DG Events Fund 2025 - Process Notes

Taking part in this process: Juanjo, Vincent, JP, Noémie, Amerissa, Sara M, Mark, Sara S, Sebastian, Alan, David, Suanna.

Conflicts of interest:
JP: has worked with Altshift in the past; but not active this year; knows several of the applicants
Noémie: organising a festival in Le Havre.
Juanjo: is promoting this fund to associations & groups he knows, but not directly involved in any.
Amerissa: know at least 2 or 3 people who have applied, including Noémie/la Bascule
Vincent: no conflict of interests, but knows most of the applicants. A bias towards la bascule because they invited him - but he can't come.
Sara: part of delinking collective application.
Mark: knows some of the london groups - would rather not grade them.
David:

Table of Contents:

Call 6: July 2nd - process for transfers

Present: Félix, Sebastian, Vincent, Noémie, Mark

Process

- Bank details: 9 applicants filled in the form with their details so far
- Successful applicants: Contact the group before transfer is made
    - 4 groups have no one assigned to contact them.
    - Start contacting groups asap.
    - Vincent NEEDS to be in cc in all communication re transfer - SG can't take the risk of the money being misused.
    - During the call with groups: ensure projects are serious (not a hoax), what do they plan to do, how, when; see how to best transfer money; see how to support in non-financial ways.

- Unsuccessful applicants: Contact them nonetheless for non-monetary support
    - 18 applicants have no contact person assigned.

    - Work to be done on a voluntary basis (hahaha, as if the rest of this work wasn't voluntary)
- communication: how to communicate centrally about all the events, including those who didn't get funded, on our website? Make a form with basic info that we ask groups to fill in? Ask them during the call to fill it in, can be used for IDN/SG reporting. Mark shares previous form on feedback from last years event & Noémie does a libera form in collab with comm team.

Call 5: June 12th - deciding on successful applicants

Present: Sara M, Sara S, Sebastian, Juanjo, Astara, JP, Noemie,

total funding

SG voted to give this fund 14 000 euros!!

Also extra donation of 1000 € from Steady State Manchester - conditions: it has to be an event with GS, marginalised & working class. Easiest is to pick ONE event. Does it need to be identified as a different fund ? We should tell the group who gets it where it comes from.

15 000 euros in total, twice what we started with!!!

Notes on criteria

unfortunately had to be defined afterwards. each applicant graded by 3 reviewers, both qualitatively (YES! yes maybe no) & quantitatively (grade). currently ranked in "distribution" sheet according to qualitative. Column X indicates whether or not we want to fund it. needs to be filled in.

finishing column X (semi-final decision)

Discussing each application independently and picking "yes", "no" or "maybe"

stepping back to go forwards: concerns around the cave narrative. Leave it on stand by for now? be nuanced with the amount we give

doughnut in nürmberg: no because political party & can probably get funding elsewhere

cabaret: will happen regardless. could fund only lighting & tech? don't need tech & light for a degrowthy performance? Not hitting the GS, working class criteria. could do a separate call on art and degrowth

Beyond growth conferences: they can get support from other sources - in parliaments? sad to say no because estonia is a new place for degrowth.

Apocalypse: event has started: they don't need our funding. berlin already a hot spot for berlin.

Berlin beyond capitalism: berlin already a hot spot

degrowth for youth: hungary, several events, continuity. ask for little

SUDecrescimiento: italy. Do they have more money than we do? looks like it, and we want to fund smaller things.

Human nature dualism: folks from degrowth in action. Humble, but close to catalonia so can prob get support from elsewhere. Focus very interesting. Methods & decolonial reflections that we're keen on. targeting "multipliers" so quite impactful!

brackish: fully virtual. caribbean group, so quite underrepresented. Asking for A LOT of money. If we only offer a seventh of what they ask for, is it still helpful for them? Noémie gets in touch and asks whether with 10% of what they ask they could do something (more homemade & degrowthy)

Imagining otherwise: more about freelancers looking for funding; pricy venue, rather a no.

Uruguay: pricy place; they mostly need help for transportation & venue. application beyond our scope

what comes after oil: too ivory tower? maybe only part?

Swap & thrift day: most feasible; but doesn't need our funding & not most degrowth-articulated.

Distribution of money

Proposal: We divide the total amount (15 000) by the number of accepted applications. Those applicants who asked for less than that resulting amount get covered fully. The rest get 1000. There are still 1275 left after, which will be distributed as follows:

"Kigali 2025, Arts and Resistance: Let's cultivate degrowth through commons and plural knowledge" and "Re-incarnating the traditional Labdanum Resin Harvest from Mediterranean Rockrose in Mount Lebanon" get 500 each, and 275 are kept for unexpected expenses. (next in the waiting list)

Proposal passed

Follow up work

Communication with applicants

- Write acceptance / rejection email template
- Communicate results to applicants
- For yes but partial funding: check whether it makes sense
- Collect information for bank transfers

Money

- Properly document who gets which amount plus banking/transfer information
- Transfer the money

General organization

- Decide (and document) who does what
- Set Deadlines

Documentation

- make sure that there's no personal information in the spreadsheet & other to-be-made-public doc, so that they can be published

Call 4: June 6th - sorting applicants

Present: Suni, JP, Vincent, David, Juanjo, Sara, Sara, Noémie

- Public documents:

All the spreadsheet will be public, except for reviewers who will be anonymous. Review your comments so that they are constructive.

- Decision making criteria

Reproducibility of the event is: important
We fund degrowth events, not events where degrowth people intervene.

- condition before transferring fund

having a conversation with the applicants.

- Total fund

No extra fund is guaranteed. For now count on 7 500 euros total fund. We'll make a waiting list for the optional extra fund.

- Distributing the money

If we give all requested funding to all Unanimous Yeses it makes it to roughly 14 000 euros. How to proceed? suggestion to only discuss Yeses & Unanimous Yeses (column V) -> 14 applications
usually funding is given in full - you don't give less than people ask. Funding 10% might be a waste of our money because the event might not materialise. 50% would be a minimum. Too high requests might be a reason to disqualify.

Process proposal: validate the global result: who do we want to support, who do we want to reject, who do we maybe want to support (this is column V). Give this list to the Support Group, and see from that if they want to extend their funding. Then make bundles. Maybe put a cap at 1000 per project.

- Non monetary support:

Support is also experience (2 people from IDN supporting), not just money. Can still support with experience those who we don't fund.

- Running through column V together to check we agree

V Escuela: tricky, giving it a no, but would like to support.

Degrowth & Labour Struggles.
Juanjo: one of the few where working class was covered.
Sara: same; a lot about inclusion

Degrowth & Delinking: big disagreement. One of the most important conversations in degrowth atm. their event last week was very very followed. is a key pillar of degrowth. They did ask Oslo for funding but said no. Concern around the event taking place in Oslo - but who needs to take part in this conversation? also the most privileged.

Just mobilities & aviation: not exactly fitting for the fund, stay grounded is too narrow vs degrowth

Call 3: May 22nd - polishing the decision-making criteria

Attending: Alan, Amerissa, JP, Mark, Noémie, David, Sara

- Conflicts of interests for new people - see top of this doc

- Minimal funding

we don't wanna fund less than 500 - otherwise it's too insignificant.

- Resolving questions around criterias -See criteria working doc

Concern: point 6: feels odd that an event based or led by GS country has a 4th of the weight of something else -> can we make it count more? 0-4 or 0-5?
Is it really binary? you've got the clearly GS, but you have Europe periphery, like balkans -> how do you classify that? core of the core vs periphery of the core?
Proposal: scale becomes 0-5, JP rewrites the description, and reviewers use their best judgement. (adopted)

Concern: creativity, led by minorities, working class etc -> those things were not asked explicitely, how do we know?
Proposal: possibility to use decimals if the criteria isn't clearly covered in the application. (adopted)

Concern: 14 is hard to judge - why is it so powerful? It feels corporate, who are we to judge?
Proposal 1: reduce the scale to 0-1 with decimal. (dropped)
Proposal 2: add it afterwards to help distinguish between the best applications (adopted)

Concern: criteria are coming after the call for applications. We didn't prepare on time.
The spreadsheet is a tool, we're not subjected to it. In the next call we can bring up any applications that we think have wrongly not been shortlisted.

Concern: Criteria 2 on first time applicants: should recurring applicants be excluded? Or rather a 0-1 scale? Option to have a bigger scale to give big advantage to new applicants?

Proposal: exclude groups who received the fund previously. (adopted)

Concern: Critique of big foundations is that give funds to lots of new groups but don't stay to support them in the long term
take that into consideration. But we wanna support orgs that are not mature yet.
good to follow up with people who were excluded?

- Cutting line

How do we decide a threshold for shortlisted applicants?
we'll discuss that once we have a chunk of applications reviewed and a better idea of how it's spread.

TO DOS: all review applications they're assigned to by next call. Notify the group if you were by mistake assigned to an application you have a conflict of interest with!

Call 2: May 8th - How to review & select applications?

Time & Duration	Item
0.00 5 min	**Check-in Round** 🙂
0.05 3 min	**Attendance:** Noemie, Sara, Vincent, Juan, Amerissa, JP
0.08 2 min	**Consent to the agenda**
0.10 2 min	**Round of conflicts of interests: (see top of this doc)**
0.10 2 min	***REPORT: Current situation*** *Link to process:* *https://degrowth.net/our-work/guidelines-for-2025-degrowth-events-funding-applications/* *Currently **13 applications**, 3 from Global South* ● *Total requested amount: **28,000€*** ***Deadline:** Thursday 15th May* ***Decision on results by Sunday 15th June*** ***Current fund: 7,500€** (could be increased up to 10,000€)* ● *Maximum of 10 projects to be funded*
	Discussing criteria for decision-making General idea for splitting the money: **As many people as possible should benefit from this fund**.

	Proposal to have the option to give less than what people requested. PASSED **Proposal not to prioritise recurring applicants (binary)**: Last year criteria: people who already got the fund won't be prioritised. De facto it will mean excluding recurring applicants PASSED **Proposal to privilege new places (binary)**: Funding new places & groups where degrowth is not already receiving a lot of support. (**This will be balanced with the topic being discussed.)** PASSED **Proposal to give less to online events than face-to-face events because they face very different costs (binary). This will be balanced with the topic being discussed.** One online event for now. It depends on topic discussed! it could contribute to the debate, and it could bring a lot of people to degrowth. … but you don't need much budget for an online event. Budget can be high to allow greater accessibility, good practice! PASSED **Proposal to prioritise events that would not happen without our financial support.** With the overall budget & requested budget we can easily evaluate whether the event would take place or not without our fund. PASSED **Proposal to prioritise smaller events** PASSED **Proposal to prioritise subjective relevance in the degrowth discourse** PASSED **Proposal to prioritise subjective impact?** impact on the world? on the region? long term change takes time to be visible, can be hard to measure. Impact can not be initially anticipated. PASSED **Proposal to prioritise events organised by minorities regardless of geographic region?** We haven't asked for that in the application form - does it make sense? it will be spelled out in the applications if it is? PASSED **Proposal to prioritise GS based events?** Using IMF advanced countries classification PASSED **Proposal to prioritise creative/unique events?** As in a fun format we haven't encountered, prioritise artistic expression. PASSED

	Proposal to exclude big established orgs (binary): Some orgs have been organising big events and are already institutionalised. PASSED **Proposal to prioritise participatory and non-hierarchical events?** PASSED **Proposal to not have a limit on number of events to fund.** this is too arbitrary a restriction. Adding one extra small event light not change much and still help a lot. PASSED **Proposal for minimum amount of funding to be 500e** To avoid giving insignificant amounts that actually don't help the event enough. PASSED **Proposal to have a maximum amount of funding to be 2000e per event** PASSED **Proposal to prioritise groups' adherence to the spirit of IDN principles** PASSED **Proposal to prioritise events that are inclusive / geared towards the working class** Knowing "the working class" is a very subjective factor and there are many ways to be inclusive of the working class. PASSED TO DOS: JP does a proposal based on these criterias. TO DOS: work on making the needed documents public ***Observation: a lot of these criteria are defined post-application, so applicants couldn't take them into account. We acknowledge this and will do better next time.***
	Enlarging the overall fund? One person in the SG against increasing the fund to 10 000. The SG will re discuss when we've reached the application deadline (May 15th) TO DOS: Vincent brings it up in SG again and gets back to us
	Process for decision-making a sheet with all criteria and a yes/no column or sliding scale . 2 to 3 people review each applications, and then we do the average. Then we select a shortlist & we discuss TO DOS: Noémie does guidelines for the process (number of shortlisted applicants etc)

	Process for admin & sending money SG in the past has done bilateral calls with all groups funded. We can divide the projects between us and have those calls, give advice, check on how we can support, ask to join IDN etc etc. Discuss how they can be more inclusive in their org & events. INVOICES: about individual invoices and legal restrictions: we always find a case by case solution. SG can make donation to a non profit NGO; OR can reimburse a person/org; OR the SG can directly pay an invoice (for renting a room for example, or an invoice issues by organising org).

Call 1: April 9th - Setting up the call for applications.

Present: Noémie, Vincent, Juanjo, JP

Round of conflicts of interests - see top of this doc

Role of this group:

- define guidelines
- make the call
- make sure that info is public & accessible (both call & allocation)
- facilitate the fund allocation
- liaise with SG to ensure transparency and information flow
- SG remains in charge of transferring funds

Timeline: proposal

- criteria to be defined by end of April
- call to be made in late April
- Applications till end of May
- Allocation of funds decided in the first 2 weeks of June.

Draft Guidelines

- define criteria for who can apply (format? Focus?) - see doc on guidelines

Decision-making

Groups who previously got funding

Vincent: when SG facilitated the process groups couldn't apply again.
N: wouldn't exclude it, but also not prioritise them
V: last year 7 applications, all of which got funded.
Juanjo: priority to new groups, but not exclude

Post growth conferences*:*

Can get funding from elsewhere easily, so SG last year excluded it.

Word degrowth?

Degrowth has to be mentioned? (do we accept post-growth or other related phrasing)?
Refer / respect key principles: https://degrowth.net/about/principles/
Include a question about how groups put the principles in practice?
Ask people to sign a charter - ie IDN principles.

- define bundles (how much can one get? Different amounts based on GN-GS? Based on size?)

- previously distinction was made last year between large (hundreds of people) and small scale events (tens of people). Do we do the same? Large got 2500 euros, small 1000 euros?

- define application process

Application; simple online form? Be as simple as possible.

- define decision making process (peer review process? co-budgeting?)

How many is a max? 10 events? what's the max after which we think it's not enough money per applicants?

TO DOs:

- **form - Noémie & Juanjo & JP as co authors. include privacy statement**
- **new clean PDF of the application guidelines - Juanjo**
- **make this into a page on our website - JP**
- **draft an email to the world mailing - Noémie**