help component societies to explore more effective new approaches to candidate recruitment and education that are consistent with the highest educational standards of the three training models of the IPA.

c) Maintain, classify and publish to each component society an inventory of existing component society out-reach programs and, as far as possible, seek out means for evaluating the success of projects in terms of increases in patients and candidates.

d) Encourage component societies to develop out-reach projects, seek to facilitate them by establishing contacts with the nearest society(s) with successful programs of the same kind and when necessary, and upon request, provide consultation visits.

e) Establish and maintain relations with other IPA committees, e.g. International Research Board, Congress Scientific Programme Committees, Public Information Committee, CAPSA etc., to further the goals of the Project Group, e.g. the use of outcome studies by component societies, congress panels on out-reach projects, newspaper publication about community projects, working groups, if needed etc.

f) Establish and maintain relations with the IPA web site and Newsletter and organize conferences when justified by results and the unavailability of other equally effective communicative alternatives.

g) Present panels at regional and IPA meetings focused on the part played by successful programmes and projects in the further development and renewal of individual societies.

h) Assume overall responsibility for the work of the following committees which shall become sub-committees of the Outreach Committee:

Sub-committee on Prejudice
Sub-committee on Psychoanalysis and Culture
Sub-committee on Psychoanalysis and the University
Sub-committee on the United Nations Committee

i) The Committee shall provide an annual report on its work to the Board of Representatives and such interim reports as may be required by the Board from time to time.
It is the responsibility of the Committee to propose an annual operating budget to cover operating costs to the Budget and Finance Committee that is timely and in sufficient detail including budgets for the sub-committees of the Committee.

**Analytic Practice and Scientific Activities Committee (CAPSA) Mandate**
CAPSA will be composed of a Chair and two members from each region, an honorary secretary and, ex officio the Chairs of the three Project Groups and the Chair of the International Research Board.

**Key Objectives**
- a) To establish criteria for providing funding for international *working groups'* projects with specific aims and appropriate methodologies which will engage the psychoanalytic community and which are directed at identifying, specifying and relating to each other more precisely psychoanalytic theories and clinical approaches relevant to and exemplified in clinical practice.
- b) To review and approve (as appropriate) proposals for creating and maintaining work group projects and to disburse the annual budget according to the aforesaid criteria.
- c) To monitor annual reports from ongoing *working groups* and to seek out opportunities for co-ordination and development between projects initiated at global, regional, societal and individual levels.

The CAPSA committee will seek the advice of anonymous independent external reviewers to help it assess *working group* project applications and progress.

**Scope**
The CAPSA committee will encourage proposals
- a) from existing groups set up in the regions or which are the result of past IPA or regional initiatives
- b) from IPA Project Groups and committees and
- c) from new groups.
- d) It will respond to proposals from other IPA committees.

**Definitions**
1. A **working group** will be defined as a group of colleagues usually but not necessarily from different IPA societies usually working at the regional level and set up with agreed objectives and methodologies – methodologies which are judged suitable for the problem with which the *working group* seeks to engage. Members of working groups will be able to meet two or three times yearly and will generally have the responsibility both to contribute to the development of their specific working group aims and to moderate *workshops* of a wider group of IPA members (and candidates) who will meet on a regular basis at regional, global or society levels. Broadly, a *working group* will be distinguished from other groups because (1) its aims are consistent with the overall objectives of the CAPSA committee and (2) its methods for achieving these aims have been judged appropriate following formal review.

2. A **workshop** is a small group of IPA members, usually from several societies, organized by a *working group* at a society, regional or IPA meeting. Such workshops provide the opportunity to work in depth in an ongoing way on the specific issues/problems the *working group* has been set up to address.

3. A **working group associate** is an IPA member or candidate who makes an ongoing commitment to attend workshops and so to be an ongoing part of the group engaged with and developing the work.
Principles of reimbursement.
1. Generally and subject to the specific annual budget prepared and approved by the Board, working group members will be reimbursed for travel and accommodation for working group meetings only if they are playing an active part in any meeting – i.e. they have to do significant preparatory work and/or follow up work.

2. Generally and subject to the specific annual budget prepared and approved by the Board, working group members will have registration fees waived and be reimbursed travel and accommodation for moderating activities at meetings.

Conflicts of Interest
Members of the CAPSA committee will include individuals who in one way or another may also be playing a role in working groups or workshops; it is precisely among these people that those who possess the necessary experience are likely to be found. Therefore, it is inexpedient to exclude them from the CAPSA committee. Procedures will be put in place to ensure that those evaluating particular projects are independent of judgment and free from any conflict of interest.

It will be the responsibility of CAPSA to provide an annual report on its work to the Board of Representatives and such interim reports as may from time to time be required by the Board.

It will be the responsibility of CAPSA to propose an annual operating budget to cover operating costs to the Budget and Finance Committee that is timely and in sufficient detail. Anticipated working group costs should be included in the CAPSA budget.

Organisational structure:
Committee Appointments Approved by the Board August 2009

100TH ANNIVERSARY IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE
Henk Jan Dalewijk (Weesp) Chair
Harriet Basseches (Washington) Co-Chair North America
Plinio Montagna (São Paulo) Co-Chair Latin America
Georg Bruns (Bremen) Co-Chair Europe
Stefano Bolognini (Bologna) Consultant

ALLIED CENTRE COMMITTEE
Alain Gibeault (Paris) Chair
The Board stipulated that Dr. Gibeault should be asked not to carry out any outreach or
arrange any Site Visits until the Board had considered the programme further at its meeting
in January.

ANALYTIC PRACTICE AND SCIENTIFIC ACTIVITIES COMMITTEE (CAPSA):
David A. Tuckett (London) Chair

CHILD AND ADOLESCENT PSYCHOANALYSIS COMMITTEE (COCAP):
Florence Guignard (Chandolin, Switzerland) Chair

INTERNATIONAL RESEARCH BOARD:
Peter Fonagy (London) Chair
Marianne Leuzinger-Bohleber (Frankfurt) Vice-Chair
Ronald Britton (London) Committee Chair
Ricardo Bernardi (Montevideo)
Juan Pablo Jimenez de la Jara (Santiago)
Hoest Kächele (Ulm)
Lynda Mayes (New Haven, CT)

IPSO/IPA STANDING COMMITTEE:
Susana Muszkat (São Paulo) Chair

INTERNATIONAL NEW GROUPS:
Jorge Canestri (Rome) Chair
Mauro Gus (Porto Alegre) Co-Chair for Latin America
H. Gunther Perdigao (New Orleans) Board link to New Groups

OUTREACH COMMITTEE:
Marvin Margolis (Franklin, MI)

PREJUDICE SUBCOMMITTEE:
Cyril Levitt (Toronto)

PSYCHOANALYSIS AND THE UNIVERSITY SUBCOMMITTEE:
Franco Borgogno (Turin)

PROJECT GROUP ON CONCEPTUAL INTEGRATION:
Werner Bohleber (Frankfurt)
PROJECT GROUP ON CLINICAL OBSERVATION:
Adela Leibovich de Duarte (Buenos Aires)

PUBLIC INFORMATION COMMITTEE:
Sergio Eduardo Nick (Rio de Janeiro)

RULES AND PROCEDURES COMMITTEE:
Ana Maria Andrade de Azevedo (São Paulo)

SITE VISIT TO THE PORTUGUESE SOCIETY:
Marilia Aisenstein (Paris) Chair

WEBSITE EDITORIAL BOARD:
Eike Wolff (Brussels) Chair

WOMEN AND PSYCHOANALYSIS COMMITTEE:
Giovanna Ambrosio (Rome) Chair