

## **European Quidditch Congress Meeting**

Date: 4th February 2018

Location: Skype voice

Meeting time: 21:00 CET - 22:11

In attendance: Mel Piper- QUK, Michael Škácha - ČAF, John Seem - NRF, Francesco Pacciani - AIQ, Chula Bruggeling - QNL, David Jonsson - SvQF, Ana Mercado - AQC, Michael Puntschuh - SQV

Absent:

Apologies: Bex M

Chair: Felix Linsmeier

Secretary: Michael Puntschuh

### **Agenda**

- 1. Introduction**
- 2. Roll call**
- 3. Update on EU privacy laws (if applicable) [Chula]**
- 4. Update on Two-Tier EQC [Stevo et al].**
- 5. EQC Questions**

#### **1. Intro:**

Felix: Hello to everyone! Are there any other issues to be discussed?

#### **2. Roll call**

#### **3. Update on EU privacy laws (if applicable) [Chula]**

Chula: I went to a meeting and didn't type out everything yet. However, we should be fine as long as we add something to the website, since Quidditch Europe does not have much data protection relevant activity. However NGBs will have to adjust their work to the directive.

Felix: There will be however some relevant things regarding EQC for next year, since the directive will be in effect in May.

Chula: Mostly you need to state what you will do with rosters. You need to make a document and detail which data you collect and what you do with it as an NGB. This is relatively extensive, but as long as you make this document and publish it on the website we should be fine. So it is some work, but not too difficult. I will make a document which explains it more in detail. Mostly it's based on the principle "which data are you collecting and who are you showing it to".

Felix: Any questions?

Chula: One more comment: Also non-EU NGBs mostly fall under the directive (since it relates to all organizations active in the EU in some way) - so we must all comply with it

Felix: Thanks for gathering the input. We will need to think about it for the next EQC. But it will be on this year's waiver as well, just to be sure.

Chula: If you do it with the roster submissions and the sign up forms, you should be covered.  
Felix: Any comments?

#### **4. Update on Two-Tier EQC [Stevo et al].**

Felix: Is there any update on the 2-tier-EQC?

Michael: We have compiled a short analysis of the feedback we received, it focuses on 4 themes that were discussed. Issue 1 was refs and volunteers and the main problem that was mentioned was a possible shortage of refs and volunteers for division 2. A possible solution would be ref quotas from division 1 teams or NGBs to send to div 2; the second solution would be raising benefits to volunteers.

The second issue was performance points; the exact algorithm is still up for discussion; the main point pointed out was that div 1 would potentially be dominated by a few powerful NGBs. One solution would be reintroducing caps, the other would be averaging out results over a few years.

The fourth point was logistics, i.e. which EQC when where; some suggested close proximity, but most agreed that different times and locations would be preferable. It was pointed out that div 1 would be better suited to be somewhere in Western Europe, and div 2 in Central/Eastern Europe. The next step would be publishing these results and showing that the feedback was taken into account; when this is done, we will need to decide whether to actually go for this, since it's not been ultimately fixed.

Felix: Any comments? As a first comment: It is safe to say that we have set ourselves on a path where it would be difficult to not realise this system. People are now expecting a 2-tier-system. This is mostly a good thing.

Francesco: One thing regarding refs: Maybe we can have different requirements for referees for the Div 2. Maybe we can force teams to provide referees. We would need to think about who should provide those refs - but possibly we should require the Div 2 teams themselves to send refs

Felix: I think it would be possible to ask Div 1 NGBs to send Refs to Div 2. It is a necessary evil, but since those NGBs are profiting from this system a lot it those would be in question.

Chula: I think the trickiest part about this problem is that in general in newer regions (which will go to Div 2) the amount of refs is lower. That makes it trickier to require those teams to send refs themselves. But if we want Div 1 teams to send refs those will be non-playing and cost more - we need to deal with that as well. However, we will have much more teams paying team fees. So if we raise entrance by just a few Euros it will give us more money to do things with. That depends on how we go about this.

A more general point: It is clear that we want to go through with a 2-tier-system and whether we want to sent a point when we want to have all of that figured out OR whether we wait with the announcement until we have discussed everything.

Felix: It seems that it seems more natural, since we already involved the community in the development that we will do that in the future as well.

Chula: Since we want to open up the bidding process for EQC 2019 after EQC this year, then we should have it done by EQC and also before, so people can adjust to that. We need a timeline when we will decide on things. So we can make an announcement now or wait for another 1-2 months and then make the big decision.

Michael: I think we need all decided (at least in general teams) including the algorithm before EQC 2018.

Felix: Especially the relegation system

Chula: Also, in a way logistics is important since that will influence the bidding process: Do we want two venues, do we have preferences on the location? (Div 1 western, Div 2 eastern) Then we also need the performance points distribution, so we can see who goes to EQC. So we also need the logistics decided before EQC 2018.

Felix: How would we do that? Would be encourage or only require applications from certain regions?

John: This was discussed already in the Slack group, but not decided on anything yet

Felix: What do we do if we don't have quality applications from the location we would like for Div 1 and 2.

Chula: Maybe we can have a color coding of NGBs to suggest which Div tournament they can submit a bid to. That would not be too restrictive but give the community and impression of what makes sense.

Felix: So going back to the issue of when to announce what?

Mel: I think step-by-step makes more sense. We have already started with that and then there is no gap to the announcement. It builds more sense of trust with the community and shows that we are transparent and take the feedback into consideration.

Michael S: I agree.

Chula: If we go on that route, than we also need to be clear on what we expect / what the timeline is. We need to make clear what will happen now, for what we want feedback, what they will see and deal with at the moment and which what later. Maybe not have a specific deadline, but something more like "in the next months we are doing this, later we will do that"

Felix: That point is particularly valid because of the expectation that we are setting, since this can only work if people get more involved (e.g. we need more bids). We need to be clear that this won't happen if there will be no additional support from the community. That boils down to publishing the feedback results relatively soon and then tell everyone what will happen.

Chula: Maybe it would be wise to do some form of press release to combine those: "This was the feedback, we are going with it, now we are working on the details".

Felix: That sounds reasonable.

Michael P: I think we need an official committee decision first to decide that we are going with the 2-tier-system.

Felix: We can't do this today in the meetings

Chula: Maybe we can just use a google form, doesn't need to be in a meeting. So we need a decision and then discuss the timeline, so we can then publish this as an announcement together with the feedback. Felix, you could make a decision form and then we can discuss the timeline on Slack.

Felix: Yes, we can do the vote online, that is valid.

Chula: The timeline might not need a formal vote and just have a consensus on Slack.

Felix: It makes sense to discuss it on Slack and then we can approve it.

Chula: This should happen this week, so we need to start making decisions and get moving.

Felix: To summarize: The actual decision on the 2-tier-system (do we go with it now officially?) still needs to be made and will be done via a google form or some form like that soon. Regarding the timeline I will make a post on the Slack group.

## **5. EQC Questions**

Felix: I have some smaller points.

Michael P: Motion to move into camera

John: Second

## **6. AOB**

John: Motion to move out of camera

Michael P: seconded

John: Motion to end the meeting

Michael P: seconded

Meeting ends: 22:11