

STICHTING HORIZON

Summary of the meeting of the subcommittee of STICHTING HORIZON May 24, 2019

Present:

Subcommittee:

Jeremy Amos
Alexander Amos
Stefan Henle
Henk Lubberdink (Chairman)
Jan Haas
Felix Henle

Office:

Geraldine Leegwater (Minutes)
Nils Smit

Summary of the discussion

The mission of Horizon

Is the mission still up to date?

Stefan starts by referring to the existing text, including Jorg his letter. Cultural identity is the most important aspect in the mission. And to have a lobby as well: Horizon is the lobby for culture. Our work will help culture to survive. An important aspect in the past was effectiveness of the money: provide money where we can achieve most. In the future, he expects more project closer to home.

Jeremy agrees with Stefan, but he adds that Horizon will only survive by development and people bringing new ideas to the table. He expects that older projects will go to a different stage. It would be wrong to continue with an organization in the same way.

Does the current mission about culture and identity sufficiently determine what can be supported or should we make things more specific?

Alexander shares the opinion that it is better not to further define it. It's more important that family members have the opportunity to be a good and enthusiastic sponsor.

Jeremy adds that on all the projects we had in the past, projects were hardly ever rejected.

Jan agrees that the mission should stay the same. He considers Horizon an active foundation: we search for the projects. It is therefore depending on the people around the table.

Felix agrees that the foundation was always a culture foundation. But identity was not always at the same level as culture. The unwritten message is that it is a platform for the family, for their identity and strengthening of the family cohesion. Therefore, it should not be narrowed to a smaller group of people.

Alexander thinks that another mission is possible as long as family members can have a personal attachment to it. By coincidence it was culture. The next generation should be engaged and therefore the focus should not only be on culture. Identity stands for giving people an identity and the vehicle is culture.

Henk summarizes that the mission of Horizon has a broad interpretation, almost everything is possible as long as the family is really involved. In the subcommittee, the majority of the members have a preference for keeping it close to culture. Alexander has a slightly different view and is more open to other areas as long as the (family) sponsor is really engaged. Jeremy adds that broadening is possible under the current mission as "identity" incorporates even more than culture.

Are we happy with the kind of projects that we currently do?

Jeremy starts by saying that Horizon is defined by the sum of the projects. We can do everything what comes up. However, Alexander thinks it's not specific enough for the rest of the family. We have a responsibility to communicate to the other family members as well.

The question is also what is the next generation looking for? The next generation will have a more modern approach. On a question of Alexander on whether the broader family and the next generation is sufficiently aware of what is possible, Jeremy answers that children could learn via their parents and a more precise definition is not important for that.

On a question of Stefan, the members of the subcommittee agree that board members and family member can bring in projects.

On a question of Jan about the funding of (family) business, the subcommittee agrees that the relationship between Horizon and the beneficiary should not become too close and should be independent.

Henk summarizes that everybody is satisfied with the current mission. There is agreement on- and understanding of what we do and will not do.

The strategy of Horizon for the next 3 years

Stefan kicks off with saying that the strategy should be that Horizon finds- and supports more projects. But he asks immediately whether we can manage this and whether there is money for more projects. Therefore, we should discuss the existing vision on the long-term bigger projects.

Jeremy shares his view on the number of projects. It's likely that some major projects will change for various reasons. Important beneficiaries getting older and therefore potential retirement of projects. Or political reasons, costs of projects in the EU becoming comparable to projects outside the EU. If this happens; the number of projects will go down. It will imply we have more time to manage the other projects. So we need to get new projects and engage them.

Felix adds on this topic by saying that in Kiebitz the main persons involved will retire in a few years after which the case for this project might change. He expects that new projects will be closer to home because people are working and will not have too much time for travelling and acquiring new projects abroad. Felix thinks we should look for longer term projects as the setting up of a project is quite time consuming.

Jan thinks that it does not make sense to stop good projects. According to him, the strategy should be to have longer term relationship. It takes time to get to know an organisation. However, a beneficiary should not become dependent on Horizon.

Felix mentions an important criterion for the selection of new projects: Are there competences available to evaluate a project either within Horizon or through external persons / organizations? Do we as an organisation build sufficient competences over time or should we focus on this in the coming years?