

By2020WeRiseUp: Seventh and final European Strategy Conference

These are the exhaustive minutes, [you'll find the executive summary here](#).

The seventh and final European Strategy Conference of By2020WeRiseUp took place on the 27th and 28th of November 2020. Due to the ongoing Corona-pandemic it had to again be held entirely online. This again led to significantly lower attendance than during in-person meetings. The number of participants fluctuated and varied from 15-20 people. Nonetheless, over a dozen European countries from all corners of Europe as well as all parts of the climate justice movement were present (“classical” climate justice grassroots groups, Fridays for Future, XR, and NGOs) or coordination efforts.

This conference both concluded and evaluated the By2020WeRiseUp-campaign. It also identified a direction for the future of coordination for the European climate justice movement.

The principal aims of the meeting were:

- empowerment - reminding ourselves of the amazing work we have done so far and what can be achieved when we collaborate
- getting an understanding of what worked/was useful and what wasn't in the By2020-campaign
- finding out which impediments to coordination there are how they could be overcome
- gathering what is needed for coordinating European climate justice action in 2021
- getting an understanding of which coordination efforts already exist in 2021

In the following, “the movement” doesn't refer to the By2020-platform but to the movement for climate justice as a whole. “We” is to be understood as representing the participants of the conference, as groups or people, as part of the climate justice movement.

Table of contents

Session 1: What has happened so far?	2
Session 2: Evaluating the By2020-platform	4
Session 3: What do we learn from By2020WeRiseUp and how do we move forward?	6
Session 5: Breakout sessions	8
How does European coordination look like in 2021?	8
What do we need to coordinate in 2021?	12
Session 6: Consensus check	16
Session 7: Goodbye	17

Session 1: What has happened so far?

The last European strategy conference [reached a consensus](#) about a framework for climate justice action during the autumn. After an opening exerciser, the following session reflected about and evaluated what happened in the autumn.

Opening exercise: Collecting revolutionary songs

- Pete The Temp - Don't Watch The News, Be The News
- David Rovics - Kiss Behind the Barricades
- Ezra Furman - Body Was Made
- Bella Ciao
- Mittelmeer- Mal Èlevé
- Hinter den Barrikaden- Revolte Springen
- Rage Against the Machine - The Machine
- Mandolin Orange – Wildfire
- David Rovics - I'm a better anarchist than you
- Victor Jara - El Derecho de Vivir en Paz
- Bob Marley - Get Up Stand Up
- Bob Marley - Redemption Song
- Seize the Day – Anything
- Billy Bragg - The price of oil
- Neil Young – Who's Gonna Stand Up

Mapping what happened in the autumn

- August
 - Czech Republic - [Klimajízda](#) - Bike ride for a week through the coal regions, talking to locals, workers in the coal industry, mobilizing for the action days
 - 22 Aug - 6 Sep: "Stoppa PreemRaf" coalition action weeks against oil refinery expansion in Sweden - big mix of disobedience, letter writing, protests etc.. with many different groups.
 - 29 Aug: XRUK day of action at eight UK airports, mostly marches and rallies with one exception
- September
 - 3 - 6 Sep: Czech Republic - [Action days against coal infrastructure](#) (mass action of civil disobedience & legal demo)
 - 21 Sep: Croatia, international peace day: laser screening on ministry of defence
 - 25 Sep: Portugal, Global Climate Mobilization in 10 cities in Portugal.
 - 25 Sep: Hungary, Fridays for Future, Extinction Rebellion, banner drop from a bridge that says "There is no vaccine for the climate crisis"
 - 26 Sep: Germany, Ende Gelände mass action with an elaborate hygiene concept - mask mandate, tracing concept, 8 camps, 14 fingers. Several successful blockades but lots of police violence as well
 - 26 Sep: Sweden, Climate care Uprising: Solutions oriented outreach in suburbs of Stockholm, collaboration between BLM Sweden & XR Sweden
- October

- 7 Oct: Slovakia, Bod obratu + "Climate Coalition" (XR, Greenpeace Slovakia, Znepokojené matky, Študenti bez mena) CCU action - symbolic blockades in front of Government Departments and Office of Department
- 9 Oct: Hungary, Extinction Rebellion - Budapest Climate Summit (Greenwashing Summit), Football match of climate destroyers
- 12 Oct: Croatia, Climate care uprising action, banner lifting from skyscraper on main square
- Portugal, Climaximo - [anti bodies](#) - Block on of the biggest rondabout in Lisbon for 2 hours in a mass civil disobedience action, Three Emergency Demands: Carbon Neutrality in 2030, Unconditional Basic Services and a Maximum Income Limit.
- Portugal, [Bailout the Future](#), Not Profit march in Lisboa, Porto and Guimarães
- Bulgaria, Outrun the mine,
- November
 - 6/7 Oct: XR Sweden "November Uprising" (in Stockholm)
 - 21 Nov: Italy, Società della Cura new social justice group - first national protest supported by FFF and Extinction
 - [ongoing] Czech Republic - Campaign around the coal commission's decision - since the 16th of November Limity jsme my, FFF, XR and Universities for climate are occupying the entrance to the Ministry of environment - will be there till the decision on 4th of December - [you can support us by writing an email to the Coal commission](#) (the soonest scenario for a coal phase out is 2033, leaning more towards 2038 so too late)
 - [ongoing since beginning of October] Germany, police eviction of the occupation of Dannenröder Wald (Danni), an old forest that is supposed to be cut down for the construction of a new highway

Evaluating the Climate Care Uprising

- You can access the [full results of the coalition evaluation here](#).
- CCU – the results are 3 weeks of actions in 24 countries globally, 20 European countries, 57 cities worldwide, 72 activities; this was a good entry point for a coordination
 - Lots of climate justice action in Central and Eastern European countries!
- There were about 100 people on the July action conference. Afterwards Bi-weekly calls to come ip with proposals. This resulted in the consensus about what would happen in a local context
 - Short time frame. This conference took part in the summer, where people took brakes.
- The intersectional aim was key, but some groups also reflected that it was hard to build connections with social justice groups in this short time;
- To never forget this huge moment, we have also put together a finalwrap-up video! Please, share it if you haven't already!
 - [Facebook](#)
 - [Twitter](#)
 - [Instagram](#)

Session 2: Evaluating the By2020-platform

Evaluation-Input

The following input is the result of internal evaluation and a call for papers.

By2020WeRecap: What happened during the By2020WeRiseup-campaign?

- By2020WeRiseUp was conceived within the climate justice action network (CJA) to be a platform for strategy, coordination, and escalation
- Main effort were the seven European Strategy Conferences
 - March, May, August, November of 2019 and March, July, November of 2020
 - Over the course of all conferences, there was attendance from all over Europe.
 - Central and Eastern Europe as well as Southern Europe were under-represented in the beginning and attendance from France stayed spotty (presumably due to the English language barrier)
- European Strategy Calls took place about once a month
 - attendance fluctuated heavily, peaked during the first months of the Covid-19-pandemic
- Original idea:
 - In 2019, Climate justice groups would escalate their activities on a regional/national level
 - In 2020, escalation would take place at a more international/inter-regional European level
- The idea of waves of action originated from conversations with grassroots groups in early 2019. There were three attempts at coordinating waves of action:
 - a first wave in the autumn of 2019 (mainly riding on an already massive amount of climate justice action),
 - a second wave in February 2020 targeting the finance industry (the focal point being a protest march targeting the WEF, a call to action got some but not many responses)
 - the Climate Care Uprising in the autumn of 2020 (the coordination effort was challenging to the Covid-19 pandemic but worked quite well for the circumstances)
 - interest and support for actions coordinated on a European level was continuously expressed but rarely followed through independently of pre-existing plans
- Over the course of the campaign, several requested resources for climate justice action were created
 - e.g. action ideas, advisory on demands, resources for external communication, etc.
 - all resources will remain accessible via the [By2020-Website](#)

By2020WeAppreciate: What did work about the By2020Weriseup-Campaign?

- The already ambitious idea of coordinating climate justice grassroots groups across Europe was over-accomplished
 - grassroots groups, NGOs, and even some social justice groups were part of the conversations
 - increased amount of coordination, especially for new groups that didn't exist when the platform was conceived (like FfF and XR groups)
 - national or even regional coordination was inspired in different regions (e.g Iberian Peninsula, Austria, Belgium, Germany, etc.)
 - especially in-person conferences were a fruitful space for learning and connecting
 - NGO participation worked because it was organic - they got involved through individuals who were connected to NGOs but had an understanding of grassroots groups and did not do any co-opting
- Transnational coordination is an established concept at this point, at least around dates + messaging
- European Calls were a useful way to stay in touch and proved especially valuable in adapting to the Covid-19-pandemic in spring of 2020
- A lot of useful resources were created and made accessible via the website
- The core ideas of By2020 - coordination, strategy, and an escalation of tactics - were and remain necessary impulses for the climate justice movement

By2020WePointOut: What did not work about the By2020Weriseup-Campaign?

- The process moved ahead and probably became too ambitious too quickly - objectives were prioritised over capacities
 - Too little time was given for groups to organically build the platform and take ownership of it
 - For groups (re-)joining at a later stage, there was no proper on-boarding process to get them up to speed
 - The concept of the platform remained hard to understand for process-"outsiders"
- A non-binding coordination platform was the correct (and probably only) way to establish European coordination - but groups not having to commit to the process led to them stepping in and out of it, based on how far they deemed coordination to be useful
- Differing communication and security cultures of groups within the platform were not resolved beyond e-mail being the lowest common denominator
 - This also meant that the communication mostly remained reliant on the platform itself and didn't spread organically
- It remains challenging to find delegates for (European) coordination:
 - Many people hesitate to attend these spaces due to feeling uncomfortable about representing their whole group.
 - The few people who do feel comfortable in these roles, tend to amass them and be overworked.
- Most of the discussions, especially at the beginning of the campaign stemmed from a Western European perspective - this was and is problematic due to the different situations of climate justice efforts in the Central and Eastern European countries.
- The internal working process focused on the output of the platform - and neglected to establish a sustainable work culture
 - Internal communication wasn't standardised, therefore communication channels remained unclear at times
 - Too little work was put into getting people up to speed, no proper on-boarding process or ladder of engagement

Breakout groups: What is missing from the evaluation-input?

Breakout groups were asked to think about what was missing from the presented evaluation with a specific focus on obstacles to coordination

- Obstacles of coordination *internal* to By2020WeRiseUp:
 - Process was hard to follow if you are not part of the coordinating groups
 - Grassroot groups (from CEE countries?) didn't have/reserve the capacities for coordination
 - the bigger the scale, the less useful coordination seems to be deemed (local, national, European) - the more practical the coordination, the more likely it is to happen (especially concrete projects like an action day)
 - risk of missing big picture questions/issues, especially in regards to strategy
 - Grassroots coalitions/coordinations struggle to make decisions in external, if common spaces because of their horizontal structure
 - decision-making spaces are challenging to construct
 - Language was an issue (many documents not being translated into e.g. Italian)
- Obstacles of coordination *external* to By2020WeRiseUp
 - On-boarding other groups was difficult;
 - Difficulties with delegates for European coordination
 - capacities - people involved in the beginning need to leave due to capacity (new people needing to do things that they maybe didn't know how to know)

- perhaps people getting involved were people who already had a lot of tasks, drained energy
- perhaps a feeling that you need to be really "skilled" in order to take part in by2020, therefore people didn't join
- There were more spontaneously coordinated activities – but rarely actions on the basis of a thought out and consequent strategy
- In some places, smaller coordination spaces were missing
 - would have been good if regional movements also worked more closely together as they may have more in common (and then find lowest common denominator for whole of Europe)
- Digital-only spaces due to the pandemic were unfortunate (in-person meetings are way more fruitful and productive!)

Session 3: What do we learn from By2020WeRiseUp and how do we move forward?

Recapping Obstacles to coordination

- Internal capacity building represents at least as much work as any other aspect of what we are doing and requires real knowledge and time
- We need to empower more people within our groups to be delegates for the sake of coordination
- European coordination should go hand in hand with national/regional coordination to account for the specific situations and contexts
- There is a tension between making coordination as accessible as possible (non-binding, proposals for common dates, hashtags, and messaging) and making coordination as tangible and fruitful as possible (continuous and committed process, planning together with or at least mindful of other groups)

Discussion: How can we overcome obstacles?

- *Framing questions for the discussion were:*
 - *How can we make the value of coordination visible for groups?*
 - *How can we make coordination accessible?*
 - *How can we empower people/groups to participate in coordination spaces?*
 - *How can we reach common decisions?*
 - *How can we connect different levels of coordination?*
- More feedback, picking up an interesting action/event each month - bringing attention to what's happening around Europe/world, to inspire and empower people
- Empowering people to join coordination and see value in it - communicate very clearly that is not only experts who are involved in activism and cooperation, that everyone can try and join
- Not only expertise, but also inclusivity - personal connections
 - solution: short guidance on what is coordination, that it is not rocket science, buddy system (a person already involved is helping a newcomer to get familiar with platform/group/processes etc)
- How to support organisations that are structured in different ways? E.g. for XR Sweden would be hard to send a delegate, how to navigate people who want to do this work?
- Need to make space for groups who want to be part of a continuous process and also for groups who would spontaneously decide to join something - communication is crucial - perhaps on various levels as talked above (regional, national etc) - to see what knowledge is out there, what worked and what didn't

- Designated people to do outreach and make sure that this information is shared and spread
- Communication is key - but at the same time there is struggle to only chose a communications platform (because of security concerns, encryption is needed, being used to certain channel)
- What are the practical ways to make communication smoother?
- Open space can also be limiting - often it results in people not contributing so much (everyone can do it, lots of people - insecurity, etc) - what can work better is to have already a package of information, something that was already thought through and communicated in a facilitated process a bit, so it's easier is to elaborate and continue working on it/discussing
- All communication needs a moderator/facilitator - these spaces needs to be coordinated and that requires time and energy
- People show up in calls/meetings when they have something bigger in mind, something to win (learn, share) - so it's not only about the means of communication, but about content, outcomes
- People consider coordination valuable when they hear about it, however many people do not know about the platform and that is open and accessible - how to let more groups hear about it?
- What do we want to get from a coordination platform? E.g. information about actions could encourage more people to take part
 - In Croatia there is a website with all the actions from grassroots in the country (will be ready by February), to inform about it's happening and then also report, there could be something similar and common for all the countries

Looking ahead towards future European coordination

- Three identified options for next year by the By2020WeRiseUp facilitation-team:
 - Merge with/handing over to Glasgow Agreement (GA)
 - escalation, mobilization and coordination space
 - tool for reclaiming initiative from the governments
 - is global - helps to coordinate with beyond Europe but keeps regional coordination spaces as well
 - New Team, new name - similar platform
 - new people to maintain the platform and organize conferences
 - platform would have to change, for now it was not sustainably managed
 - necessary to think about what spaces in this platform would be needed for the future
 - End the campaign and focus energy/boost on the Climate Justice Action network
 - Climate Justice Action Network precedes By2020
 - no continuous coordination process
 - coordination efforts would have to re-start from scratch every time

Glasgow Agreement Proposal

A presentation about the Glasgow Agreement was followed by a Q&. If you're looking for information about the Glasgow Agreement, [their website](#) is highly informative.

- Main goal: not addressing the government to act, as the governments and institutions are failing, but acting ourselves
- There already are more than 100 organisations that joined GA, that started out in March
- There are working groups already (inventory, financial, logistics, communication, etc)
- When a groups joins, there are 3 months to do an inventory of emission sources to be shut down
 - How you gather data for the inventory, what data you used?

- There is a guide on how to do the inventory, there is a working group that is helping groups to do it, also help from academia and universities, the information is already out there especially for Europe, just need to know where to look for it
- Followed up by exchange of knowledge and tools
- Timeline won't be perfect, do not want to wait too long for actions to take places
- How are the regional spaces work?
 - There is a global space, regional spaces are being created
 - Next assembly end of December, focus on inventory and regional space establishment
- Plans for next year are still open – maybe counter COP, communication with the COP26 coalition
- Groups can join at all times, using a form on the website, email to follow up on how to create the inventory and what are the other groups in the region that are part of a GA
- Number of countries involved: 34, already lots of European groups as well
- Will there be a common actions, common narratives even before the counter-COP?
 - Regional and global spaces will be used to coordinate actions, especially around specific targets

Session 5: Breakout sessions

How does European coordination look like in 2021?

Discussion

Focusing the discussion

- Three options for European climate justice coordination in 2021
 - Similar Platform to By2020 (= SP)
 - No European coordination, falling back onto the CJA-network (= CJA)
 - Glasgow Agreement (= GA)
 - Temperature check with a majority for GA, some votes for SP
- SP: Feeling from previous conversations that two things are needed, one for more involvement of building from bottom up (also available in GA) and also need for a low level engagement way for movements to participate (which GA does not offer). E.g. coordinating actions, hashtags etc.
 - Is it possible to emphasise low level involvement in GA?
- GA: There's a higher entry point - signing the agreement requires a consent from whole movement, some groups have no process to sign it at all, while going to By2020 meeting does not have a barrier of entry. Some groups might fear of being co-opted - By2020 was just a support network, while Glasgow Agreement looks like a whole new movement (of movements). Some movements don't have energy to be constantly connected with an international initiative, By2020 was easy to take part in even just from time to time (very open and low level engagement). GA has a clear divide between those who are a part and those are not. Is there a way to be semi-part of this?
- SP: Concern from some groups that they were spending in many places without outcomes. This might be a way out of that (focusing just in this alternative). Already many other European movements part of GA? Better that everyone is there rather than duplicating work. Also depends on regional coordination
- GA: If a lot of European groups are part of it, there is the risk of overlapping coordinating efforts if we try to come up with an alternative platform for European coordination. For groups that are not part of the Agreement, maybe it will be possible to plan along anyway through regional spaces.

- Agreement to focus the discussion on the Glasgow Agreement while taking into account the concerns raised in regards to it.

Discussing input to the Regional Coordination process in Glasgow Agreement:

What might a regional space in Europe might look like? Note that we don't here have a mandate to make a decision around this, GA has mandate for that. But we are able to now give our experience/knowledge/input to that process.

What do organizations (any collective/group/grass-roots movement/NGO/etc. = common name used within GA) need from a regional space (what will the space need in order for organizations to invest time in this)? and from a global space?

- Needs for continuous processes around strategy etc + low-level engagement (both are needed from the space)
- Who would organize that space (would it come bottom-up or top-down?).
 - Needs would depend on who is creating it.
- Good to learn from work in By2020 when continuing with GA. Not yet defined how regional spaces will work, e.g. it is not yet decided if there will be specific working groups (this was the case in By2020 and was perhaps a problem there, people/groups felt disempowered)
- Difficult for representative from a group to go and create a space (while needing to check in with their group all the time). Better to have something like a working group that has mandate to create certain things. Then people/groups can just take what they want. - A need then might be common campaigns, hashtags etc, that groups can use.
- Inventories will highlights clear "enemies", might be hard for groups not connected (who might have other "enemies") to feel connected to campaigns. How could these groups join campaigns with GA?
- Appears to be high entry point for GA, if you want to be part of it you need to sign GA. Many movements are very horizontal, would require a very large process on deciding whether to sign or not (no capacity for this). Other groups may even be too horizontal to sign an agreement at all.
 - Big weakness for By2020 was that there wasn't a clear buy-in: it was too easy to join and therefore common action was very low. It also created great strain on the facilitation team because they were left to do a great deal of work (other groups came and went). Perhaps this is a potential of GA?
- By2020 was a useful place to learn about different initiatives, meet other groups and people, learn new skills/training. This kind of network are very needed. These kinds of advantages are needed even if they may be harder to quantify or even notice. These kinds of networks are still needed.
 - If this is the purpose, then make that much clearer. Perhaps that could be the CJA? CJA has been more dormant recently. This kind of network doesn't overlap with something like the GA.
- There are new groups that are in GA but maybe not in CJA, it is possible to be in both.
- When we do the actual work (inventories, actions etc) other groups will join the work and collaborate, this is a way for them to be a part of it without signing the GA. Possible to have sub-meetings in CJA meetings for GA meetings. Also possible to identify groups already working with a specific issues/against specific companies that can be invited to GA campaigns.
- Unfortunate that CJA has died during Covid crisis. Hoping that these kinds of spaces to rise again.

- Proposal: Is it possible that we need both something like CJA and common causes like GA were it is also possible for groups not wanting to sign the GA?
- What is the ambition of GA? Is it interested in creating something like a replacement of By2020?
- By2020 has tried to have some of this overlap (network + common strategical push) but it hasn't really worked.
 - Proposal: Identified need is common meeting ground within this region (open for groups that don't want to/haven't signed the GA).
- Feeling like groups would have liked to join a push (during By2020) but didn't feel that they have the capacity.
- Difference between CJA and By2020?
 - Former had open meetings for sharing and skill share but no discussions of common strategical work.
- GA doesn't have an ambition to be an open support network. There is already a "text" a political message, common ground has already been identified by those who have already signed. Also possible for common training. In other parts of the world the conversations and needs are completely different.
- With CJA you can send out an email and see who answers, very fluid process. Groups in different parts of the world but also within Europe have different needs and capacities. Perhaps a need for GA to compensate for these differences (who do we include those that don't have the capacities as others).
- Important split (in Europe) is between western vs. eastern and central Europe (oversimplifying things). Important to highlight this main difference when collaborating.

What sort of coordination is needed? E.g monthly calls, capacity development, regional days of action?

- Coordinating around more than just hashtags and dates - making coordination visible and tangible – coordinating around objectives, targets, strategies
- International mobilisation for actions in neighbouring countries/territories
- Regular conferences/calls or other ways of continuously staying in touch
- Providing clarity and consistency on the (required) work by supporting groups - also in terms of scheduling
- Empower supporting groups / their members to be part of international work, we cant just expect it from all or many groups - a best praxis example might be the Ende Gelände international working group. Need to have clear "how to be a delegate", in our experience an over-estimation of the grandeur or the role of international coordination
- Regular in-person meeting spaces
- Glasgow agreement will need to reserve capacities to be pro-active about communication - By2020 found a huge need for active outreach

What is the relationship between European and "smaller" coordination-efforts (e.g. Germany, Nordic countries)?

- Sub-levels, e.g. stemming from cultural commonalities, should be created organically with time
- Recognise existing networks/coordinations but start with only the European level to not pre-determine structures

What should our practical next steps be?

- Announcing the end of the By2020-platform together with the proposals of promoting both GA (as a strategy-coordination-space) and CJA (as a skillshare-space)
- Having an (probably online) meeting early next year
- Maybe asking over the CJA-list as well what preferences would be?

Summarised Results

Consensus proposal:

- The participants of the Final By2020WeRiseUp European Strategy conference in November 2020 agree that future European collaboration between grassroots groups is key to combat the interconnected crises we are facing. To that end, we encourage
 - groups:
 - to explore the Glasgow Agreement (GA) process and the interest in your groups to sign up to the agreement.
 - both groups and individuals:
 - to engage in the Glasgow Agreement process - especially on the potential for a European Regional Glasgow Agreement space that can support European strategy and coordination
 - to re-energise the Climate Justice Action network (CJA) as a skillsharing & networking space.

Input to the Glasgow Agreement:

- The participants of the By2020 Strategy conference would like to provide the following input, questions and reflections to the Glasgow Agreement process on developing regional coordination spaces – given the experience of the By2020 platform and associated activities.
 - That in Europe, we see a need and desire for continued spaces that encourage skillsharing, networking and sharing of plans between all grassroots groups. We recognise that the Climate Justice Action (CJA) network has traditionally held this space even though its not possible currently due to COVID. We encourage the individuals involved the Climate Justice Action network and the Glasgow Agreement Regional Spaces to explore ways to cooperate - for example, but not limited to, co-hosting European Grassroots Summits like the one held in Brussels in March 2020.
 - There is need for a European Regional Coordination space of the Glasgow Agreement to host a continuous process of strategy development and coordination of activities. We encourage this space to at appropriate times be open for attendees from groups who haven't signed the Glasgow Agreement in order to maximize our impact and also provide a lower level of engagement to European collaboration. We hope this in turn will also lead to more groups who find it appropriate to sign the Glasgow Agreement.
 - We recognise there are differences across Europe in terms of the reality and political landscape for activists, but also note that the By2020 process found a lot of common ground and opportunities for coordination that took these differences into account.
 - We recognise the need for more territorial or smaller regional coordination but based on the experience of by2020 we encourage that to develop organically with time. To that end a regional space should remain as the main entry point to avoid confusion and extra levels
 - There is need for participating groups to reserve capacity to be a part of and help coordinate a regional space - a best practice may be the Ende Gelände International Working group. To that end the regional space should clarify the expected capacity required to attend and as well clarify

how much is expected from coordinators. The more this could stay consistent the easier it is for people to engage.

- Suggestions for the output of a European Regional Coordination space include:
 - regular in-person meeting spaces
 - regular calls or other ways of continuously staying in touch and up to date
 - being pro-active about communication - By2020 found a huge need for active outreach
 - coordinating around more than just hashtags and dates - making coordination visible and tangible by coordinating around objectives, targets, strategies
 - international mobilisation for actions in neighbouring territories
 - providing clarity and consistency on the (required) work by supporting groups - also in terms of scheduling
 - provide an (e.g. online) resource where information on campaigns, action moments, etc.. are easily available to avoid information hierarchies as much as possible
- We encourage the organisation of another conference, possibly online, in February or March of 2021 in order to make it easier for groups to understand the process and begin to get involved.

What do we need to coordinate in 2021?

Discussion

Expectations + Focusing the Discussion

- What do we understand by strategy?
- Talk more about finance campaigning
- Regional collaboration is forming in Nordic, look for overlaps
- EG has no plans, learn what's going on in Europe, where are overlap
- Collaboration not only between climate justice movements, but social justice groups as well (how to reach out)
- Overview and appetite for joint activities
- No plan and energy, get inspiration
- What exactly is key, we are entering social crisis, trying to map what external hooks and opportunities: what we will try to leverage?
- What do we need to coordinate? is it showing a collective strength, we need to be able to show the collective strength beyond activists bubble

Mapping exercise: what's already planned by the movement?

- XR Nordic coordination: Larger action in middle of May (in one of the Nordic capitals) - targets and tactics not decided (but finger structure with different targets) - potentially shutting down critical infrastructure
- Change Finance is running a campaign in 2021 (against BlackRock - given a deal by EU) - in January a letter from BlackRock's CEO (Larry Fink) which will be a hook - potentially also a way to work on the social justice aspect of our struggles: the financial and the climate crisis are closely linked, and by working on money and justice we can also take on the climate crisis. Project to talk about that and to try to map which fossil fuels projects' financing can be targeted + who is already doing it.
- Campaigns against banks around Europe

- In CZ Limity et al are busy with coal commission - and their decision will inform 2021. Fossil finance campaign is starting in 2021 Uncertainty if another pr
- Glasgow agreement --> inventories and climate agenda will be ready and the COP26 as a hook
- pipeline resistance around Europe (Denmark for sure, sustained resistance)
- EG: Looking to (re)-start anti-nuclear and climate justice project in 2021 - a statement connecting nuclear and climate, asking groups to sign it to counter the narrative that nuclear power is a solution to the climate crisis - idea is to publish it in March or April (around Fukushima or Chernobyl anniversaries -- hoping to mobilise youth climate groups. Anti-nuclear groups in France involved - as there'll be a nuclear transport going from France

Discussion: What is strategy and what is our need?

- In Limity is tiring getting involved in reactive fights - one problem at a time, when the change we need to achieve. Strategy is discussed, but there doesn't seem to be capacity to carry out. So Limity has been discussing reaching out to other groups and unite/connect them under climate camps and there to figure out to handle the systemic fights. We need to remember to push the vision of the world we want (instead of just saying we don't want) - so in Limity people are trying to formulate that vision.
- XR Sweden has been trying to collaborate with other movements (indigenous, unions) and supporting them in their fights, which has landed well in XR SE - people really appreciate it and has given more exposure and a broader base to mobilise from
- Doing actions in city centres instead of production sites, while joining forces with FFF with XR tactics and EG finger structure - (concern on using fingers tactic in the city, may be challenging. it's challenging from narrative: how to do it without piss people off, it's easier with production sites)
- INF: a lot of prep has been done SmF, could be useful to ask them
- What kind of narrative do we want: on the city level it could be specific. but for Europe and globally, but developing a narrative beyond borders is challenging (obtaining justice could be a common denominator). with intersectionality - how not to spread too thin while fighting all fights
- Glasgow agreement is an interesting experiment - we could have inventory on regional level (like Nordic, CEE, etc.)
 - common framing with regional narratives - should/could be doable
 - how much it helps if have a frame/narrative internally but we are not able to bring this common thing to the public and media/people see our "small" separate activities.
- Good to have spare capacity to join other fights / riots and connect dots and link to the climate (and not burn out ourselves).
- External hooks: a strategy to achieve system change could be to target the system where it hurts it structurally and in a way that also connects to a segment of the population's direct concerns
- Big moments are often prepared but not "happening". worry: how not to wait for big moments when "people are fed up". other thing is that we are mainly middle class and it will take long for us to establish a contact. so whom we are targeting?
- Keeping the balance between talking strategy and getting more concrete about next steps to help us navigate us in our activities.
- Coordination works when an idea resonates - so the overlap between strategy & coordination is where the energy is. What gets people excited - what makes people feel like they gain more than the resources/times they put into something (and the same goes for strategy work) - so an idea could be to map external hooks and targets and see where the energy is and move forward down the path where the energy is (to avoid spreading ourselves too thinly)

- If it's difficult to come up with a common narrative, then rather looking at how different systems are interconnected and how various actions in different countries could then potentially support/amplify each other and stress one part of the system.
- How do we address COVID and right wing information?
 - The financial crisis is not that apparent yet, people are suffering but it's being "absorbed" by the system. So if we plan on waiting for a big, obvious financial crisis then we will have a problem.
- **Attempt at summarizing points that participants saw as key for strategic planning:**
 - *Which points of the system are key and can be pushed in the current situation*
 - money (feeling of injustice that connects us to the rest of society)
 - communication (key for visibility and bringing about feeling that something is wrong or can be done)
 - *Differences have to be kept in mind:*
 - capacities
 - national situation
 - historical situation (movements + countries)
 - *Smart alliances*
 - when we talk about reaching out or bringing more people on board, who is actually the segment of population we are targeting? On which grounds can alliances be built?
 - *Branding/ visibility*
 - a "brand" of sorts, a symbol, is very useful to bring people on board (from outside)
- Interesting to see a collective shift away from targeting governments.
- Part of what could be coordinated could also be literature, tips for actions - lots to build on.
- Not sure we need to coordinate something if there's not something to coordinate at the moment - maybe it's just sometimes two countries supporting each other. Could we coordinate?
- We are on the crossroads, with 2021 still being a blank canvas for many groups ,so shall we try to go out for more systematic approach. Building on the suggestion to find a part of the system that's interconnected across borders where various actions can put pressure on the same part of the system. And finding out what that corner might be by using Olga's point around going where the energy is. Coming up with different suggestions. IT'S **NOT TOO LATE** to coordinate and see where energy is.
- Groups have a strategy and then you have actions (at least for EG). the Q is if there is a common European strategy to fight a climate change? From my point of view it's not, decisions are very often made on the national level.
- Not all groups have a strategy, smaller grassroots might not have knowledge and/or capacity. Systemic change strategy - what is the tipping point? what are points to hit the system?
- Countries are different, some could be pushed from outside and some cannot (for example Poland and other even more authoritarian leaning countries)
- One thing is group's strategies and another thing is national/regional strategies which should be left to those respective groups - and then other groups can support/show solidarity if the calls come.
- There needs to much more knowledge and skill transfer between groups and countries.
- We shouldn't coordinate for coordination's sake - but we could/should target the same part of the system via tactics or targets. For example there's currently a plan to map ways to target the finance system.
- Combining an international CTA (eg. EG's Paris yr) with where the energy is could be encouraging groups to come up with proposals for international collaborative moments.
- Could we target the media (alongside potential finance)? They're using individual responsibility narratives, not exposing the big polluters' and their responsibility - which speaks to more localised actions because the media landscape is fragmented around Europe.

Summarised results

- Collective need to talk about and understand strategy better, especially how strategy informs action and concrete change
- Building on people's power - not just grassroots power. Finding energy from untraditional allies - being mindful of trying to reach too broad of an audience and then not managing.
- We need more experience and skillsharing - while acknowledging that local/national knowledge of the most efficient Theory of Change is always the most valuable.
- We should create a space to identify sensitive points in the system (even if targeting that part of system can look different in different countries) - for example on Finance (or communication/ media) and let groups bring forward proposals for where we could take collective actions. And go where the energy is. This space would need to happen quite quickly, as currently many groups don't have major plans yet for 2021 - but that will change soon. Hub on education and talking about finance to be built together in 2021.
- Space to talk, share experiences and educate about strategy, see if that's something that can build into the GA process.)

Session 6: Consensus check

Proposal 1: Concluding the By2020-campaign

- The By2020WeRiseUp-Campaign is concluding with the end of the year 2020. Its resources will remain accessible via the By2020-Website.
- The supporting groups of By2020WeRiseUp intend to keep putting an emphasis on coordination, strategy, and an escalation of tactics to ensure that the just transition is happening fast enough to prevent further catastrophes such as climate change over 1.5°C or ecosystems and societies collapsing.

Questions and concerns:

- Question: Does the By2020WeRiseUp-facilitaion team already know how to preserve the resources via the website or is there a need for help?
 - Help would be welcome, but several options are already explored.
- No concerns were voiced and the proposal reached a consensus.

Proposal 2: Climate justice action in 2021

- The participants of the Final By2020WeRiseUp European Strategy conference in November 2020:
 - Encourage each other to work on system-sensitive points with key and system-relevant examples being finance & communication.
 - Acknowledge that targeting a sensitive point of the system will look different depending on the country
 - Encourage to dedicate time & capacities to coordination and strategy outside of our groups
 - Look into establishing strategy space & invite people to it & connect it to a call for proposals and ideas

- Look into establishing a finance-targeting space & invite people to it
- Integrating what was said above into existing structures as much as possible

Questions and concerns:

- Question: With "finance", we're referring to the financial sector, right?
 - Yes, in all its shades and hues
- Question: What happen if parallels structures remain?
 - We can't "outlaw" parallel structures but the best idea is to go where the energy is, currently that's the Glasgow agreement
 - Addition: Proposal is very broad because there was no delegate from GA in the working group.
 - Addition: If they're in touch, parallel structures can also be helping each other
- Clarification: This proposal is not binding because the platform is dissolving: list of ideas and wishes.
- No concerns were voiced and the proposal reached a consensus.

Proposal 3: European coordination beyond By2020

- The participants of the Final By2020WeRiseUp European Strategy conference in November 2020 agree that future European collaboration between grassroots groups is key to combat the interconnected crises we are facing. To that end, we encourage
 - groups:
 - to explore the Glasgow Agreement (GA) process and the interest in your groups to sign up to the agreement.
 - both groups and individuals:
 - to engage in the Glasgow Agreement process - especially on the potential for a European Regional Glasgow Agreement space that can support European strategy and coordination
 - to re-energise the Climate Justice Action network (CJA) as a skillsharing & networking space.

Questions and concerns:

- *There were no clarification questions regarding this proposal.*
- *No concerns were voiced and the proposal reached a consensus.*

Session 7: Goodbye

Stay in touch?

- CJA Email List: Sign up by emailing a request to: cja-request@lists.riseup.net
- [European Changemakers Newsletter](#) - Activist Stories, Upcoming Conferences/Events, Skillshares
- Contact to the Glasgow Agreement [on their website](#).

Evaluation / Feedback

- Start: What should we start doing differently?
 - Explicitly welcome all levels of language/ involvement (used to do that in previous conferences, somehow slipped our minds at the beginning of this one)
 - Be more clear of what are the debates will be (not so generic) when advertising the conference
 - More time to discuss proposals after presenting them
 - Having an even longer lunch-break than 1.5h

- More reminders about where we are in the agenda, about upcoming breaks
- Stop: What should we avoid doing next time?
 - Some parts of the agenda, e.g. Friday evening might have been understood as "less important" - people then come later, do not know each other
 - Starting relatively early in the day
 - Being too courageous about announcing that we will end early
 - Stop being so worried about getting everything right, cause what we're doing is truly remarkable and a big experiment
- Continue: What should we continue doing?
 - Social sessions, especially if they're anywhere as energetic as the Pete-the-Temp-performance
 - Good to have frequent energisers, especially with a playful/silly element
 - Good to have 3-5 facilitators (might be the ideal number)
 - Breaks, both to take time off of screens and for socialising in front of it
 - Preparing the facilitating for the breakout groups
 - Awareness team
 - Presentation slides for orientation
 - Good efforts to get everyone talking (through breakout rooms and encouraging people)
 - Inspiring work (also re. mechanics/ language used)
 - Generally: excellent process and organisation (especially given how sick everyone is of online meeting)

