

European Quidditch Congress Meeting

Date: January 11, 2014

Location: Skype voice

Meeting time: 18:00 GMT

In attendance: David Danos (Belgium), Eduard (Catalunya), Elisabeth Jørstad (Norway), Nina Heise (Germany), Alper Erisen (Turkey), Rebecca Alley (EQC 2015), Jagoda Sadecka (Poland) (for parts of meeting), Paul Wespataat (Germany) (for parts of meeting), Orel Cosseron (France) (for parts of meeting).

Chair: David Danos

Secretary: Rebecca Alley

Agenda

1. Secretary and Robert's Rules of Order
2. Liaison introductions
3. Updates from past week
4. Organization discussion
5. Deadline discussion
6. Mission statement
7. Transparency and reliability
8. Other inquiries
9. Announcements

1 - Secretary and Robert's Rules of Order

David: There is a need for understanding of what's happening in meetings; it's important for people to understand what we are as organization.

Elisabeth: Meeting minutes have been taken, but have not been made public. It hasn't come up and nobody thought to do it.

David: Introduces Robert's Rules of Order. Their appearance is formal, but when they are used it makes meetings run better, especially with large groups.

Rebecca: 5 major points in Robert's Rules. The first is "making a motion". What making a motion does is to add something or to confirm something. One person must put that motion forward and then must be seconded by another individual. A discussion follows. Then it is decided how many to pass the motion, and then it is voted on. For example, we might make a motion to introduce the position of a secretary.

The second is "amending a motion". If someone wants to update the motion in regard to the secretary, they move to amend the motion, and if it is seconded and the subsequent vote passes, the motion is amended and discussion continues normally.

The third is "move to question". What does that is it ends the debate and you immediately vote on the motion. The vote passes with an agreed upon majority (often simple majority).

The fourth is "tabling a motion". This means that an agenda point is not decided upon at that meeting and is left on the table until the next meeting. This is good if there are few people

present at the meeting, or if more information is necessary before a vote. The agenda point is only tabled if somebody seconds the move to table.

The last is “move to adjourn the meeting”. Generally done after the full agenda has been discussed. The chair often moves to adjourn. Like the others, this must be seconded.

A useful addition to this is “going in camera”. This means that minutes are not taken. The secretary records who moves to go in camera, and who seconds it, but then the minutes stop until somebody moves to go out of camera and is seconded. This is useful for things that could harm individuals outside of the discussion, or that are incredibly private. Not to be used just to hide a controversial discussion.

Rebecca : introduces motion to implement Robert’s Rules

Elisabeth: seconds

Elisabeth: Notes that this is what IQA does in their meetings with motions and secondings.

David: Affirms what Elisabeth has noted.

Elisabeth : Transparency is a big issue but difficult to see from inside. She doesn’t mind public minutes; anything that could make Quidditch Europe more organized seems good.

Rebecca: From experience with uOttawa, these rules make things more formal, which can help in quidditch where executives are often groups of friends. Also makes minutes easy to follow.

Alper: Robert’s Rules are difficult to understand but wants to read through.

Nina: Agrees they are difficult to understand at first, but structure is good.

Elisabeth: These rules will help.

David: It will be difficult for first few meetings, but will be good over time once the committee has implemented the rules better; we need to make the effort.

Rebecca: Offers to make sparknotes version of Robert’s Rules in plain English.

Elisabeth: YES.

[General discussion on how to easily keep motions in mind; agreed upon to bold them in the minutes and copy/paste them into the skype chat window while discussing them.]

David: Has never used these rules, how do you finish a motion?

Rebecca: The vote is always the same for how it passes, what does QE do now to pass a vote?

David: Generally uses basic majority, for larger decisions, $\frac{2}{3}$ majority, usually. It has never been totally formal; the committee passed things based on what they felt was basic majority or once everyone was on the same page. They understand this is not the most stable or best way to run a meeting. This will come up later in organization updates. For now everyone is digesting. It’s probably too soon to vote.

Rebecca: What if we table vote while people digest Robert’s Rules, but do a trial run with them this meeting?

David: Moves to table Robert’s Rules, moves to continue using Robert’s Rules for this meeting.

Rebecca: Second

Rebecca: Motion to call the question on these two motions

Alper: Seconds

Vote: unanimous yes

2 - Introductions (liaison)

David: Everyone here knows each other, except Rebecca. She is representing the EQC committee. EQC needs a liaison. Part of compromise reached between the EQC committee and QE is to legitimize our organization and figure out what QE really is. Rebecca brings knowledge from past quidditch experience - she spent 3 years on the executive for uOttawa Quidditch so understands how to run meetings. She also brings an outsider perspective - lots of points brought up recently show the difference between our organization and others' perception of our organization. Rebecca will bring in fresh air, an outsider viewpoint, and the EQC viewpoint. She is given 1 vote (same as other countries). She doesn't need to be in meetings for QE infrastructure, and is in meetings for EQC things. EQC's desires are very attached to all the things being discussed in this meeting.

3- Updates from the past week

David: Will move through quickly. Everyone has been part of conversation. When we were in discussions with EQC, we had similar goals but had breakdowns in communications. This led to a breakdown in working relations. However, it also led to lots of important discussions. The compromise we reached to continue working together: we promise to make Quidditch Europe more transparent and more accountable - people need to know who is on the committee and need to be able to reach them easily.

Rebecca: This communication needs to happen through a method that is not facebook; facebook is unprofessional. The other part of the compromise is that we will see Quidditch Europe's goals and mission statement, so people know what QE is here for. At this point nobody knows what it's supposed to do.

Elisabeth: Right now, Quidditch Europe is a place to discuss things that one country can't decide alone. We don't see ourselves as organization or see further needs. We haven't tried to be an organization.

4 - Organization Discussion

David: Being an organization was never something that was discussed. There was always lots of resistance to being organized at a level that resembles a quasi-IQA. But, if we can be an organization without being that convoluted.

Rebecca: From an outsider perspective, everyone could benefit from more organization.

Elisabeth: We don't have the time to do further development. We wouldn't have time to make it good. UK have been proposing not sending presidents because presidents don't have time. But, most countries might find it hard to find somebody else dedicated enough to the sport.

Rebecca: What about a structure where the presidents resemble a senate and meet once a month or so to vote on things, but the day-to-day running is done by people who apply and are hired by current group to further the development of the organization?

David: Nations currently have VERY VERY FEW dedicated people and so it's hard to have enough bodies to populate committees etc. What about if countries create position that's liaison but if not have the pres?

Rebecca: What about an organization that is hired to work on behalf of the body of presidents (director, vice-director, secretary, international development (east/west?), international

competition, etc) that meets with the presidents every month or 6 weeks to go over things with them and get input from other countries?

Nina: Yes, but is concerned that it would be majority UK.

David: What about introducing a national quota - max 2 from any given country?

Eduard: I think that in the same way every nation or region must have a NGB, having an organisation would help. It should be a long term objective. But what would this organization do that the current committee isn't doing?

Rebecca: It would do what the current committee is doing, so the presidents can keep the work up in your their countries and not be overwhelmed.

David: A quota could still have issues. There is also worry about how communications would run given issues in communication with EQC committee. But, the proposal makes sense - similar to a managerial level with a Board of Directors to provide input and approve large decisions.

Eduard: Agrees there may be too few people in Europe willing to take this on.

Rebecca: Thinks that it would help to have more diverse committee, as many of the problems in communication between QE and EQC were due to cultural differences in communication between a predominantly English/UK committee and predominantly mainland European other committee. It was the mainland voices in the EQC committee who brought in different perspectives, so given more diversity there may be fewer communication errors/issues.

Rebecca: With regards to not enough people, if you do decide to proceed with this, the hiring doesn't have to happen right now. You can take as long as necessary to hire the people you need to ensure good balance.

David: Suggests to put it in Quidditch Europe facebook group so people can take time to think and write comments. Sees two paths: number 1, create new committee and overhaul organizational structure; number 2, make what we have work better. But given limited people in the meeting, **moves to table discussion.**

Rebecca: Second

Unanimous vote yes in favour of tabling discussion on administrative structure.

5 - Deadlines Discussion

David: We need to figure out when we have a decision on what that Quidditch Europe is going to look like moving forward. We don't need a decision on what it will look like specifically, but what sort of structure we'll be going forward with. This will help frame discussions on what it will start to look like.

Rebecca: Suggests that QE takes more time than you think you need, and implement large scale changes over the summer.

David: What are other things we agreed to give deadlines for?

Rebecca: An organizational list of names, positions, and non-facebook contact information, and public meeting minutes. One week is realistic.

David: Agrees with goal for end of this week to get everything released.

Elisabeth: Can we get opinions from people not here before we release meeting minutes?

Rebecca: Why do you need to take time before doing it? Why are opinions necessary for things that should be public record?

David: It's fair because we didn't know what in camera was, so we need to make sure there is no information that can hurt anyone else. Re-proposes 1 week for addresses/names, 2 weeks meeting minutes?

Elisabeth: Agrees

Rebecca: Reluctantly agrees, wants to make sure the committee differentiates between things that are unfavourable and things that can actively hurt others when redacting.

David: Motion for 1 week deadline on names/emails, 2 week deadline for release of meeting minutes.

no second

Elisabeth: 2 weeks is bad, since almost everyone will be in Toulouse.

Rebecca: So then publish the Friday rather than the Sunday and amend the motion to say that the deadline is Friday 23 January.

David: Motion for 1 week deadline on names/emails release.

Alper: Second.

Elisabeth: Does everyone have email address that looks professional enough for quidditch?

Nina: Germany is in the process of setting up website but won't be ready within the week.

Rebecca: It doesn't need to be a quidditch related email, a school address or [firstname]_[lastname]@gmail.com is just fine. Just not the one you made when you were 10.

David: Move to question on release date of contact list.

Rebecca: Second.

Vote: unanimous yes

Rebecca: Suggests re: Toulouse to simply make the deadline on Friday for the meeting minute release.

Elisabeth: That won't work for the Norwegians; they can't release the minutes.

David: Won't be in toulouse, so can make it in his homework to release it that Friday as long as he has all the information.

Elisabeth: What about the Tuesday after Toulouse?

Rebecca: It seems like things are getting pushed back too much.

David: Everyone has other commitments, so favours Tuesday after.

Nina: Agrees, Germany's first national tournament on Sat 24 January.

David: Motion to set meeting minute release deadline on Tuesday Jan. 27.

Elisabeth: Second.

(had discussions before motion, whoops)

David: calls vote on motion

Vote: Alper (Turkey) and Rebecca (EQC) abstain; 5 in favour.

Alper: Will this meeting be included in that release date?

Rebecca: We can get it released by next Wednesday.

Alper: Does everyone have to look over it?

Rebecca: Given use of Robert's rules and knowledge of "in camera", no.

Alper: Motion to release these minutes Jan. 14.

Rebecca: Second.

Vote: unanimous in favour

6 - Mission statement

David: We need to talk about a mission statement, but facebook will be better. A mission statement is something that is simple and small, a description of goals of this organization - what do we do? It won't talk about specific goals, but will talk about end points. It is the very broad, overarching direction that the organization is going in. It will also help clarify what we are as an organization. (i.e. an organization like this with heads of countries? or a secondary board discussing day-to-day logistics?) It is important to start mission statement. We can put it in our group along with the organization structure discussion.

Rebecca: Can we get a deadline for release of information on potential reorganization of QE and mission statement?

David: Discussion can happen through facebook, we can probably set a week deadline to give a deadline?

Alper: Can we have a couple of people writing the mission statement? (subcommittee?)

David: Will ask on facebook - will give examples of organization structures, other mission statements.

Elisabeth: Can we set a deadline to find a deadline? Doesn't want to decide right now

Rebecca: Motion to set deadline for release of information re: QE structure and mission statement by Sun. Jan 18?

Elisabeth: Second.

Alper: Release of information?

Elisabeth: We decide how long we have to discuss everything and make a decision.

Nina: What if everyone disagrees with structural change?

Rebecca: Then you announce that there will be no structural change on that date that you choose.

David: We're doing this through facebook so everyone gets a voice on things that are a big deal, this is why we're allowing everyone work together to set a deadline to finish the big discussions.

Rebecca: Move to question on the release date of Jan. 18 for a deadline/release date for more information.

Alper: Second.

Vote: unanimous yes

7 - Transparency and reliability discussion

David: What this entails is not necessarily steps to take or decisions made, wants everyone to be on the same page about what transparency and reliability are and what it means for us as QE. So when we do discuss on fb, we all are on the same page. Who has ideas of what these are?

Nina: All the things we agreed upon will help with transparency - public minutes etc. Reliability will come with this. It depends on how structural talks go.

Rebecca: Up until now, both these things have been quite frankly, awful, but things discussed here and also things you can look into in the future like a website or a constitution will help a lot. Increased transparency = increased reliability.

Elisabeth: What other things can we do?

Rebecca: For reliability, create a website. It looks more professional and therefore reliable. For transparency, create a constitution. Both of these are probably more useful when you've got your structure in place and are lower priority than deciding on organizational structure.

Elisabeth: What can we do now?

Rebecca: That pretty much covers it, a website would be good.

Elisabeth: Websites require money.

Rebecca: Sites like wordpress have fairly good free, professional-looking options that are easy to do.

Alper: We can explain policies better so people can understand reasoning behind policies

David: Is everyone comfortable with our definition and able to discuss freely and openly with other members of quidditch europe?

Rebecca: Can somebody bring up the idea of a wordpress website? It would help a lot to keep the increased volume of information in one place, so people don't lose countless google docs.

8 - Other enquiries

Rebecca: Who will be your EQC liaison?

David: Can we discuss it and release in a week? I will continue to be interim liaison.

Rebecca: Motion to vote on EQC liaison deadline in a week

Alper: second

Vote: unanimous yes

9 - Announcements

David: 2.5 announcements. then will open it up to any other major announcements. Quidditch Posts's articles and coverage of Europe is limited, he has pushed for them to go for a more international point of view but they need writers. Please disseminate information to all quidditchers to contact QP if they want to write, so QP can get more European content. EQC currently has a facebook event. Invite every single person you know. Get spectators there. BQF is hosting an international tournament the last weekend of February in Antwerp.

Alper: The Turkish national championship will be in February, in Ankara.

Rebecca: EQC extension decisions will be out within the week.

Elisabeth: Norway is meeting tomorrow to decide national championship and which teams will be sent to EQC.

Nina: German national tournament is in 2 weeks on Saturday, will have 4 out of the 6 German teams there !!!

10 - End of meeting

David: Motion to adjourn meeting.

Rebecca: Second.

Meeting end time: 20:06 GMT

Agenda

- Meeting cut off time: proposal 1,5 hours.
- Minutes
- Defining QE (IQA update -> Michele?)
- Leadership
- QE Goals
- Constitution
- Meetings
- Representatives
- Hiring press representative
- Internal QE communication
- Website update
- Bids & update on European Games (today)
- EG policies, eligibility

Present

Jerona (MQN), Laurens (BQF), Elisabeth (NRF), Orel (FQF), Amy (QUK), Jagoda (PLQ), Michele (AIQ), Yeray (Spain), Alper (QAT), Marc (Catalunya)

Absent

Rebecca (Ireland)

Minutes

Jerona chairs the meeting.

Orel is choose to take minutes.

The meeting starts at 21:05

Jerona: Michele was supposed to be our president, have you looked for someone else?

Amy: Suggestion: We open applications for someone who isn't running an NGB to do this role? It's too big to do both roles as well as studying or working

Jerona: I agree with that, we whould open to people who are not president or vp.

Michele: I'm the one in our board who have the more free-time, and I already don't have much, but if you have someone to do that that would be great.

Elisabeth: We should add someone in our board allowed to represent our NGB and to vote in our name, as long as it's someone in the board.

Michele: Can you do that?

Elisabeth: Yes, in a GAE.

Michele: Would everybody be ok with having someone who is not actually part of the board?

Jerona: Yes.

Jonas: What would be the difference between havong the president or a dedicated person?

Jerona: President don't have time, we are already busy. QE deserve more attention.

Jonas: So president could not be part of QE anymore?

Jerona: They can if they want to.

Jonas: Ok.

Jerona: Coming back to leadership: how do you feel about open it up to representatives?

Marc:

Michele: As long as we are in an IQA committee,

Elisabeth: Can we have an active chair?

Michele: Yes.

Marc: Is there a restriction?

Michele: The chair must be a representative in the IQAC.

Elisabeth: We can have something who actually act as a Chair.

Jerona: Does that mean that we need 2 people?

Michele: I'll be happy to do that if needed.

Elisabeth: I'll prefer someone who is part of the board already because they have more experience.

Jerona: I get your point but I'm not sure we'll have many applications.

Elisabeth: I move for having a job application open to members of our board in priority.

Jerona: I second. Can we add an application for executive director?

Michele: It doesn't need to be a formal application.

In favour: AIQ, MQN, FQF, NRF, QUK, PLQ, QAT, Catalonia, Spain, DQB, BQF

Against: -

Motion accepted.

Jerona: I'll try to make a form within a week.

Amy: We'll share it.

Jerona: Good topic would be our goals, as EQC or EG, the 2 big ones.

Elisabeth: Motion: Let other members of the board represent their country on in the European Committee

In favour: AIQ, MQN, FQF, NRF, QUK, PLQ, QAT, Catalonia, Spain, DQB, BQF

Against: -

Motion accepted.

Jerona: We could work with a secretary as well.

Laurens: If the secretary is not present we're taking minutes ourselves in BQF.

Michele: Having a secretary would make a difference.

Jerona: We could try it without a secretary and if it doesn't work we'll hire one.

Jerona: Website: we have the one that rebecca set up. We could use it for press release, application forms, etc. It's kind of a secretary role.

Amy: Definitely not essential at the moment in this stage of our development, anything that needs to be done can be sorted by whoever gets the leadership job.

Elisabeth: I agree.

Jerona: I'm fine with that.

Elisabeth: I think it's not a rush right now.

Jerona: I agree, it's pretty important but still.

Amy: It's definitely needed at some stage, but again, leaving it a few months will not hurt anyone

Jerona: Next, we've got something about communication and meetings and goals for QE.

Let's start with meetings. We haven't regular meetings so far. How often have we to met?

Marc: We should have a minimum amount of time between meetings.

Laurens: Doesn't have a clear schedule reduce the number of people who can attend.

Amy: Regularly scheduled meetings are REALLLY REALLY IMPORTANT. 3 weeks?

Jerona: I do agree with Amy, 3 weeks sounds good. We can schedule our next meeting for 3 weeks for now.

Laurens: Could we have a meeting planned a week before EQC? I think it's important.

Jerona: I'm confused: a meeting with EQCcom?

Michele: David was our liaison but since he left could you replace it as you are part of both?

Laurens: Yes.

Elisabeth: I think it should be someone else as the liaison should represent QE and Laurens is part of both committee.

Jerona: Laurens, do you want to?

Laurens: Eeeeeeeeeeeer... Yes? I'll check with rebecca and the EQCcom.

Jerona: Michele, can you planned our next meeting?

Michele: Ok.

Amy: Whilst we're talking about EQC, do you all have complaints systems in case any players have reason to file official complaints against your members? Sorry to drag this out!

Jerona: What kind of complaints?

Amy: We receive behavioural complaints about QUK members a surprising amount.

Jerona: I think the organisers will have something.

Amy: Complaints tend to be from players, about players, to be dealt with by us (QUK)

Laurens: At the moment we do not have one but we want to have this system.

Amy: If there's an incident that a player has with a player of a different NGB, are there routes that the relevant NGBs have to sort it?

Michele: They can talk to their own NGB which will contact the second NGB.

Jerona: Their own NGB or directly the second one?

Michele: We can leave them the choice.

Elisabeth: Let say that I'm both the contact point of Norway and the problem: it's better to give them the choice.

Michele: Fair point.

Jerona: Do we have a contact list?

Michele: We have one on the IQA website and in Quidditch Europe.

Jerona: Internal communication within QE: Amy and Matthew want to be contacted by e-mail, the rest of us is on FB. It's becoming chaotic.

Amy: YES PLEASE!! We can't guarantee that we can check all the FB things, so email

Jerona: Sometime we made decision on the FB group, we should do that in meetings.

Michele: Yes.

Amy: Why would decisions be made on the FB group?

Jerona: Because of the lack of meetings.

Amy: Ah, that dangerous cycle

Jerona: We're breaking it today.

Elisabeth: Do we keep the group?

Jerona: We can keep the group to have discussions.

Michele: Yeah.

Jerona: Constitution. Do we need one as part of the IQA?

Michele: Yep for everything specific to QE.

Jerona: RRoO can be a part of it.

Michele: It's also part of the IQA. WOUld be more like "this is our goal, this is our structure", 2 pages max.

Jerona: Do we talk about it right now?

Michele: We should draft something first.

Jerona: That sounds good. Do you want to make it?

Michele: Hm.

Jerona: Great.

Michele: Do we start to talk about goals now?

Jerona: We should talk about EG a little bit and EQC in the time left.

Michele: No big news about EG, the statement should happen tomorrow on the IQA website. We'll tell about the accomodations and transport so people won't freak out.

Amy: Does anybody know where it will be here?

Michele: Chicago.

Elisabeth: It's going to be in Italy and it's going to be awesome.

Michele: We're receiving a lot of help from the city. Almost every player already have a place reserved to stay, and there is a lot more places to stay.

Jerona: sounds good.

Elisabeth: How many volunteer do you need? Who's running the thing?

Michele: The people in the association are doing a lot of ground work, we basically need a TD and the usual position. It will be published in the IQA website as soon as we announce the thing. We do have some volunteers, but every extra help is welcome.

Jerona: What about relationship with EGcom? How are we going to make things... differently than with the EQCcom?

Michele: We have a contract.

Jerona: Can we see it?

Michele: Yes.

Elisabeth: can I bring up a policie? Everyone who is born in a country or who have played in a country can play for this country.

Laurens: Can each NGB be stricter than that?

Elisabeth: Yes.

Amy: Do any countries have issues with players who sign up to be on two or more national teams?

Michele: We have often problem with that.

Jerona: I think that we shouldn't be allowed to play for more than 1 team.

Michele: Are you planning to have both spanish and catalonian teams?

Yeray&Marc: Yes.

Jerona: What if a barcelonian player doesn't want to play for catalonia? Technically they can play for spain...

Marc: Spain and Catalonia should speak about it.

Jerona: How would we know if someone apply for two teams?

Laurens: A belgian player is in the UK almost all the time but all the stuff for the team is in Belgium. So that is why he apply for both belgian and UK teams.

Jerona: Motion: Players will only be able to apply for one national team. This includes sharing information about who has applied for your national team.

In favour: AIQ, MQN, FQF, NRF, QUK, PLQ, QAT, Catalonia, Spain, DQB, BQF

Against: -

Motion accepted.

Jerona: Is there anything else we need to discuss?

Alper: How will we communicate this information between NGBs? Warn others about suspicious players?

Jerona: Yes that's it. Anything else on the EG?

Laurens: Some people might be interested to volunteer. If they are selected in their national team they should not want to be volunteer anymore.

Elisabeth: MOTION: Every nation may choose their own criteria for who may be on the national team. It might be stricter than the following, but not less strict:

- Anyone with citizenship may apply
- Anyone who has only played quidditch in the nation may apply
- Anyone who for at least the last academic year has been playing in the nation (and not their nation of citizenship) may apply
- Anyone who has lived in the country for at least 3 year

Laurens: Is a year 365 days?

Elisabeth: No it's just the last year.

Michele: I second.

In favour: AIQ, MQN, FQF, NRF, QUK, PLQ, QAT, Catalonia, Spain, DQB, BQF

Against: -

Motion accepted.

Jerona: It's close to 22:30. Anything else?

Michele: If you want to know more about EG, just write me. That's all.

Laurens: When will the announce occurs?

Michele: should be tomorrow.

Jerona: Thank you all to have come today. It's a new start! I think that conclude the meeting.

The meeting ends at 22:27

Agenda

1 hour 30 minutes.

- Discussion on Committee's charter (doc never happened, so we will get it started during the call, with the actual work to be continued over the next weeks)
 - Michele?
- Updates and discussion on hiring of Executive Director
 - 2 candidates so far, deadline next week by Jerona
 - Rebecca Alley = assistant tournament director eqc, canadian in france
 - Felix Linzmeyer = from germany
 - Introduce committee to speed up this process and choose/talk to the candidates
- QE structure: positions needed and responsibilities
 - Now: 1 official chair (Michele) - contact person. But no practical tasks.
 - New: Exec director → emails, planning, chairs meetings (also: website?)
 - Proposition: two people are going to think about it - for next meeting.
- EQC updates & discussion if needed
 - Michele?
- EG updates & discussion
 - ...
- Feedback forms for each NGB for complaints/feedback.
 - Specifically since EQC is coming.
 - There are two ways to deal with complaints: own NGB/foreign NGB.
 - A message we can send out to show people this is something they can do.
- IQA fees discussion
 - Are we accepting it/are we going to be against it? what now?
 - Developing leagues have to pay as well..? Even though they get no vote/benefit you can show? - legality?
- Check on status of National Teams (double applications, other issues)
 - last time: every country would share info on national teams to double check. deadline for this + how to share + who will look at it?
 - tell players "you have to choose" asap.
- Criteria for teams to be recognised as official (discussion re: some form of standard)
 - Now: NGB says it's official - it is official. Do we need European guidelines?
- updating the contact sheet
 - Do we have one, where? Is it still relevant?
 - Add email and SKYPE.
 - For official statements, planning of meetings and discussions: through email. Facebook is unofficial?
- A.O.B.

Present

Michele, Ellen, Caspar, Lukas, Marc, Laurens, Ellen, Kai, Nina, Yeray

Absent

Amy, Alper

Minutes (21:00-22:08)**Chaired by Caspar****Minutes by Ellen**

Michele: create a document, put guidelines in there, but we need to decide what we want to do for Europe, what our goals & structures are. We know it already but we need to write it down.

<https://docs.google.com/document/d/14cLFWuApwtUskOoQyZbq6scg7g4H3mHJQat7WrlCtHk/edit>

Caspar: Such a doc would be nice to have but we don't have to discuss what is in there.

Michele: Agreed. But whenever the doc is created, please contribute because it can't just be one person.

Caspar: We can set up a document.

Caspar: Jerona talked me through this. She had 2 candidates: Rebecca Alley & Felix Lindsmeyer (?), should we make a committee with 2- more of us to contact these people?

Laurens: why?

Caspar: to tell them they got the position. You have to make it official at some point.

Michele: One person?

Caspar: Okay, one person. But a meeting to decide who gets is it inefficient. But we can get a subcommittee. And of course they can always ask for general feedback but they ultimately do the big work and look at the cons and pros.

Michele: Does anyone here want to do that as well.

Caspar: I'd want to, but it would be 2 dutch people (+ jerona) and that's not a good idea; it's not a lot of work. Anyone else who can help Jerona?

Kai: I can help.

Caspar: 2 or 3 people is okay. We'll contact Jerona about it to see if she's okay with it.

Kai: Have they filled an application yet?

Caspar: Not sure.

Kai: Jerona is in charge of that.

Caspar: Discuss it in private. Now, do we have a list of executive director tasks? I don't think we do.

Michele: The thing Jerona posted covers it a little bit. She wrote: arranges and schedules meetings, arranges and distributes meetings, contributes...So basically do the day-to-day stuff that we don't have time to do.

Caspar: And the official website? Would he/she be in charge of that? Because I feel nobody is?

Michele: Nobody is. But I feel two people are needed: one for tacky stuff and one for official things.

Caspar: Maybe a PR person?

Michele: We already discussed but once we have an Exec Director it'll be easier.

Kai: Maybe we can get a temporary semi-PR person?

Caspar: but then again we kind of can already make it official. We're looking for an exec and we're looking for a PR.

Kai; I was thinking more the Exec can also be PR until we find another one.

Kai: Also, how are we on the web page?

Caspar: I think it's an idea?

Michele: Rebecca said it's just basic ideas and articles. By the way I don't know if it's a good topic for this meeting but I think Rebecca said she could only start in April 'cause she's doing EQC right now.

Kai: is there a deadline for the exec spot?

Caspar: Jerona wants the deadline in 1-2 weeks.

Michele: Laurens, how are we doing on EQC?

Laurens: We have everything under control except for the draw stream. That sucked, but we were late, and then it didn't work.

Nina: Will there be a livestream of the actual EQC?

Laurens: I cannot reply to that.

Nina: but games will be filmed at least?

Laurens: no idea. But we're already lacking volunteers. We have enough referees but we're short on volunteers. I can actually read something because our volunteer director posted something in our group today: we're sitting on 47 volunteers... We still only have 5 people saying they're willing to First Aid.

Nina: Can you maybe do a list of specific positions still needed?

Laurens: I cannot give that right now.

Marc: is there gonna be more food than VC?

Laurens: Probably. 'Cause we've been talking about it a lot but our logistics coordinator wasn't able to attend the last two meetings. But we're gonna have at least 3 people with different types of foods on site.

EUROPEAN GAMES

Michele: we're short on volunteers.

Laurens: I didn't know the applications were open.

Michele: We need a tournament director and other positions. Just push it with people who aren't planning to play, if possible. That was the one thing. And the other is: the Sarteano organisation asked us for contact relations for mails to send everyone to help with transportations. I'd like to have all the contacts for people who are the contact points for the team by today or tomorrow.

Kai: How many people do you need? We haven't chosen anybody in charge yet, we have 3 people in charge of the national team.

Michele: How many people will be traveling, how are you traveling...I want to know who to send that e-mail to.

Caspar: I'll make a FB post. Everybody gives their e-mails and their Skype names.

Kai: individually, or?

Caspar: individual is fine, NGB address is fine too.

FEEDBACK FORMS FOR NGB

Caspar: Is this a new point? Or was it discussed? MQN is setting up a feedback process for anybody who feels the need, and I feel every NGB needs to have this. Also in regards to EQC and EG coming up. We must be able to comment or complain to each other. If we have to. Does everybody have that?

Canan: we only get data from participants, not from nations.

Caspar: Two options: you can complain to your own NGB and we'll contact the foreign NGB. This is Jerona's idea but we need to set up the system. People pay, so we need to set up the system for feedback. Maybe we can set people to work on that?

Michele: What was mentioned last time: every NGB needs to get something and publicize it, in their own language and English, so people who have an issue with that NGB can contact them as well.

Caspar: We need to find out who already has this and then make 1 doc where all the info is stored. Do we want to appoint people for that now? Does any NGB NOT have any system like this?

(Marc:) We don't have anything like that. (Catalonia)

Laurens: Belgium doesn't have any either; We do have a team with all the team presidents + staff where they can ask question but it's not for complaints.

(Austria): We have a really small NGB with 1 team so we don't need it.

Canan: We have a system but not many people use it.

Caspar: It's important with the national games coming up.

Canan: We have a form on the website.

Kai: Norway mostly contacts individually through Facebook and such. Not many complaints.

Marc: is this feedback about the working of the NGB's or international tournaments?

Caspar: I think both, but mainly in the light of the international tournaments, we need to have complaints professionally handled.

Marc: We don't have anything here yet, but it would be great.

Caspar: Every NGB needs to think about it. Maybe not an elaborate system but a mail address and somebody who handles this professionally. Maybe next time we can try to integrate it in one document.

Michele: A website is more handy so it'll all be bundled.

Caspar; but we won't have a website for a while. But it's something that SHOULD be on the website.

Kai: We can put the link in the pin post of quidditch Europe.

Michele: I can make a page that redirects once everybody has it, but not one at a time. I'll wait until everybody has one.

Caspar: Let's send everyone away with the message 'talk about it with your NGBs and see what they think. Try to set it up, it doesn't have to be a big thing.'

IQA FEES DISCUSSIONS

Laurens: we don't have to discuss this really, nothing is set in stone:

Canan: How are they going to use that money? Do they have budgets or documents for this? How did they decide the amounts of money?

Michele: That happened in a few congress meetings. The ADA is supposed to pay for the incorporation price, budget for tournaments, website, a couple of other things. Merchandise too, I think. But I haven't seen anything specific or a document saying '100 will go to that'

Caspar: Can we request this?

Michele; I think we can ask Brian and be like 'can we write something down' Actually, I think we have a financial person in the IQA we can ask.

Caspar: Who is going to do this?

Michele. I can do that.

Caspar: There was also a discussion about developing leagues, what they have to pay to IQA. I'm against that, they're developing and nothing official, and they don't benefit of being part of IQA yet.

Michele: They can be an emerging area. If you're developing, you can play in tournaments, so they still get something out of it, and it would be only 50 euros or something.

Caspar: I remember when MQN was recently founded; 50 euros couldn't even be paid officially.

Laurens: They're not demanding to pay an emerging area. You have emerging area, developing league and member league, the latter are full numbers. (200,300).

Caspar: we didn't know the difference.

Michele: Emerging is more than 0 teams but no NGB or competitive play. Developing has a NGB and competitive play on a more or less regular basis.

Marc: if a developing region want to play in games, they pay. You can't force anyone to play, but that makes sense. Also, the mail we received said we had to pay by the first of April. I think we're all agreeing not to pay until we have the budget. What's gonna happen if we decide not to pay?

Caspar: The ball is in their park but we still want to see the budget.

Kai: I was at the last congress meeting. Nothing was decided yet, because we haven't finalized any ideas. Not enough NGBs pressed to make any ideas. They're not going to sanction us if we don't pay. I don't think there's going to be much of an issue. Of course it's time to get things moving.

Michele: The IQA is not incorporated yet, so we're basically paying an individual.

Caspar: I guess nobody is gonna pay until it's official.

Laurens; also this way we're forcing the IQA to step up their game.

Michele: that would mean money for tournaments.

Laurens: and also not team fees of over 200 euros.

Michele: The fees amount is way smaller than it could be, so I don't have an issue with that.

Caspar: Let's see the budget first. We'll see after that.

Michele: I can send that mail to the IQA, and ask for the budget.

EUROPEAN GAMES

Caspar: He signed up for Belgium in the UK (Cory), and last time somebody said we should double-check EVERYONE and share info about applications.

Laurens: Having a database where every NGB can say 'these are our applications' and everybody can check, discussed this with Michele.

Kai: Do we want to publicise our teams, though?

Caspar: Maybe at some point but not until they're all chosen.

Kai: For us, or for everyone?

Caspar: We're not going to publish all applications. I guess everybody sees each other there at the games.

Kai: I thought this was just about people who signed up for 2 teams.

Caspar: we'll do it in one spread-sheet, copy-pasting. Internal checking.

Laurens: We can look at it, but we won't publicize it to the public.

Caspar: I think everyone has other deadlines, but NGB's need to stress or publicize that people can't apply for two teams.

Caspar: Just checking, it's technically not illegal if an italian player wants to play for the UK?

Michele: they need to have a relation with the NGB.

Caspar: but not membership?

Michele: There are a few options. Citizenship is one.

Caspar: *checks document, No, you don't have to be a member.

Laurens: Belgium is only choosing 2 of those guidelines.

Kai: Can it be only stricter?

Laurens: Yes.

Canan: How are they going to prove themselves? Don't they need to apply to the NGB first? Are their records kept?

Caspar: It's probably organised through the NGB so it's nice to have contact, but you don't have to be an official member of the NGB. The NGB is the gateway but you don't have to be a member.

Laurens: Unless the NGB restricts it.

CRITERIA FOR TEAM RECOGNITION? EUROPEAN STANDARD?

Caspar: Right now: if the NGB is official, the team is official. Should there be team guidelines?

Laurens: if the team is recognised by the IQA-recognised-NGB then it's definitely an NGB team.

Marc: The issue is that different NGB's will have different criteria to become official. But right now, some have representatives but some don't. So you lower the criteria to zero, you can get as many as you want. Our previous rep found the criteria would be revised by the IQA, but she couldn't find where she saw it. We need to push this forward.

Caspar: I realize it would be useful, but I don't see which one. We're talking about minimum guidelines.

Marc: When we were creating our NGB we were watching others, and some were very good and some were very vague or low. And anyone could become an official team, even if they didn't have enough players to play.

Kai: I don't see why we should discuss this with Europe, we need an INTERNATIONAL standard, we need to discuss this at the IQA.

Caspar: We'll leave this point for now.

CONTACT SHEET

Caspar: Do we have an official one? It would be nice to have, not a facebook post, but a proper document.

Michele: There is an official one on the QEurope page, but it's not updated.

ANYTHING ELSE:

Marc: Next meeting before EQC. Yes or no? Maybe the week before? 8-9?

Caspar: We can put a doodle for the last week before EQC?

Kai: That's the regional championship (Norway?)

Caspar: If anything concerns EQC I don't think it'll matter anymore. But as an introduction to our possible Exec director then, I think it'll be nice to have one there.

Kai: It could be good to either have a meeting to discuss what is needed and what exactly we're looking for, or have a meeting to introduce said person.

Caspar: If we all agree generally we're fine with you two picking the person.

Kai: We don't need a meeting before IQA.

Caspar: Let's try to squeeze a meeting in, but also think about whether the exec director can make it.

European Quidditch Congress Meeting

Date: 6th of May 2015

Location: Skype voice

Meeting time: 21:00 GMT

In attendance: Rebecca Alley (Exec. Manager), Felix Linsmeier (Secretary), Michele Clabassi (Italy), Laurens Grinwis Plaat Stutjes (Belgium), Lukas Linser (Austria), Mel Piper (United Kingdom), Jagoda Sadecka (Poland), Jean Blake (Spain), Elisabeth Jørstad (Norway), Marc Garganté Oliva (Catalonia), Nina Heise (Germany), Alper Erişen (Turkey)

Chair: Rebecca Alley

Secretary: Felix Linsmeier

Agenda

1. Introduction
2. Roll call
3. EQC Follow-up
4. European Games Updates
5. Website
 - a. General
 - b. Information to be supplied by NGBs
6. Logo
7. Purpose, vision and goals of the European Committee
8. Organisational structure & Financial
 - a. Increasing the efficiency of the European Committee
 - b. Status as organisation & Bank Account
9. Other inquiries
10. Announcements

Introduction

Roll Call

1. Rebecca Alley (Exec. Manager)
Felix Linsmeier (Secretary)
Michele Clabassi (Italy)
Laurens Grinwis Plaat Stutjes (Belgium)
Lukas Linser (Austria)
Mel Piper (United Kingdom)
Jagoda Sadecka (Poland)
Jean Blake (Spain)

Elisabeth Jørstad (Norway)
Marc Garganté Oliva (Catalonia)
Nina Heise (Germany)
Alper Erişen (Turkey)

EQC Followup

Rebecca: How did EQC go, what could be done better?

Elisabeth: EQC was organised much better than previous events

Alper: Some People are upset about score updates, which were little or nonexistent.

Elisabeth: More videos would be much appreciated (Volunteers)

Michele: Is there something the organising committee noticed that would be well discussed at an early point?

Rebecca: Hire people early to give the committee time in advance, the last schedule was very tight (example: hosting for volunteers), and also a starting budget would give the organisers a good basis

Laurens: Committee players who are playing were the only real problem; it can be very stressfull

Rebecca: Graphics responsables who are not Native Speakers should have English-native proofreaders to avoid mistakes (as a specifically assigned person)

Michele *[following up Rebecca's earlier point]*: When should preparations start? Rebecca: As soon as possible (now), hiring staff etc.

Laurens *[adding]*: Is the next EQC planned around the same time as this year (should it be checked with everyone)?

Rebecca: a Poll is possible, but giving only a general period of time (which is not specific to actual dates) to give more more leeway to organisers

Marc: NGBs are focussing on European Games and National teams right now, might the bidding time in a month's time be too early?

Michele: affirms that the current timeframe of about a month's time should work.

Elisabeth: The date should be based on holidays and away from common exam periods

Rebecca: Is there consensus on doing a poll to find out the best timeframe? A late bidding process would not give much time for planning and there are also worries about teams being on vacation in summer, where not many people would respond to polls and bidding

Mel: Instead of club bidding, should there be venue bidding (cities bidding for the hosting of EQC)

Rebecca: Agrees, especially since EQC is a bigger event than European Games

Elisabeth: Agrees

Jean: Agrees and gives example about Spanish Cup in Valencia

Rebecca: Should this be voted upon now or is more time needed to confer with NGBs

Michele: Do we want to switch to an entirely new system or do both team and venue bidding?

Elisabeth: Would this proposal still include the NGBs in the bidding process or bypass them?

Michele: Is in favour of removing the “extra-step” through NGBs, but guidelines for this would be essential

Rebecca: These Guidelines would need to apply to both teams and venues

Jean: Is this about cities and teams both being able to bid (what about NGBs)?

Rebecca: Cities and NGBs can collaborate if they want to. Would people be interested in NGBs being able to make bids themselves?

Jean *[responding]*: Could there be issues between teams and NGBs (when planning their bids)?

Rebecca *[responding]*: Why would the taking of teams with their NGB make a difference with the bidding process?

Elisabeth: Probably would not be a problem, the bids could still be made regardless of possible issues between the two

Alper: A contract was signed for the European Games, who would sign a contract in the case of venue bidding?

Rebecca: This can be discussed at a later point in the agenda.

Elisabeth: Does it have to be a venue/team or could it be an organisation or something similar?

Rebecca: There is no sense restricting it to venues because every assistance counts towards a better event

Michele: For European Games, associations are already included in the phrasing of the bidding regulations

Rebecca: Bids could be extended to venues, teams and associations; the bidding process would be strictly regulated; problems between teams and NGBs could be made known after the fact

Marc: How could a city actually apply?

Rebecca: It works similarly (via a group of responsables), cities could create a specific committee or use their existing infrastructure to host the event (also economic factors and tourism would be possible advantages)

Elisabeth: *[citing the rules for EG]*: "Each NGB is encouraged to work together with cities, teams, or other entities, but is not required to do so. A maximum of

3 bids per NGB is allowed." Cities, teams and other entities should be used for next EQC for uniformity

Felix: *summarises main points*

Rebecca: **introduces motion to move to vote upon changing the bidding process to what was just discussed**

Felix: **Second**

Vote: Turkey abstains, otherwise unanimously in favour

Rebecca: Is Facebook accepted as a medium to regulate the bidding?

Elisabeth: A selection committee might be too much to hope for but it is worth a try

Nina: What happened to the general feedback form, which should have been discussed here?

Rebecca: True. *[Goes on to summarise the main points]* People are generally pleased; some issues included housing for more people, more food options and getting score updates sooner

Laurens *[adding to the list]*: scheduling and gameplay (on day 2), shared 3rd place, having a sheltered place, there are also differing opinions about how the tournament went and how well it was organised

Rebecca: More communication with the facilities is needed next time; playing committee members are an organisational issue

Felix: Some organisations rent out school gyms (or a similar venue) to offer cheap housing to volunteers and participants: might be a good option?

Alper: Will the forms be shared with the committee?

Rebecca: Yes within the next week; the rest of the feedback should be done on Facebook

European Games

Michele:

Shares a link to the European Games update [06/05/2015: appendix] and goes over the updates (clarifying some immediate questions)

Fields: several locations have been scouted which are usable to varying degrees (ER is not far away as well)

Rebecca: Will volunteers and organisers be first in line for accommodation or have to wait for the general public announcement?

Michele: This will be dealt with beforehand.

Jean: Does accommodation currently only include hotel and camping?

Michele: Currently yes, other options need to be sorted out.

Alper: Is this document okay to share?

Michele: There should be no problems with that

Elisabeth: Will the socials be discussed at a later point?

Michele: Still needs to be addressed (and possibly about the separation of Quidditch (sport) and other surrounding Harry-Potter-themed events

Further Questions:

Alper: How is Internet and streaming coming along?

Michele: It is being worked on.

Website

Rebecca: Work on the site has been started and the sitemap has been posted to the European Committee group. Still needed is a list for teams which will need to be supplied by NGBs: respective team names, locations, team contact e-mail, facebook/social media contact, status as official teams. Furthermore, a webmaster should be hired to keep the website up to date (sole responsibility for the site), approval would be needed from the committee.

Laurens: is studying something similar and would possibly be willing to take up the job [the issue will be discussed between Rebecca and Laurens personally]

Logo

Rebecca: Should the logo be updated, especially considering the recent well-done graphic design for EQC? For more inclusion of the community and transparency there could also be a competition

Michele: Could the committee modify a logo from a competition?

Rebecca: Rights to modify would be part of the deal

Felix: The rights would need to be waived to the committee

Rebecca: This could be done via checkbox on a submission form

Purpose, vision and goals of the European Committee

Rebecca: The impressions gathered from the members of the committee submitted in writing were compiled into a document [Vision for future: appendix]

Laurens: Disagrees on “Independence from IQA” because the goal should be more integration rather than separation

Michele: Quidditch Europe should be separate, but not split from the IQA (Similarly to UEFA and FIFA)

Marc *[clarifying]*: Independence means getting more capacities, not the complete separation from IQA

Laurens: Disagrees with the idea of more regional tournaments

Michele: A recurrent theme seems to be more structure and transparency

Rebecca: The different ideas from the submitted ideas were sorted into categories; main themes: unification of policies, help NGBs with developments, More international tournament, facilitate communication between NGBs, guidelines for NGBs joining Quidditch Europe, more independence from IQA.

Thus, goals to look at are: development, international gameplay and european-wide policies

Elisabeth: European-wide policies would have to be very general to cover all NGBs

Rebecca: This would affect gameplay more rather than NGB-policies

Laurens: Translation within Quidditch Europe would be much needed, since not everyone can properly understand English (a translation taskforce or similar)

Elisabeth: Not all languages should be translated, only necessary ones

Felix: Have translation as a voluntary position in NGBs so the European Committee does not have to adopt “Official Languages”, which would lead to even more work for the committee

Rebecca: Are there any “bigger picture” points referring to a “vision” for Quidditch Europe?

[Paraphrasing possible goals]: development, international gameplay and european-wide policies, leading into possible ranking and translation, being more independent from IQA

Alper: Help strengthen communities by different means as an official task of Quidditch Europe

Rebecca: Does everybody agree on the points that gameplay should be unified by the introduction of broad policies, creation of opportunities for cross border play possibly with rankings, helping development and assistance in starting NGBs and translation to all in all maintain the community of quidditch players within Europe

Rebecca: moves to vote on a mission for Quidditch Europe

Alper: Seconded

Unanimous vote in favour of adopting the mission for Quidditch Europe

Organisational structure & financial

Increasing the efficiency of the European Committee

Rebecca: Are there any ideas on how the organisational structure could be made more efficient?

Michele: Would personally like to do fewer things, but there is nobody else to do the job right now

Alper: There should be representatives other than heads of NGBs allowed on the committee

Rebecca: Is it then necessary to be an NGB representative?

Alper: They should be on NGB boards

Rebecca: is this the purpose of the European Committee [to be a board of NGB representatives rather than a “governing body”]?

Jean: Maybe the representatives from the NGBs can be specifically appointed by their respective NGBs?

Michele: On a similar note, representatives should not necessarily need to be on the board but appointed by the NGB

Elisabeth: Agrees with Michele, there should be the possibility to appoint people and then have representatives refer to the NGBs for approval

Laurens: Agrees, it is the job of representatives to update their respective NGBs

Nina: Agrees with Elisabeth, representatives in the committee should be on the boards, especially when it concerns meaningful decisions (hiring other members is fine, but decisions should be taken by board members)

Elisabeth: The current working system of the IQA should not be adopted point for point but a similarly organised working system would be preferable

Rebecca: There should be a two-point system split up between a committee running day-to-day affairs and a presidential board to make important decisions (possibly with representatives from the presidential board to the

regular committee to have a proper flow of information)

Marc: Can see this working in a few years time, but right now the European Committee is on shaky ground as it is and this would add yet another tier of responsibility

Rebecca: Hiring people would make things much easier since NGB-representatives have too much to do and a split system could facilitate this and actually stabilise European quidditch

Michele: Clarification from Marc about his point?

Marc: The presidents cannot do everything, a short-term solution could be to appoint others to the existing committee

Rebecca: The reason to have outside members to the respective committees would be mainly because they would not be burdened by the extra work related to the running the NGBs

Elisabeth: Since it is already quite late, a discussion at a later date would be much appreciated

Felix: We can create a document containing the proposals for the organisational structure and post them on Facebook to be discussed at the earliest point during the next meeting

Felix: Motion to table the discussion on this issue and to discuss it at a later time

Alper: Seconded

Michele: Motion to adjourn the meeting

Marc: Seconded

End of Meeting 00:17 CET (07/05)

Appendix

1. European Games update 06/05/2015 [document introduced by Michele Clabassi]

Staff

- TD: Karen Kumaki (USA, not a player or coach), Sandra Kreit (France, not a player or coach)
- ATD: Morena Lanzo (Italy, not a player or coach)
- Gameplay: Michele Clabassi (Italy, probably a player)
- Referees: Alper Erisen (Turkey, player?)
- Snitches: Alper Erisen (Turkey, player?)
- Volunteer: Rebecca Alley (Canada, not a player or coach)
- L'Ombrico:
 - Websites & Socials
 - Hospitality
 - Logistics
 - etc.
 - *will need supervision on a number of things → TD + ATD*

Notes:

- *From my experience and what I heard from others Sandra is not the best pick for TD gameplay-wise, while she could be for logistics and hospitality, based on her work @ Violette: in this case, though, she does not live in the same country and we need someone with a better grasp of gameplay, as we have a bigger than usual non-quidditch workforce.*

tl;dr: I think Karen will be the choice over Sandra for TD, but Sandra can probably cover some other position, maybe Hospitality to provide a quidditch point of view together with the TD and ATD, or something else

Fields

I have played on the football field on May 2nd: about 64mx90m (the length would be 100m but I doubt we can remove the goals). It's not big enough to host 2 regulation fields but in the absolute worst case we can have 2 pitches on it by cutting down the player zone length from 77 to 64m, that is 6.5 less metres (about 21ft) on each side. The field has roofed bleachers for - I am guessing - between 250 and 350 spectators at the level of the midfield line, and adjacent locker rooms. There is a back door to the field leading to the rest of the sporting complex including the dirt field, so teams could warm up outside the pitch before the game.

The other location for fields (Piano di Mengole) will see works to level the ground start in these days. It's very conveniently located, surrounded by the camping site on the West side, city centre on the North side, and the football field on the South. The area of Piano di Mengole we surely have available (we may be allowed to use an extra part at the wider end that is property of the nearby supermarket) is about 44m wide in its most narrow point, about 60m at its widest point, and 140something m long. There is a good chance we can get bleachers at Piano di Mengole: I think these would fit well on the wider half of the park, while we can use chairs on the tightest (so

one field would have better seats); should it be allowed to put the bleachers on the street, life would be even easier.

In the worst-but-not-the-worstest case we could have one field at Piano di Mengole, the other at the football field. The walking distance from the park to the field's athletes entrance is something like 450m (5 minutes at average walking speed), with the option to have vans/shuttle buses carry volunteers and players.

It is not ideal given the multiple roles our volunteers usually have, and that they may need to move between the two fields a lot, but it's not new for most sports tournament to have multiple locations, usually definitely further away from each other. Not ideal, but a decent enough fallback plan.

An ambulance will be stationed near the fields, and a tarp tent will be available should people who seek medical attention need it.

(Note: Harrison requested a tent, though at events in Italy medics tend to use ambulances as shelter for people they are treating, and take them to ER if they need more than that; the tent will probably only be used in case players/anyone need some shade but are not doing bad enough that they need to stay in the ambulance)

Accommodations

I have slept in a bungalow at the camping park (4 * camping by the way), and it's the most comfortable bungalow I have slept in. I don't know if bungalows are available for July, but people choosing to camp there get a big discount on high level camping. There are 3 thermal pools (?), a couple bars and restaurants, and WIFI over most of the camping.

I have not seen the hotel, but it should be perfect for teams who have a means of transportation (e.g. Netherlands). Even for others it's at about 20 minutes walking distance North of the city centre, and other options to get a ride to the field or city centre will be available.

If you want to get a hold of one of these cheaper options, it's a good idea to give an indicative number to L'Ombrico by the end of the week. They also need it to book more sleeping options at a bargain price should we need them.

Foods and drinks

I have now tried a couple bars and restaurants nearby and they are all reasonably cheap and good. For example, home made pasta with a drink for 12€ at lunch, 4/5€ for a beer with aperitivo (complimentary snacks with your drink) at the local Irish pub, etc. They are also working on a communal dinner, as you should know, which based on similar experiences around Italy in the past should be great.

Cheaper options are available, and the supermarket is immediately North of Piano di Mengole (the road bordering the park on the North side has an entrance to the supermarket's parking).

For those wanting to take part in the communal dinner, as per the email sent by L'Ombrico, they need an indicative number of participants for your team & staff & friends by the end of the week.

Schedule considerations

- Given the small size of Sarteano and ease of access to the fields, together with the summer weather, it would be good to start reasonably early (arrival to fields at 8am on day 1, 9am on day 2 sounds good).
- I would recommend a long break at lunch time - siesta like, from 1pm to 3pm or so - to avoid to heat peak.
- We can play until quite late, especially considering we can have evening games on the football field, where lighting is available, which also would be a good way to avoid the worst time of the day heat-wise. Sunset is also around 8pm, making it even easier to play on any of the fields until dinner time.
- Having a few (2-3) games after dinner on day 1 is an option I would consider if necessary, keeping in mind it cuts into the social. It's still feasible considering showers are available in the locker rooms, and most teams will take 5 to 10 minutes to go back to their accomodation.

Deadlines

- By May 10th please let L'Ombrico know indicatively how many people you will bring:
 - athletes
 - coaches / team staff
 - other

This is necessary for a series of things, but one of the most important: event insurance!

- Interviews for the staff should have all happened by May 12th, hopefully people will be hired by the end of next week
- Once hired, the staff should meet and start looking for volunteers by May 20th (?)
- By the end of May the staff should have considered and set any policy, deadline & similar necessary

2. Vision for future [of the European Committee; document introduced by Rebecca Alley]

- **More transparency:** Have a person in charge of making sure the community is informed of minutes and policies, including regular updates of social media, making sure people know who their national representatives are and who they can contact for information.
 - **Setting standards/ methods for organising EQC and EG:** Have a format for hiring committees, deciding bids, setting opening and closing dates. So each year, nothing has to be re-decided, people in Quidditch Europe can just follow the agreed timeline of methods.
 - **More support for new nations:** Provide information for the first teams in a nation, give them advice on what to aim for, follow up with their development and make them aware of Quidditch Europe.
-
- **EG/EQC:** remain somehow involved in the running of these events; mostly in hiring of event staff (although this may be shared with the IQA) and creation of policies that will directly impact NGB's, such as mercing or rosters.
 - **Two options for future:** Option number 1 is to stay as we are, an arena for the NGB's to communicate, and involved in some things relating to the major tournaments. Option number 2 is to expand to fill the role the IQA should be taking up in Europe, and start to work towards expansion, helping NGB's where necessary and possible, as well as maintaining the annual or biannual events. If we use option 2, allow people other than presidents/vice presidents to sit on the committee to represent each NGB.
-
- QE will become **respected** and **trusted** in Europe
 - **Roles of QE:** Organising major tournaments; help smaller NGB's develop/build leagues; set tournament and gameplay standards; provide platform for teams and NGB's to communicate and develop community
-
- **Within 2 years:** Have a small regular staff including the executive director, secretary, IT/comms team; EQC/EG announced about a year in advance; policies and guidelines in place for international play
 - **Within 5 years:** Be a committee on their own standing, have discussed w IQA how global quidditch scene fits; all new NGB's must attain minimum development standard before

achieving full standing as member of QE; EQC limited to truly elite teams with a second competition in place for teams who didn't qualify; more official international events in place (i.e. 6 nations, Scandanavian Cup, Balkans Cup, etc).

- **Roles of QE:** organise more international play, help with development and creation of resources for NGB's; system functions somewhat like USQ and its regions : overarching support with unified rules and gameplay policies, facilitation of interregional play, and development help for newer regions/resources for more developed regions. (where regions are NGB's)

- To achieve this the **structure would be different**; members of the QE Committee would be elected/appointed to represent their NGB based on some sort of proportional representation; current QE could be kept as a separate body to maintain communication and help between heads of NGB's. This way we don't put more burdens on already busy people.

- **Independance from IQA**

- **More policies/regulations:** Policies for level of development of NGB's before becoming members, more international official play and rankings; set procedure for tournament organisation and more organisation so there is more time to get it done; job descriptions are set so there aren't fights over what decisions belong to which group (*cough EQC cough*)

- **2 years:** Still IQA subcommittee to allow for developing nations; more presence in teh community, more transparency, allow for people other than presidents in meetings to increase attendance

- **5 years:** Separate from the IQA; official international play; some sort of continent wide league throughout the regular season; standards for international competition

- **Roles of QE:** Maintain ranking system, create continent wide policies, more official international tournaments leading up to EQC

- **Still part of IQA**

European Quidditch Congress Meeting

Date: 13th of May 2015

Location: Skype voice

Meeting time: 21:00 GMT

In attendance: Rebecca Alley (Exec. Manager), Felix Linsmeier (Secretary), Mel Piper (UK), Michele Clabassi (Italy), Lukas Linser (Austria), Marc Garganté (Catalonia), Nina Heise (Germany), Laurens Grinwis Plaat Stultjes (Belgium), Elisabeth Ingeborg Jørstad (Norway), Jagoda Sadecka (Poland), Yeray Espinosa (Spain)

Chair: Rebecca Alley

Secretary: Felix Linsmeier

Agenda

1. Introduction
2. Roll Call
3. Organisational Changes
 - a. Different possibilities for making the committee more efficient
 - b. Requirements for the future running of the European Committee

Introduction

Roll Call

Rebecca Alley (Exec. Manager)
Felix Linsmeier (Secretary)
Mel Piper (United Kingdom)
Michele Clabassi (Italy)
Lukas Linser (Austria)
Marc Garganté (Catalonia)
Nina Heise (Germany)
Laurens Grinwis Plaat Stultjes (Belgium)
Elisabeth Ingeborg Jørstad (Norway)
Jagoda Sadecka (Poland)
Yeray Espinosa (Spain)

Organisational Changes

Rebecca: Is there anyone who would like to give feedback on the options given in the document [Organisational changes: Appendix]

Michele: Likes option 5 the most, and having a very wide and flexible approach

Marc: Option 4 would be a good approach for the future, but currently, things are not running smoothly enough to apply this (The other options are good in general, and flexible, especially option 5 with application of 2 or 3 if wanted)

Mel [in agreement]: for the future, option 5 would be desirable

Elisabeth: 5 is good (also combined with option 2), only the presidents are not enough and 3 is not applicable very well

Rebecca: Could we move to a vote on this issue?

Rebecca: Motion to move on a vote to implement the structure of an executive committee to run the day-to-day issues of the European Committee

Elisabeth: Second

Vote: Unanimously in favour

Rebecca: Proposes to have a vote on option 2 and 3 to find out which representatives can be chosen

Rebecca: Motion to implement option 3 including that any appointed representative can represent said NGB on the European Committee

Felix: Second

Vote: Unanimously against

Rebecca: Motion to implement option 2 stating that any board member can represent the NGB (a maximum of 2 per country and 1 at every meeting)

Laurens: Second

Vote: Unanimously in favour

Rebecca: How is the structure going to be determined? Possibly a sub-committee to work out the details would be good

Marc: Would this sub-committee consist of European Committee members?

Rebecca: Yes, about three or four

Elisabeth: A Sub-Committee would be good, but it is not clear whether people will actually have the time

Rebecca: True, this would need to be dealt with

Michele: Could the sub-committees be extended to board members of the NGBs, since we are opening it to them?

Rebecca: They may not have the knowledge (currently) to jump right into this

Felix: True, this might also be a democratic problem (have people appoint themselves?)

Michele [clarifying]: This would not mean that we should do this for every sub-committee, but some of them might benefit

Laurens: About the amount of reps: Is it like in IQA (based on amount of teams in the country)?

Elisabeth [clarifying]: In the European Committee, every NGB has 2 reps per country of which one can attend each meeting (not like in IQA)

Rebecca: It would be simplest to keep the current system of reps

Marc: So far we have been having 1 rep, do the NGBs which have more representation in the IQA want more representation on the European Committee?

Rebecca: Going back to the original discussion: Should we have a sub-committee of current members or should a draft be created to present to the committee (or sub-committee)

Elisabeth: If two or more people are willing to take part in such a sub-committee we could do that, otherwise the draft option would be best

Rebecca: Is there anyone willing to sit in such a sub-committee

Laurens: Would not mind

Rebecca: We could make a quasi-subcommittee consisting of Rebecca, Felix and Laurens to create a draft

Elisabeth: Suggests to ask the Facebook group whether they want to take part, otherwise agrees

Rebecca: Are the "larger" NGBs comfortable with having equal representation on the European Committee

Mel: Equal distribution is more fair, thus everyone should have the same amount of representation

Felix: We need an organisational structure to register a bank account to manage our funds and have a treasurer to do that;

Elisabeth: Are we even allowed to do this under the rule of the IQA?

Felix: Valid point

Michele: This would need to be cleared with IQA, having the bank account on a particular person would not work (talk to financial director)

Rebecca: Can possibly speak to the financial director in person

Laurens: The European Committee organises EQC but the IQA organises EG, does this affect budgetary issues (should the money not go to the European Committee)

Elisabeth: EQC was organised before the new IQA was set up (but is now developed enough), and IQA might be responsible for next EQC

Michele: The other reason EQC was managed by the European Committee is the non-involvement of reps from the IQA. Money raised by EG should go back to Europe (this needs to be figured out). Since the IQA is likely to be set up in the UK; can organisations in the UK have more bank accounts (have the European Committee manage one sub-account)

Rebecca: There might be issues with currency conversion, Euro might be easier

Elisabeth: The IQA operates in euros but plans on operating in the UK, which is strange. Is in favour of having a bank account, but this should go through the IQA.

Felix: We would still need to have a treasurer

Rebecca: These issues can possibly be sorted out by talking to the financial director: a treasurer should be hired anyway

Felix: Agreed [several others agree]

Rebecca: Is there anything else to be discussed? [no responses]

Rebecca: **Motion to adjourn this meeting**

Felix: **Second**

End of Meeting 23:07 CET

Appendix

Organisational changes [proposed by Rebecca Alley]

Options for changes in organizational structure:

1: Nothing changes (only presidents/VP's/international directors)

Pro's: hella easy, everyone has an intimate knowledge of the NGB's (which is useful but much less relevant with the new purpose of Quidditch Europe)

Con's: nobody has time, it is unlikely that things will be accomplished, everyone is already doing a million and one things, we are all mostly in agreement that the change needs to start somewhere and this doesn't allow for that.

2: Maintain the same structure but officially allow other board members to represent the NGB

Pro's: still pretty easy, doesn't require major changes, people still have pretty great knowledge of the NGB's (but again, it's not super relevant given the new mission)

Con's: Other board members may still be far too busy, it is a minimal change and again isn't really leading to a shift in power/things that will be useful down the road.

3: Maintain the same structure but allow any appointed representative to represent the NGB

Pro's: Allows representatives that have time to be part of the board and getting things done, involves more people in quidditch governance

Con's: People may have less prior knowledge of quidditch or how to get things done, introduces an extra step for this person to report back to their NGB, there may not be people to fill this role in newer NGB's,

4: Introduce a new double-bodied structure with a Presidential Board and a representative Committee of appointees (appointed by NGB's), where the committee is responsible for day-to-day running of programs and the presidents are responsible for large decisions/decisions that require intimate knowledge of NGB's

Pro's: Allows people with time and energy to do the day-to-day projects of Quidditch Europe, retains presidents for decisions in which knowledge of NGB's becomes relevant, starts to shift power away from the same very small group of people, is a significant change and trying something new.

Con's: Requires a lot more people and adds an extra level of government so communication may be a challenge, is a significant change and is trying something new.

5: Maintain the current committee structure (introducing change #2 or #3 if we want), but hire people to do the day-to-day running of things (basically introduce departments working under the current committee)

***NOTE: this was not discussed at the meeting, but after some thinking, I think this could be a very good compromise as it allows the current committee to retain most of their power but creates a structure within which we can get people who have time to start formalizing work towards our purposes.*

Pro's: Presidents/board members could move into a more administrative role and only make major decisions, leaving day-to-day running to various departments; people could be hired for specific roles that they are interested in; employees could be hired from anywhere so

there isn't a necessity for smaller NGB's to find more interested people; this wouldn't require extensive organizational changes and everyone could still be involved at a continental level. *Con's*: Would require supervision (probably executive director at first, until we have enough people/enough to do to introduce managerial positions), the staff would be spread thin at first.

This structure needs to be decided upon before we become an official organisation and therefore before we have a bank account, which needs to happen sooner rather than later. Please read these options and come to the next meeting prepared to discuss which of these you like best (or if you think of changes that would improve these, etc), so we can begin moving forward on taking actual action.

1. Attendance
2. European Games
3. Treasurer
4. Structure
5. Logo

European Quidditch Congress Meeting

Date: 14th of June 2015

Location: Skype voice

Meeting time: 21:00 CET

In attendance: Nick van Klaveren, Nina Heise, Zoe Ford, Jagoda Sadecka, Yeray Espinosa Cuevas, Cécile Mermet, Alper Erişen, Kai Haugen Shaw, Lukas Linser

Chair: Rebecca Alley

Secretary: Felix Linsmeier

Agenda

1. Introduction
2. Roll Call
3. EG Update
4. EQC 2016 Bidding
5. Update on Organisational Structure of the European Committee
6. Rulebook 9

Introduction

Roll Call

Nick van Klaveren - Netherlands

Nina Heise - Germany

Zoe Ford - UK

Jagoda Sadecka - Poland

Yeray Espinosa Cuevas - Spain

Cécile Mermet - France

Alper Erişen - Turkey

Kai Haugen Shaw - Norway

Lukas Linser - Austria

Laurens Grinwis Plaat Stultjes - Belgium

Marc Garganté - Catalonia

European Games

Rebecca: Michele is not here, but a general update is possible. The equipment is coming along and accommodation for volunteers is currently being worked at. Does Alper have something to add

Alper: Not right now

Rebecca [to all representatives]: Please encourage volunteers for EG

Kai: Is there any information on gameplay structure?

Rebecca: Two pools of 6 teams, depending on less or more teams there will be less or more games; on day 2 there will be single elimination. Both days will have a pause during the hottest time of the day to prevent heat exhaustion and seeding has

not been discussed yet. Gameplay policies have been gone over and they are almost identical to last EQC's policies (which can then be accessed in the team-only section on the website, which has not been sorted out yet). Each team is guaranteed a game on day 2 because of the end of pool play on day 2, each team can play a maximum of 8 games. The Sarteano website has a great deal of information on everything that is happening.

Laurens: How many pitches will there be?

Rebecca: There will be 2 pitches, a few hundred metres apart. The athletes village has not been figured out yet, it will be there though

Kai: How is the situation with volunteers and snitches

Alper: So far about 20 people applied (3 of them snitches). Currently we are lacking head referees and currently 4-5 non-playing referees.

Rebecca: The more volunteers sign up, the shorter the shifts will be, so volunteering is encouraged and much appreciated

Laurens: It is going to be very hot; will there be water supply available

Rebecca: Water is needed, but most probably will be available on site. This will be made known as soon as possible.

Bidding for EQC 2016

Rebecca: Luke is happy to organise this and can begin work after his exams are over; this needs to be happen in order for there not to be last minute organisation. Are there any objections to Luke starting this?

[General approval]

Update on Organisational Structure of the European Committee

Rebecca: A general outline of a possible structure has been made, but the IQA should be consulted first to sort out responsibilities for the IQA and also the subcommittee. We will talk to IQA reps to figure this out but will also try to continue work on our own if needed.

Kai: QE asked to become an IQA group, so they might not have that much of an idea about what we should do, but it would still be a good idea to talk to them.

Zoe: QE was primarily created to work on the past EQC and to pressure the old IQA to form the new IQA, QE is currently not strictly speaking affiliated with IQA

Rebecca: I will speak with the IQA and sort out positions and responsibilities to hear more about this during the next meeting

Laurens: I and probably the other IQA reps got an email from the IQA about the budget

Rebecca: This email was sent to heads of the NGBs, but we'll talk about this in an additional point [Motion to create a separate Agenda point]

Felix: Second

Rulebook 9

Zoe: QUK are keen on having an international standard (it is currently also checked by QUK) but it would be better to have an IQA on an international level. Would there be interest in petition for getting an IQA rulebook committee started

Rebecca: This is also one of the points in the ideas for a new organisational structure; this could be pushed for by a unified QE because Europe has much power within the IQA

Kai: Long term better to have an IQA rulebook and not USQ, could be a goal for rulebook 10.

Zoe: There is currently an IQA Rulebook Committee with fixed representatives, but it has not met yet due to organisational reasons

Marc: By what I spoke with Brian I understood that from now on IQA will pick up on creating rulebooks, hopefully a new one every 2 years

Kai: It would be a good topic to talk about a rulebook for all of Europe in general.

Maybe Rulebook 9 could be the standard with possible deviations as we go along.

Marc: If I understood it correctly, QE will wait for QUK to go over RB9 and then discuss what to do then; final decisions need to be made then by QE

IQA Budget

Zoe: We were emailed by the CFO of IQA with a breakdown of the money from each country and the future spending. The current problem is that the IQA uses a personal bank account which is less than ideal.

Felix: We already discussed this in a previous meeting, we are aware of this problem.

Rebecca: Furthermore, it is illegal for associations in Turkey and Italy to pay money to personal bank accounts (they could even get shut down)

Nina: There's also the issue of development countries. DQB is currently listed with 75€ but it wasn't agreed by the congress. Should IQA be contacted about these problems and what should be done about this?

Laurens: Even Harrison does not know about the list of countries, there are a lot of confusion about all of this

Marc: Catalonia is currently in a state of limbo since no meeting of the IQA has happened since Catalonia was accepted

Zoe: Was it communicated to the IQA that many countries will not pay their dues to a personal bank account

Rebecca: The Financial Director has been contacted but they did not get back; the best course of action would be a letter from QE countries together to IQA

Alper: [Motion to draft a letter signed by the European NGBs directed at the IQA]

Kai: Seconded

Rebecca: Is there anyone who would like to take responsibility for this?

Marc: Can do this

Rebecca: Can this be done by the end of the week for the heads of the NGBs to acknowledge and sign?

Marc: Yes

Rebecca: Please also message Marc with any mistakes or clarifications in order for him to have a clear picture

Marc: This letter would state that QE countries will not pay into a personal bank account complete with any other information that the heads of NGBs send in.

Felix: Motion to adjourn this meeting

Rebecca: Second. The next meeting will be in 3 weeks time

End of meeting: 22:00

European Quidditch Congress Meeting

Date: 5th of July 2015

Location: Skype voice

Meeting time: 21:00 CET

In attendance: Jerona van der Gevel, Mel Piper, Michele Clabassi, Alper Erişen (part of the meeting), Yeray Espinosa Cuevas, Elisabeth Ingeberg Jørstad, Laurens Grinwis Plaat Stultjes, Cécile Mermet, Nina Heise (part of the meeting)

Chair: Rebecca Alley

Secretary: Felix Linsmeier

Agenda

1. Introduction
2. Roll Call
3. Update on the IQA Situation
4. EG Update
5. EQC 2016 Update
6. Global Games Bids

Introduction

Roll Call

Jerona van der Gevel - Netherlands

Mel Piper - United Kingdom

Michele Clabassi - Italy

Alper Erişen - Turkey

Yeray Espinosa Cuevas - Spain

Elisabeth Ingeberg Jørstad - Norway

Laurens Grinwis Plaat Stultjes - Belgium

Cécile Mermet - France

Update on the IQA Situation

Rebecca: A meeting with Harrison from the IQA was set up, but did not show up and is not replying; if anybody has ways to get in contact or what to do please step forward.

Michele: Did you try to get in touch with the Financial Director

Rebecca: Yes but she can't give too much information and is only really concerned with what IQA tells her, Details concerning Quidditch in general come from Harrison & others.

Rebecca: I will also try to get in touch with Brian (President of the Congress), we can probably get in touch with him reliably.

Jerona: Where are we on the Money Situation (and sending money to IQA)? I got an email with the spreadsheet on how much to pay; later there were clarifications as to the sum and a request to pay on paypal.

Elisabeth: This was brought up at an IQA meeting and there was the excuse given, that in order to set up a joint bank account, there would have to be signatures from everyone. Also then, it was given as an option to pay on paypal.

Michele: Was this also meant for countries that are by law forbidden to private accounts?

Elisabeth: It seems to be a workaround.

Felix: This seems to be a legal workaround but the issue would still be the same.

Michele: This would be strange because Italy also is not officially recognised and would pay not as an association.

Mel: It is not illegal, but all the executives from the UK have an ethical problem with it.

Jerona: Whatever we do, it should be done together to get the strongest position.

Rebecca: Is there any country that has already paid? [no answer]. How do people want to proceed (do we still send the letter that was agreed on and drafted)?

Michele: The letter should be sent, but following individual messages by the NGBs to not appear to group together too much.

Rebecca: It is our responsibility to point out problems, so problems that might arise should be addressed properly.

Mel [agrees]: This should be written in such a way that does not sound like complaining but rather in a constructive way.

Rebecca: If the European Committee stands together, they can have a very strong voice in the IQA. The letter as is is pretty well written and could be sent soon when everyone has signed (how should this be done logistically?) Typing the signatures could be enough? [general agreement by the members]. Does anyone know who this letter should be sent to?

Michele: Does this need to be sent to the entire congress or just Brian and Harrison?

Rebecca: Depends on the intended impact (should other countries been involved by sending it)?

Michele: This could also serve to get the decision away from individuals.

Rebecca: Michele, do you want to take responsibility for this?

Michele: Okay. Do we want to go over it again or rephrase?

Rebecca: Please all have a look at it and send Michele a confirmation in order for him to be able to send it to the congress (Deadline to confirm on Monday July 6th)

EG Update

Michele: The group selection has been done (albeit a bit in a rush). If there is anything that should be discussed, please let us know. You should all have received E-Mails about payable fees (15€ per player) with a deadline in 2 weeks (or in difficult cases before the tournament). If any team or NGB wants to buy the hoops that have been bought, please let us know.

We still need snitches, if you know anyone who is able to participate, please give them a heads up [Alper agrees].

Alper: They would have time to rest, so this would not be an issue for players who can also snitch.

Rebecca: There is still leftover Merchandise (currently at Luke's house); this could be sent to EG with the rest of the things.

Alper: We have asked teams to supply goal refs, but it would be good to have more people as time/score keepers.

Rebecca: In terms of inventory we have several hats, shirts, hoodies, patches, stickers etc. We would like to at least recoup the costs.

Michele: We can tell non-playing volunteers that they may be eligible for free housing, since there haven't been many signups so far.

Regarding the dinners, please send information if you have not done so yet to be confirmed. We may be able to get the two fields at one location, but this is currently still being worked on.

Rebecca: Group 2 will be playing on Pitch 1 and group 1 on pitch 2; this is due to varying experience of the pitch masters.

Michele: If the NGBs haven't send their information regarding transport, please do so in order for this to be sorted out.

Elisabeth: Will shuttle busses etc. be guaranteed or should people find their own transport.

Michele: In general, if details have been given in advance, they will have a spot on the bus. I will also ask for confirmation regarding to differing times of different people.

Rebecca: Usually they have people wait for people arriving later, but this should be no problem. Michele, are non-playing volunteers included in this?

Michele: Yes, players and volunteers are prioritised; there may be some spots for people just travelling with teams but probably not many.

EQC 2016 Update

Rebecca: I have spoken with Luke Twist who has started to work on a bid package. He is also waiting for things from Harrison but is generally doing it on his own. We don't currently have more of an update, unfortunately.

[Alper leaves the meeting]

Global Games bids

Rebecca: We are confident that next GG are going to be in Europe, since there will probably be a bid from Brussels, should there be support for this from the other NGBs or several European bids?

Jerona: For the reason that it is such a big event, we do not think we can handle it. Is there a deadline on bids for GG?

Rebecca: I don't know, but it will probably be sooner rather than later. Even if you think you wouldn't be able to handle it yourself, try to approach cities etc.

Laurens: I think the deadline will be between September and November (as decided by IQA)

Mel: Is it worth gaiging interest in the NGBs?

Rebecca: Yes.

[Nina joins the meeting]

Rebecca: No remarks here, are there any additions by anyone? [no reply]

Motion to adjourn the meeting.

Felix: Second.

End of meeting: 22:11

European Quidditch Congress Meeting

Date: 2nd of August 2015

Location: Skype voice

Meeting time: 21:00 CET

In attendance: Mel Piper, Jonas Zinn, Elisabeth Ingeberg Jørstad, Alper Erisen, Laurens Grinwis Plaat Stultjes, Yeray Espinosa, Michele Clabassi,

Chair: Rebecca Alley

Secretary: Felix Linsmeier

Agenda

- 1. Introduction**
- 2. Roll Call**
- 3. European Games Followup**
- 4. Gameplay policies** (focus on injury-related issues)
- 5. Rulebook: Discussion about regulations and standards to be used in the upcoming season**
- 6. Open discussion: European incorporation & European stance towards the IQA (?)**

Introduction

Roll Call

Mel Piper - UK

Jonas Zinn - Germany

Elisabeth Ingeberg Jørstad - Norway

Alper Erisen - Turkey

Laurens Grinwis Plaat Stultjes - Belgium

Yeray Espinosa - Spain

Michele Clabassi - Italy

European Games Followup

Rebecca: Are there any comments on EG?

Elisabeth: Is the feedback form for NGBs only or everybody?

Rebecca: It will be sent out to everyone.

Elisabeth: It went great overall, although actual Quidditch people need to be involved at an earlier date in order to make expectations clear.

Rebecca: Are there any other comments or ideas especially regarding third party support?

Jonas: Many Germans thought that there were too many injuries especially regarding the actual number of people needing to go to the hospital.

Laurens: It probably isn't a major deal since the stakes at EG are also very high. On the other hand there were many people saying that some people were unnecessarily brought to the hospital.

Michele: Many people were brought to hospital due to procedure the ER teams need to follow.

Rebecca: At EG there very athletic teams as well as teams of people who were available; several injuries could be attributed to this

Elisabeth: In general, better safe than sorry is the best course of action, so in general, the judgement of the ER should be the last word. Also many injuries may be able to be attributed to the heat. In general, we should not jump to conclusions.

Rebecca: [gives a list of known injuries at EG]

Alper & Elisabeth: suggest the collecting of data about injuries

Jonas: This would be a very important step

Rebecca: Would it be okay, if we sent out surveys to team captains?

Laurens: In the Netherlands, the red cross actually collects this data for us, it is not used very much up until today though.

Rebecca & Mel: This could give us the opportunity to collect data from the whole of Europe.

Rebecca: Could we get the form used in the UK?

Mel: Yes, I will get back to you on that

Yeray: It would be good to delay the midday games to the afternoon

Rebecca: We had the day set up like that because of volunteers and referees who had not had a break

Alper: Did all the matches get recorded?

Rebecca: Not officially

Michele: We have not found out yet

Elisabeth: Was someone in charge of this?

Michele: Not really

Elisabeth: It would be really good if this could be cleared up beforehand in the future

Rebecca: We only found out a few days before that there wouldn't be a livestream. In general, if you want guaranteed video, you have to sort yourself out.

Michele: On requirements towards third parties, we had a contract of sorts, but the people weren't able to make it happen.

In the bid package, there should also be a list of positions included that needs to be clear so the venues know explicitly who is responsible for what and what is needed.

Laurens: Belgium struggles with accommodation; in general, this should be sorted out before the bid.

Michele: This was made clear at EG though.

Rebecca: In future bid packages, accommodation should have a bigger focus (also transportation to and from there)

Felix: So in general, establish clear expectations towards partners

Laurens: There were also miscommunications on the price as tax on the price for accommodation was added later.

Gameplay: injuries

Felix: There were injuries reported that went unnoticed by people and they played anyway.

Elisabeth: Is the prevention from playing only for concussions or injuries in general?

Rebecca: In general. The policies were there, but weren't enforced because it should also be the responsibility of players and coaches.

Jonas: There should be a written diagnosis to be signed by medics to prevent injured people from just coming back to pitch.

Rebecca: In general yes, but there are issues with private information being passed around (written diagnosis)

Felix: Could it be a form stating the ability to play?

Rebecca: Yes, this could work

Jonas: There should be a list of injuries that lead to people not being able to play

Alper: Maybe there could be a volunteer in charge of that?

Rebecca: There are severe concerns for privacy with this

Felix: But this would not mean personal information being handed out would it?

Rebecca: Yes, but in general, this would need to be brought to the Gameplay Director, so it would be more feasible to just cut the middleman

Felix: So what can we actually do?

Rebecca: Legally, we could get medics fill out a form in the case of people not being able to play.

Felix: Should this be negative or positive?

Rebecca: Negative, because positive would open up the medics for liability.

Felix: Is there a way of educating people?

Rebecca: On the one hand yes, but ultimately it is people's own responsibility.

Michele: It would be good to make coaches aware of the fact that they are responsible for their players.

Rebecca: Coaches are responsible for a maximum of 21 players, gameplay directors of hundreds, so it comes down to people's responsibility

Michele: Responsibility is also teaching people to not exhaust themselves.

Felix: Why have policies though, if they aren't enforced?

Rebecca: We have control over immediate injuries, but people are responsible for their own well-being (playing on old injuries etc.)

Rulebook

Rebecca: Last time we were talking about a rulebook we decided to wait for the UK for a decision on rulebooks

Elisabeth: The UK will pretty much use RB9 with a few exceptions. The other thing is a possible IQA rulebook, which is currently being worked on

Rebecca: Nobody actually knows anything about the IQA rules committee. The Rulebook was promised but there hasn't actually been anything concrete. Does anyone have any comments?

Elisabeth: Eva from Australia is in charge of this; it apparently does not seem like it will be taking too long, we could ask for an update.

Rebecca: The question is whether this could actually be put out and tested before the next season. Should this be found out and then brought to the NGBs or not? An IQA rulebook would be good because it would set an international standard but if we don't have time to train refs etc., it will be useless for next season.

Elisabeth: This shouldn't be decided before getting more information on that.

Rebecca: Can you enquire about this?

Elisabeth: Will do

Stance on the IQA

Rebecca: We had a meeting with Brian who's with the IQA and he seems reasonable as a partner; as things are the European Committee is a sub-part of the IQA - what this means is debatable, since there are conflicting documents. The problem at the moment is the structure of the IQA (with executive director on top). This structure needs to be changed in order to make it more democratic and also having everyone accountable to each other.

Elisabeth: Have you also heard from Brian that he would like to change this?

Rebecca: Yes, at the moment there is the problem that US doesn't want to change this and there are also voices in Europe, also there are neutral people who actually don't know what this means. The problem is, that anything that has to do with European responsibilities is dependent on this structure (since Europe can easily implement these things with their vote). In general, people need to go to the congress to reach quorum.

Elisabeth: Has the constitution been voted on and approved of?

Rebecca: No it is subject to change and not finished yet; it should be established that the board of trustees is not hired by the executive director.

Elisabeth: It was suggested that with each trustee there should be a voting process with the members of congress.

Michele: There was a meeting about the fees but also this issue about trustees came up.

Rebecca: We also talked about bank issues; Brian is as confused as we are. QE is unlikely to have their own bank account, but this could be looked into on a special case basis. What needs to be figured out is power structure, so quorum must be reached. People need to be

made aware of these issues; also the executive director needs to be made accountable and as soon as this is figured out things should be able to run more smoothly.

Are there any questions?

Felix: The only issue is that Brian was very clear on QE not having a corporate identity and a bank account; this could be an issue regarding European-organised events etc.; also e.g. EU funding would have to go through us.

Jonas: Agreed, we should have our own budget etc.

Rebecca: This is very irregular at the moment because QE is only a sub-committee; this could be easily sorted out within the congress because Europe has a majority and can be voted on by the congress. For this to happen, the IQA structure needs to be resolved though!

Rebecca: Also IQA should hire an external secretary (as per suggestion by Brian)

Michele: On a different note, my mandate in QE is ending soon, so a new chair needs to be found, please make yourself heard.

Felix: When is your mandate ending?

Michele: At the end of this month/when a new Italian president is elected, so please

Elisabeth: I am also leaving the country and will not represent Norway in a larger position

Rebecca: [Motion to Adjourn the meeting]

Michele: Second

End of meeting: 22:31

European Quidditch Congress Meeting

Date: 23rd of August 2015

Location: Skype voice

Meeting time: 21:00 CET

In attendance: Mel Piper, Elisabeth Ingeberg Jørstad, Alper Erisen, Laurens Grinwis Plaat Stultjes, Yeray Espinosa, Jagoda Sadecka, Nina Heise, Lukas Linser, Nick van Klaveren

Chair: Rebecca Alley

Secretary: Elisabeth Ingeberg Jørstad

Agenda

- 1. Introduction**
- 2. Roll Call**
- 3. IQA relations and budget**
- 4. Return to gameplay policies** (focus on injury-related issues) (NL/Germany)
- 5. Rulebook: Further discussion about regulations and standards to be used in the upcoming season**
- 6. Cross-border competition**

Introduction

Roll Call

Mel Piper - UK

Elisabeth Ingeberg Jørstad - Norway

Alper Erisen - Turkey

Laurens Grinwis Plaat Stultjes - Belgium

Yeray Espinosa - Spain

Jagoda Sadecka - PLQ

Nina Heise - DQB

Lukas Linser - Austria (QAT)

IQA relations and budget

Mel: Emailed what Elisabeth had written and received a quick reply from Harrison. He seemed to think that the European NGBs thought the issues were solved.

Alper: Can it be posted on the group?

Mel: Yes [is done]

Rebecca: Anyone here in the earlier meeting with Harrison and Brian?

Alper: Yes, I don't remember details but didn't change our view. Especially worried about it being a private account.

Nick: From the meeting it felt like they thought it was a trust issue, while we said that it was about accountability, and they didn't seem to get that by the end

Laurens: I might've been there, but don't remember. But I had a private meeting with Harrison this week. He asked if Belgium had any problems paying, and said he understood our accountability concerns. He also said (which I agree) to that they can only start doing stuff internationally if they have money. And the reason we constantly see people complaining about IQA is because they can't do anything without money. Because of this we want to pay, but we also stand with QE.

Elisabeth: They need people and resources, many of the problems aren't things that will cost them money - RB, GG, bank account, etc... they want money and having money is important for them to do certain things but it's not the biggest concern and it's a bad excuse. Not that anyone is to blame (not specifically Harrison) but that doesn't excuse everything

Laurens: Resources, manpower and rulebook: I told Harrison that I could help out, and was going to look into positions. But because I'll probably become president of Belgium, I can't do it after all.

Rebecca: Apparently Harrison is the one writing all the bid things, which is slightly concerning, and not sure when it'll be done. Agree that the money thing doesn't come down to money thing, and I haven't seen them looking very hard for volunteers.

Alper: In the budget, none of the expenses are related to bank accounts. They say that they need the money to incorporate, but there is nothing about that in the budget. Can't see how they're related.

Mel: Agree. UK has the account that the IQA needs, and didn't take very long at all. We have told the IQA that we can help out with that, but this has been ignored.

Rebecca: Sounds like miscommunication, both ways. Harrison doesn't understand the full extent of QEs concerns. Haven't talked to Harrison about it, but could also be miscommunication both ways. I'm going to keep an open mind. Could be good to have another in-person, I should be able to make it in and "run a charity meeting"-ish if someone wants that, just to make everything clear and understood

Mel: Good idea. Wasn't there last time, so don't know, but make another meeting and make sure we're on the same page

Rebecca: Laurens, do you want to reply to him, and try to get a new meeting?

Laurens: Sure, need to get back to him anyway. Will make doodle for the next week

Mel: He seems very keen on this, he has answered two of my emails in a day.

Rebecca: Mel is on it

Elisabeth: You've made it clear it's all of QEs concern, and not only UK?

Mel: Yes

Return to gameplay policies (focus on injury-related issues) (NL/Germany)

Rebecca: Nick and Nina wanted to talk about this

Nick: I wasn't at the last meeting, but saw the discussion. I found the proposal (it has to be done something about players being able to play with an injury) good. There was a discussion, regarding among other things privacy. I would propose some kind of clearance from medics

Rebecca: I think this is what we agreed on at the last meeting and is in the minutes: There should be a form signed by a medic, that can say that "this player shouldn't play any more during this tournament" rather than the other way. This is because of liability reasons

Nick: There is probably a way to make it non-binding for medics so you can have a positive rather than a negative form. The other way doesn't really work.

Reb: I think a negative form is better than a positive one because if you give someone allowed to play, it also puts pressure on that player, and their teammates might expect them to if they're allowed. Better to assume that players can cont if they haven't been banned from doing so. So liability, pressure and also less paperwork are reasons to make it a negative form. During EG I had a lot of paper, and I would rather just have the serious ones. And it's easier to enforce a list of people who're not allowed to play. You see my point?

Nick: I was mainly talking about the serious ones, like the ones going to the hospital. If you have medics on the field they can tell if they're allowed to play or not. At the hospital there is no way to check

Rebecca: You can bring a form back from the hospital

Laurens: So this is the Belgian policy: Because of good connection with medics at tournament they always fill in paperwork anyways: "If player injured and told not to play, they can't do so before written consent by medics". The paper is given to scorekeepers if it happens mid-game and TD

Nina: Problem with a negative form: People who go to hospital and are told they can't play, and then come back and play, how can you expect them to hand in a negative form? Don't think they would, so it doesn't solve the problem. Other medic things, like the one Vinnie got at Grie Soss, have had positive forms so this is also normal in non-quidditch cases, like at hospitals. Think people can tell it themselves if they don't want to play.

Rebecca: How to make sure people turn paperwork in: It wouldn't be in the hands of the actual injured player, but coach or travel companion. You would need two people who wanted to hide it. Otherwise it's a valid point

Alper: Issue: Would have to track all injured players, which would be hard. It's easy enough for those going to hospital. No one remembers the other cases, so people might not realise there was an injury and he might not be on any list

Nick: You (Bex) can't imagine a hospital player coming back on pitch, but that is what this is based on. There was a head trauma case at EG where this happened, the player said to the coach that he could play.

Rebecca: What about a two-part system? Minor injuries (not hospital): Negative system to gameplay. Positive system for those who go to hospital. Can then maintain a list of people who aren't allowed to play.

Nick: Sounds great

Laurens: Is this for European competitions or every NGB?

Rebecca: Former, NGBs can adopt it.

Rebecca writes it out properly:

2 part system:

INJURIES THAT DO NOT GO TO HOSPITAL:

if players are no longer permitted to play, the medics will fill out a form and that form will be delivered to scorekeeper (if game has not finished) or gameplay director. That player's team name, player name, and jersey number will be added to the "no-play" list that referees will be made aware of before games.

INJURIES THAT DO GO TO HOSPITAL:

players will be added to the "no-play" list automatically if they are sent to the hospital. upon return from the hospital, if they have a note containing explicit permission from the doctor that they may continue to play, that note can be delivered to the gameplay director and they will be removed from the "no-play" list

Elisabeth: Would it be ok with a doctor saying "not now, maybe later, if given permission from a medic"?

Rebecca: Difficult to think of a situation, but probably?

(could also be done by another doctor, Bex re-writes to cover than scenario too)

Rebecca: players will be added to the "no play" list automatically if they are sent to the hospital, and will only be allowed to re-enter play if they have express written permission from either a doctor or other medical professional with no conflict of interest.

Rulebook: Further discussion about regulations and standards to be used in the upcoming season

Rebecca: As Laurens said earlier, the IQA RB should come within the next week. I also know that the RB will be a more generalised version of the USQ RB. They will be using that, so they won't change too much. The mouth guard rule and cleat things might change

Elisabeth: They don't know if they can promise when it'll come, head of the committee didn't want to promise specific plans, but gameplay will be the same, equipment stuff may change but that's it. Every gameplay aspect will be the same.

Rebecca: Chris (Canada and RB committee member) says that it'll come soon. Canada will use IQA RB.

Laurens: We've told captains/coaches that we're waiting for IQA RB

Mel: We (the UK) have only changed mouthguards and cleats and made some things clearer

Elisabeth: UK changed things like arm tackles, that's the only other change.

Rebecca: What do you guys want to do? Do you want a google form or something so you can go back to your NGBs and talk to them first?

Laurens: Shouldn't we actually wait for the IQA RB first, so we're sure it hasn't changed things?

Rebecca: Thought you already had decided to use it

Alper: Second Laurens

Rebecca: So wait as before, vote when IQA RB happens. What would options be? USQ, IQA, USQ with UK extras?

Laurens: Yeah, about that

Alper: QUK + capes

Mel: RB1!

Rebecca: Will make the poll once it is published, and decide the deadline based on that

Cross-border competition

Rebecca: Put it there because it was a goal you guys talked about earlier this year as things QE wanted to manage. As we're at the start of the competitive season, and doubt IQA can do this, you want to do something like this?

Laurens: Belgium and Netherlands have the Benelux cup every year, and this makes us both better. Close countries help. Then North Cup happened unofficially, but it could be made official among the northern NGBs. Norway, Belgium, Netherlands, Germany, northern France... Would be a great tournament if we made the bonds between the NGBs.

Rebecca: USQ and Canada are starting to make conferences, for teams close to each other. Have to play everyone else in that conference, and then have a final. Could work really well cross-border also in Europe

Nick: We really want to play more also against Germany, as there are teams there relatively close.

Nina: I'm not sure this is a topic for QE rather than the specific NGBs. Conferences make sense to talk about, but not like North Cup.

Rebecca: Yeah, agree. But like North Cup, could that be made into conferences?

Laurens: On Nina's point: I agree that we shouldn't, but I felt that it should be mentioned because some NGBs are already trying to accomplish this.

Rebecca: So do you want to consider making the conferences?

Laurens: Think it will be too early for this season, as most NGBs are really young. More important to focus on national skills, rather than cross-border play.

Rebecca: Playing diverse teams is one of the best ways to improve. If you're trying to develop, this is great. Playing the same team all the time isn't great

Laurens: Belgium is going to have a league next season, everyone playing everyone. Like conferences, but with the entire country.

Elisabeth: We (Norway) just can't join conferences, because of distances

Rebecca: Anyone got anything else?

Rebecca: Motion to end meeting

Elisabeth: Second

Rebecca: You got a meeting with IQA soon?

Mel: "It'll be soon". That's all we got

Meeting ends 22.10 CEST

European Quidditch Congress Meeting

Date: 20th of September 2015

Location: Skype voice

Meeting time: 21:00 CET

In attendance: Kai Haugen Shaw, Mel Piper, Jerona van der Gevel, Nina Heise, Yeray Espinosa, Jagoda Sadecka, Lukas Linser, Laurens Grinwis Plaat Stultjes, Michele Clabassi & Andrea Miglietta, Alper Erisen, Marc Gargante

Chair: Rebecca Alley

Secretary: Felix Linsmeier

1. Roll Call
2. Introduction
3. Transfer Policies with regard to EQC
4. Rulebook and European rulebook coherence
5. EQC 2016 Bid Package

Roll Call

Kai Haugen Shaw - Norway

Mel Piper - United Kingdom

Jerona van der Gevel - Netherlands

Nina Heise - Germany

Yeray Espinosa - Spain

Jagoda Sadecka - Poland

Lukas Linser - Austria

Laurens Grinwis Plaat Stultjes - Belgium

Michele Clabassi & Andrea Miglietta - Italy

Alper Erisen - Turkey

Marc Gargante - Catalunya

Introduction

Transfer Policies with regard to EQC

Alper: This issue was already talked about several months ago, players should not be allowed to switch teams just for EQC and then switch back. There should be a clear policy regarding this issue

Rebecca: Laurens, there is already a policy for this in Belgium isn't there?

Laurens: Yes, in general, only "primary" players are allowed to attend EQC and players can only play for their primary team.

Alper: Our transfer policy allows for one switch every season, if someone switches for EQC, they have to wait out the season should they want to switch back.

Kai: We do not really have a system of keeping tabs on players, we would like to be able to make very rare exceptions to regular team policies.

Mel: In the UK there has to be a good reason for a switch and/or one a season.

Jerona: The Netherlands' policy is a mix of those, we do have primary teams, we are thinking of implementing a timeframe though (e.g. no switches allowed some time before EQC)

Marc: Our transfer policy is only to pay the registration fee again. People are free to transfer whenever they want, but the receiving team has to confirm they accept that player. Since we only have 3 teams it's not really an issue.

Felix: This issue is mostly a national one, should this really be a European decision?

Rebecca: Are there any countries who have a National Championship early enough that there would be a problem.

Jerona: Not this time, but next year we are aiming for a November tournament.

Laurens: The Belgian cup will be in November as well.

Rebecca: Would a policy be feasible, where people cannot switch teams after their National championship and if countries want to implement special case exceptions that's their prerogative?

Kai: To prevent people switching in a larger timeframe in which the qualified teams are known already, we could do it "whichever comes last"

Alper: Our teams would like to make transfers in that timeframe, which is not only aimed at EQC but for national play as well, because the season starts on January 1st, 3 months as limit would therefore not work.

Felix: Why do we think that people switch because of EQC only?

Rebecca: That's why there would still be national prerogative.

Kai: Agreed, there should be exceptional rules

Laurens: We have a rule stating such exceptional rules.

Rebecca: This is not a policy that we can enforce, is there consensus among the NGBs on this issue, since many of you already have such policies?

Laurens: To come back to Alpers problem: The Belgian rules state: From season to season there will be no limitations on switching teams.

Rebecca: If people have problems with people switching between National Championships and EQC there would have to be individual policies.

Michele: In football, there are separate rosters for Nationals and Champions League, this would potentially be a viable solution.

Alper: Not everyone should implement the same policy, everyone should have a policy on this matter (but it should exist).

Rebecca: What is your policy on that, Alper?

Alper: If you switch teams, you have to stay in that team for the whole year?

Rebecca: So it would be possible to stack teams for EQC?

Alper: Yes but the teams have to stay together for the whole year.

Rebecca: I'm a little bit confused why Turkish teams are annoyed about this issue while they have such a policy.

Several members: This seems to have been an issue in France [who are not present at this meeting due to their handover]

Rebecca: This should be talked about when all members are present.

Rulebook and European rulebook coherence

Laurens: At the moment, every country seems to have gone off to create their own rulebook policy. The IQA rulebook has come out but isn't very good at the moment but a united stance is needed. The proposition would be to use the QUK adapted RB9.

Rebecca: Under the IQA rulebook, RB9 is completely legal, not sure about RB8.

Mel: We've made our changes and would be happy to let other countries use them (whilst the IRDP is on hiatus)

Laurens: I actually wanted to propose that QUK be asked to let us use it. Secondly, RB9 IS legal under the IQA Rulebook, but there is no consistency between countries.

Jerona: It would be very good to get clarity on the differences between rulebooks.

Rebecca: What opinions do other countries have?

Kai: It was discussed to use the IQA rulebook but currently there is no consensus (whilst also being very sceptical about the IQA rulebook).

Alper: We are working on USQ RB9 translation therefore we will "most likely" be using USQ RB9 with a couple of modifications.

Poland: We will go with the UK rulebook.

Lukas: What are the changes in the UK rulebook.

Mel: Differences are non-compulsory mouthguards, allowed metal cleats and “linking arms”-regulations (slightly differently worded).

Lukas: Austria would then also use the UK rulebook.

Yeray: Spain is okay with the UK one.

Michele: Okay as well.

Marc: Catalunya has yet to discuss this but possibly has issues with interlinking arms.

Lukas: Can we just decide on a European rulebook?

Felix: This is an NGB issue, so we cannot decide this as “Europe”.

Rebecca: Most of Europe seems to be okay with using the UK Rulebook. How should NGBs contact QUK for resources?

Mel: Email president@quidditchuk.org

Nina: Does this mean that the UK rulebook would be used at EQC?

Rebecca: This would have to be decided at a later point when everyone is present.

EQC 2016 Bid Package

Rebecca: We have compiled a document. [goes over the document]

Kai: We would really not like May as a date.

Rebecca: The dates mentioned in the document are arbitrary, so we’re open to discussion on this. What timeframe would work then?

Andrea: Easter is the last week of march, possibly too early.

Laurens: Between April 1st and April 31st would be best.

Felix: The timeframe should be discussed as soon as possible so NGBs and teams can sort out their own tournaments.

Rebecca: If there are any strong objections to April, please let us know. Next point is the Deadline for bids, here mentioned as October 31st to give more planning time (to be able to announce a winner around November 15th). Are there any points to be made about this?

Kai: This seems like a good suggestion.

Rebecca: There should be a group of people to come together as a subcommittee.

Felix: I would be happy to work on it, since I have already started to work on the bid package.

Laurens: Also looking at the Global Games guidelines would be a good suggestion.

Rebecca: Please all go through these documents within the next 48 hours and give possible comments so we are able to release this by the end of the week.

Kai: Did we all decide that April would be the timeframe? Will May 1st be included in this, since it is a sunday and also workers day?

Rebecca: We can limit it to the weekend before

Rebecca: This seems to be mostly consensus. Please let us know about any wanted

changes as soon as possible. Furthermore, we would like to hire a tournament director along with this, so they can get into contact with venues immediately.

Kai: Should we maybe give more time in order for more people to apply?

Rebecca: It is more important to have someone skilled than them being in the right place, so this would be the best option.

Kai: It would be very useful to have local language skills, so it should be later?

Rebecca: True, but we could potentially run into problems like at EG where there were issues with the venue. Only the tournament director would be hired, not the entire tournament committee. I strongly recommend hiring the tournament director along with it.

Michele: We could disclose where the bids are located for candidates to know?

Kai: Yes for example the TOP 3 would be useful.

Rebecca: The expected release date for this is Wednesday with Deadline to apply on October 31st/Decision announced on November 15th.

Lukas: In the section medical aid, there should be the request to state the cost for ambulances.

Rebecca: Added.

Rebecca: **Motion to adjourn the meeting**

Felix: Seconded

End of meeting: 22:34 CEST

AGENDA:

- Process of selection of bid
- TD/hiring of tournament staff
- EQC deadlines
 - Qualification deadline
 - Roster submissions
- Refereeing/rulebooks?
- Being a member of / playing in different NGBs
 - Might affect qualification tournaments and/or EQC

Attending:

Mel Piper - QUK

Lukas Linser - QAT

Jagoda Sadecka, PLQ

Jørgen Stenløkk - NRF

Laurens Grinwis Plaat Stultjes - BQF/FBQ/BZB/BQV

Nick van Klaveren - MQN

Andrea Miglietta - AIQ

Rion Blake - AQE

Nina Heise - DQB

TOP 1: Process of selection of bid

Rebecca: Haven't heard from anybody interested in being on selection committee.

Alternative: Give all bids to everybody and let NGBs rank them; give points for 1st, 2nd, and 3rd place, see which one gets the most.

Laurens: What if two bids get same amount of votes?

Rebecca: Probably go into second round. Have anonymous poll sent out to email accounts and talk about result in short meeting.

Rebecca: Currently only one single bid. Hopefully more to come.

TOP 2: TD/hiring of tournament staff

Rebecca: Has anybody heard of people who might be interested? Currently no applications, NGBs should push this, since TD is something we really need to have.

Jørgen: Norway probably not able to help out, most staff members also captaining at EQC.

Nick: What are qualifications for TD?

Rebecca: Have experience in leadership, want to do it, ideally not playing, ideally multilingual. But really just need people to apply. Ideally extensive experience doing tournaments, but lack of experience can be compensated by further staff. TD mainly for coordination.

Rebecca: What is the plan if we do not have anybody who applies for TD?

Lukas: Maybe take TD from country bid comes from? Ask them to also direct tournament.

Rebecca: As long as they have someone who has actually run a tournament before.
 Alternative, have playing, experienced TD and non-playing, less experienced ATD.
 Laurens: Just use other non-playing staff, have someone step up from there.
 Rebecca: Staff will be very busy filling their own position, better to have one point of contact, one single person in charge, making sure everything gets done. Strongly recommend against not having TD.
 Rebecca: Anybody in the UK possibly? Lots of people there have the experience.
 Mel: I was thinking that. I'll try to put a look out again. Had a lot of people, but struggled with people for own regionals this year.
 Nick: Same in Netherlands, also not enough staff for regionals.
 Rebecca: For now, everybody remind people to apply. Tell them we can work around them playing, so we at least have people to choose from. For other tournament staff, get applications out as soon as bid location is announced. Need form for applications, will save it in Drive this time because last year's have been lost.
 Jørgen: How much experience are we looking for?
 Rebecca: See if people would be interested. TD should have run tournament before, but people keen on other position can be supported in their roles even if they have less experience.
 Jørgen: If we don't get applications at all, maybe contact known TDs in Europe directly.
 Mel: Sounds great.
 Andrea: Sounds okay to me.
 Laurens: Still has access to old EQC folder, contains only job descriptions but no application form.

TOP 3: EQC deadlines

Qualification deadline:

Rebecca: Who brought up qualification deadline on facebook? Netherlands?
 Nick: Last year, deadline was 1 February. Had to ask for extension of deadline. So, with regards to planning the qualifier, would it be a problem this year to have a qualifier in February?
 Rebecca: Reason for deadline was to make it fair with regards to spots not filled. Last year, every single spot that wasn't filled by an NGB went to the UK because teams from other countries couldn't go on such short notice. If deadline is late, only local teams can fill extra spots.
 Nick: So, what would be a fair amount of weeks before a tournament to set a deadline?
 Rebecca: Imo, two months.
 Rion: For next EQC, do we already have a deadline for submitting teams that qualified? Spanish qualifier will be in February as well.
 Laurens: Last year, NGB deadline extension form was created. Could ask for deadline extension till 28 December, deadline was 15 February. Do NGBs have a qualifying tournament?
 Nick: Tied to Belgian tournament.
 Jagoda: Qualifier in January.
 Nina: Qualifier in January.
 Lukas: Tournament in December

Andrea: Tournament in March or May, but qualification depends on last year.

Laurens: Seeing as most NGBs have qualifiers in January, 15 February seems like a good deadline.

Jørgen: if everyone has qualifiers in January, why not do 1 February?

Rion: Spanish qualifier in February, but could probably do 15 February. Possible deadline extension?

Laurens: Looking at the extensions from last year, latest extension that happened was first week of March, so that is a three weeks extension that you could probably ask for.

Rebecca: So, 15 February seems good to everybody, maybe give Spain an extension.

Roster submission deadline:

Rebecca: Past EQC, roster submissions due to NGBs and then passed on to tournament committee. One of the NGBs saw it as extra work, would have preferred different system. Sill sees this as best option because NGBs have member lists and know their own membership policies, so can better check if everyone on roster is allowed to play.

Jørgen: Makes sense, NGBs can also remind teams to hand rosters in in time.

Rebecca: So, hand whole process to NGBs.

Jørgen: Sounds fine.

Nick: Sounds good to me as well.

Rion: Yeah, NGBs can do that.

Rebecca: Further question, how to calculate how many spots were awarded to each country. How was it done last year?

Laurens: There was a pre-registration form for teams interested in going to EQC, looked at those numbers to calculate number of spots per NGB. Also looking at numbers of official teams per country.

Rion: Last year, Spain didn't make it, but this year already counting on three or four spots because grown number of teams.

Laurens: Sounds a lot, Belgium gets 3 spots for 11 teams.

Rion: Maybe same number of spots as Belgium then.

Rebecca: So do 32 team tournament again?

Nick: Depends on bids.

Laurens: And pitches available.

Jørgen: Do pre-registration again?

Rebecca: US does it based on number of registered teams up to a certain point. Do it based on percentages of registered teams per country.

Laurens: Roster deadline was 25 March last year.

Rebecca: NGBs got another week to go over rosters. As everyone seems okay with NGBs getting rosters, let's keep that deadline.

Rebecca: Back to bids distribution, what would be a reasonable date for allocating them? Keep in mind that a week or two will be needed for calculation.

Nick: Before or after qualifiers?

Rebecca: Would prefer to know before qualifiers.

Nick: Agreed.

Rebecca: Probably most people would agree.

Mel: Need to know as soon as possible for teams to calculate travel costs. QUK qualifiers begin in two weeks as well.

Nick: Maybe before the end of the year? 31 December?

Laurens: Is this to tell EC qualified teams or give number of registered teams?

Rebecca: Number of registered teams.

Laurens: 31 December seems to late. Maybe November 8.

Rebecca: Everyone okay with 8 November?

Nina: Would prefer end of November as German teams are allowed to register till 30 November.

Jagoda: Many new teams starting out, so would prefer end of November.

Nick: Same for Netherlands.

Rebecca: Last weekend of November is 29 November, 30 is a Monday. Have Laurens do formula to put in numbers of teams and calculate number of sports for each country, so it can be done asap. Ask countries to submit number of official teams first thing in the morning 1 December, so we have a result in the afternoon of that day. Also gives enough time to talk about size of tournament. Probably wouldn't make tournament smaller, but depending on bid it could be extended to more teams.

Deadlines:

Number of registered teams per NGB: 1 Dec

Qualified teams per NGB: 15 Feb

Rosters due three weeks before tournament to NGBs, one week later from NGBs to tournament OC.

TOP 4: Rulebooks and Refereeing

Rebecca: Topic has come up a lot recently, also discussed in Congress.

Rion: asks for clarification of gender rule

Jørgen: So, EQC will be played under IQA rulebook?

Laurens: In Congress only decided for World Cup; European Committee could still decided something else for EQC. Everyone seemed to agree on the rulebook though, so it would make sense to use it for EQC, and countries should start playing with the IQA one by that time.

Lukas: Makes sense to use that rulebook because many people attend both events.

Rion: agrees.

Rebecca: What is QUK doing about the IQA proposed rulebook?

Mel: QUK has adopted the IQA changes.

Laurens: Would like to raise a point about snitches. Saw Quidditch Canada adapt QUK's snitch certification process. Should consider snitches in Europe in general, while referees are internationally certified still no European certification for snitches, something that should be put in place.

Rebecca: How QC and QUK certifications works, there are different levels of certification.

Laurens leaves for a bit.

Jørgen: Good idea to have certification for snitches as it's working well with IRDP and referees.

Rebecca: Process can be found on Quidditch Canada website.

(<http://www.quidditchcanada.com/snitch-certification/>) Seems reasonable and solid.

Rebecca: Location for EQC is announced on 15 November.

Rebecca: Thoughts on certification?

Nick: Agrees with procedure but what are the exact certifications?

Rebecca: Several sections of test with certain percentages, added up and level of qualification depends on that score.

Jørgen: Does footage always need to be provided?

Rebecca: Possibly also field tests, but Canada too huge to have snitch coordinators attend all tournaments.

Jørgen: Seems biased, too dependent on person evaluating.

Rebecca: Possibly have some sort of European snitch committee/board for that.

Laurens returns at this point.

Rebecca: Probably best to take this back to NGBs and discuss it there. Would QUK be okay with sharing the snitch test if people were interested in using it in their countries?

Mel: Imagines so, will check in Exec meeting on Tuesday.

Rebecca: Everyone familiarise themselves with process, talk it through with NGBs and go back to it in next meeting.

TOP 5: Players in more than one NGB

Nina: Problem of players being members of two NGBs, might be abused to fill up tournament rosters.

Rion: Can relate personally. Is vice president of Spanish NGB, but currently plays for Nargles and will have to sign up with MQN. Will leave Netherlands after this semester to return to Madrid and Madrid team will probably play at EQC. So actual possibility of both teams attending EQC.

Mel has to leave at this point.

Laurens: Same situation with one of their players last year. Was member of BQF but then went to UK. Belgium actually have policy for members not signing up with other teams, so they couldn't register with the UK team and played with Gargoyles at EQC.

Rebecca: Do other countries have policies like that?

Jørgen: No, but moving shouldn't be penalised.

Rebecca: Sounds fair.

Rion: Obviously not fair to be able to go to EQC with two teams. For Spain currently allowed to be member of two NGBs though.

Rebecca: So basically do it case by case?

Nina: Agree that moving shouldn't be penalised because you can't help it, but teams might abuse this.

Nick: Up to now, has been evaluated on case to case basis.

Jørgen: Don't have that problem in Norway, but for EQC there should be some kind of policy, so teams can't just use players from teams from other NGBs to fill up their qualified teams.

Laurens: Belgian policies say the following: "An individual member can not be affiliated with any other IQA recognised governing body as part of a team outside Belgium" and "Players may switch teams, but only at the approval of the Teams Director. This can happen once

per term per player." Can be evaluated on case to case basis but NGB can only be changed once per season.

Rebecca: Most countries appear to do it on case to case basis, depending whether the player has a good reason. How to put this into a policy, is a policy needed?

Rion: Just try and watch out. It should be obvious when it is only for a tournament. NGBs should be able to work it out themselves.

Laurens: NGBs should all have some kind of policy written down, not just verbal communication. Also, NGBs should communicate when players are moving.

Rebecca: So, a QE policy that says all NGBs should have a policy on foreign players which will be evaluated on case to case basis and NGBs should talk to each other about moving players?

Rebecca: As it is an actual policy, table this for now, everyone go back and discuss it with their NGBs and have a vote next time.

Proposed policy: "All NGB's must have a policy about player transfers between countries and teams, meaning that they cannot simply switch teams to qualify for nationals, EQC qualifiers, or EQC, and that transfers must be evaluated on a case-by case basis. If transfers happen between NGB's, those two NGB's must discuss the transfer."

Nina: So, does that mean a person can still be a member of two NGBs at the same time?

Rebecca: So when players are moving they'd have to give up membership in the NGB they're moving away from?

Jørgen: Sounds fair.

Rion: Maybe some NGBs don't mind players being member of another NGB at the same time.

Rebecca: Probably makes sense to divide this into five parts and have separate votes on each of them.

Proposals:

I. All NGB's must have a policy about player transfers between teams within the country and between countries.

II. These policies must include that players cannot simply switch teams to help a different team qualify for major events or at EQC.

III. Transfers must be evaluated on a case-by-case-basis.

IV. If transfers happen between NGB's, those two NGB's must both be aware of the transfer.

V. Players may not be members of more than one NGB at any given time.

Rebecca: Motion to adjourn meeting.

Laurens: Seconded.

European Quidditch Congress Meeting

Date: 5th of November 2015

Location: Skype voice

Meeting time: 21:00 CET

In attendance:

Chair: Melanie Piper

Secretary: Felix Linsmeier

Agenda

1. Introduction
2. Roll Call
3. European Snitch program
4. Players in more than one NGB
5. Team registration deadline for EQC
6. Bids received for the hosting of EQC 2016
 - a. Venues
 - b. Dates
7. Other

Introduction

Roll Call

Lukas Linser - Austria

Mel Piper - UK

Jagoda Sadecka - Poland

Kai Haugen Shaw - Norway

Alper Erişen - Turkey

Yeray Espinosa Cuevas - Spain

Nina Heise - Germany

Andrea Miglietta - Italy

Laurens Grinwis Plaat Stultjes - Belgium

Nick van Klaveren - Netherlands

Rebecca McLaughlin - Catalunya

European Snitch Programme

Mel: The idea is that QUK already has a Snitch Programme and could distribute that to the other NGBs. Was this the point that was raised?

Laurens: Yes, but also about the implementation of a European Snitch Programme as a database to find out about people signing up as Snitches.

Mel: Have people had the chance to take a look at the existing programme
[no, a link is posted to the QUK programme]

Felix: [goes through the pages]

Mel: Is the idea for all of Europe to use this? Would this have to be taken back to the NGBs?

Laurens: Yes, this should have been already done.

Rebecca: Would the certifiers have to be certified themselves?

Mel: In QUK, we have Snitch Coordinators.

Rebecca: Yes, applied to the whole of Europe, there should be a proper system though.

Alper: If only EQC would be the place to be certified, there might not be enough Snitches certified overall.

Rebecca: This could be done with certification during pool and Certifiers deciding whether Snitches could handle bracket.

Laurens: Snitch coordinators in some countries would probably be a good starting point.

Rebecca: This could be started up like in the IRDP with a decision being made.

Kai: I feel like we're not getting anywhere with this discussion, we should probably think of a better system.

Nina: Didn't somebody come up with a European board concerned with this?

Canada for example has video submission for evaluation.

Rebecca: USQ was going to have a committee of "best snitches" to appoint others.

Mel: We will go on to the next point, please discuss with your NGBs how this could work.

Players in more than one NGB

Rebecca: What about people playing in a different NGB; should there be a system of “secondary” NGB that people are allowed to play for?

Laurens: Would this be fair?

Rebecca: If a secondary NGB system was implemented in all of Europe it would be fair to everyone.

Laurens: In many cases, it is just not clear, who belongs to which team.

Felix: The idea is that no player can support more than one team in qualifiers for EQC.

Rebecca: Catalunya’s stance is that people should be allowed to play in more than one NGB.

Laurens: Coming back to exploiting the system, there are exceptions included in the proposed rules, where contact between the NGBs is proposed.

Rebecca: You shouldn't screw people over for the year i.e. Erasmus students, it should be easy to switch if you move. Especially people who move a lot would be heavily affected by this.

Nick: We support Rebecca fully in this.

Alper: Is this the actual policy of Catalunya?

Kai: People can switch teams and also do so tactically, but the idea is to prohibit more than one transfer.

Felix: Are there any objections to individual proposals? [reads them out]

Rebecca: Proposal II) would stop people from randomly switching teams without any connection?

Felix: yes

Laurens: Maybe a further specification to the phrasing “simply” means?

Felix: How could this be rephrased?

Kai: I actually like this phrasing.

Felix: what about proposal III)?

Nina: Could we change the phrasing to “can” instead of “must”?

Rebecca: They should look at every case though, so “must” would be fitting.

Mel: Agreed.

Felix: I think Nina meant, that they have the ability to evaluate on a case by case basis?

Mel: Okay, but still “must” would be better.

Felix: Going on to IV)

Nina: I was wondering whether we should add “made aware by the player”, because it’s their responsibility?

Rebecca: Could in the future there be a transfer-specific committee person?

Felix: We have very limited resources at the moment, but theoretically yes.

Kai: Adding to that, since there exist so many policies within different NGBs, this would be very hard to implement.

Alper: Would it be better to say “transfers between different teams of different NGBs”?

Kai: Yes that works, but you also have the previous proposition.

Felix: Okay, what about V?

Laurens: I think it should be more reflective of the actual membership as player rather than affiliation. Proposition: “An individual member can not be affiliated with 2 IQA recognised governing bodies as part of a team”

Nina: I would like to come back to responsibility of the player for a sec. Could we introduce this?

Alper: If the new team knew, could they still choose not to tell the NGB about this to prevent punishment?

Kai: Ultimately the responsibility lies with the player, we don’t really have punishment.

Felix: Going on to Laurens’ proposition ““An individual member can not be affiliated with 2 IQA recognised governing bodies as part of a team”?

Alper: Should we omit the IQA recognised?

Laurens: Regarding this, we are a subcommittee of the IQA, so for a member to be part of this committee, an NGB has to be IQA recognised. I feel one of the reasons to join the IQA is to participate in events like EQC.

Kai: The way it is phrased now, there might be a loophole of people creating new NGBs or joining non-recognised ones, but this might not be a real-case scenario.

I. All NGB's must have a policy about player transfers between teams within the country and between countries. [not amended]

- II. These policies must include that players cannot simply switch teams to help a different team qualify for major events or at EQC. [not amended]
- III. Transfers must be evaluated on a case-by-case-basis [not amended]
- IV. If transfers happen between [teams of different] NGB's, those two NGB's must both be [made] aware of the transfer [by the player in question] [and the NGB that is being transferred to must approve the transfer]
- V. [An individual member can not be affiliated with two IQA-recognised governing bodies as part of a team"]

Felix: motion to vote on an amendment to V.

Alper: Second

Felix: We will vote on the two phrasings individually.

"Affiliated with two IQA-recognised governing bodies as part of a team":

In favour: 8

"Affiliated with two IQA-recognised governing bodies as a player"

In favour: 3

Felix: Are there any further comments on these proposed regulation. Motion to go to a vote on individual regulations

Kai: Second

Felix: Vote on I. All NGB's must have a policy about player transfers between teams within the country and between countries. [not amended]

Unanimously in favour

Vote on II. These policies must include that players cannot simply switch teams to help a different team qualify for major events or at EQC. [not amended]

Unanimously in favour

Vote on III. Transfers must be evaluated on a case-by-case-basis [not amended]

Unanimously in favour.

Vote on IV. If transfers happen between [teams of different] NGB's, those two NGB's must both be [made] aware of the transfer [by the player in question] [and the NGB that is being transferred to must approve the transfer]

In favour: 10

Against: Turkey

Vote on V. [An individual member can not be affiliated with two IQA-recognised governing bodies as part of a team"]

In favour: 10

Against: Catalunya

Team registration deadline

Felix: There seems to be an issue with regional championships being after the team registration deadline on Feb 15th.

Nina: We should probably discuss the idea of extension; in the future, if there is a deadline, it should be kept to.

Laurens: This year, since these issues have been known for a while, teams should plan according to known deadlines.

Alper: Agreed with Nina and Laurens, NGBs should plan accordingly, this year there could still be made exceptions though. If we are willing to give exceptions, can we decide on how this would be decided? It would not be appropriate for the events committee to do this.

Felix: This would affect Catalunya and Spain.

The committee states the wish that deadlines will be kept to in the future but will give limited exceptions this year since tournament dates have been set.

Bids received for the hosting of EQC 2016

Felix: Situation with Toulouse

Kai: When is the deadline for us to decide?

Felix: We decided on the 15th as publication-date for the decision.

Kai: I would like more information on the medical situation in Gallipoli since the bid was rather vague.

Alper: Will there be an ambulance; is there wifi? There is no information on whether the entire field is playable.

Laurens: In the Verona-bid, it is mentioned that the pitch rent is 5000€ for all pitches, how much would it be for only 2 of those, since they might be enough?

Alper: At tournament site A field 3, one of the fields looks like a dirt field; is it playable?

Andrea: Ambulance and First-Aid are included in the deal in Gallipoli. Transport to and from the Airport could possibly included if well-organised. Half-Board means breakfast + lunch OR dinner; full-board is 50€. From a certain amount of bookings onward there will be free spots that could be given to non-playing volunteers.

Kai: How far away is the closest hospital?

Andrea: Probably Gallipoli, this would have to be clarified (Gallipoli = 5km away)

Kai: On the pictures, the ground looks rather dry, is it playable?

Andrea: Maintaining of the pitch would be included.

Kai: The field condition is probably one of the more crucial questions that remains to be answered.

Andrea: There have already been Football tournaments at the site, so it should work.

Alper: Could you elaborate on the free spots situation?

Andrea: We would get one free space for each 10 bookings (if above 600 bookings).

Kai: With 32 teams, there would need to be a high number of players per teams to make this number.

Alper: Maybe the venue could be convinced to offer this with lower numbers.

Alper: What date does the Gallipoli-bid plan.

Laurens: Regarding Verona: what would be the price for just get Pitches A & B?

Andrea: Would need to find out.

Kai: Several fields look rather rough (regarding fields in Verona) - are they playable?

Andrea: Not clear at the moment, I suppose they should fix that.

Alper: Could they supply more up-to-date pictures?

Andrea: Should be possible.

Laurens: For those who might be concerned about A:3 and B, the rugby pitch B looks better than satellite, these pictures might not reflect the current situation.

Alper: Is there wifi in Verona?

Andrea: I think so, but have to ask.

Felix: Any further questions/players.

Laurens: I am unsure about whether Gallipoli would actually be cheaper, the costs would probably just shift back and forth between player/team fee and accommodation (+ flight)

Kai: Verona also said they would look into sponsorship opportunities.

Andrea: For Gallipoli, it is suggested to go through Rome to Brindisi on separate flights.

Kai: In that case, extra travel time needs to be accounted for. What are travel times to Brindisi?

Andrea: Flight time of less than an hour.

Laurens: About the flight through Rome being cheaper, this is not the case for Belgium.

Kai: We should probably talk about this at a later date, further questions can be asked on Facebook. Motion to adjourn the meeting.

Alper: Second

End of meeting: 22:40

European Quidditch Congress Meeting

Date: 22nd of November 2015

Location: Skype voice

Meeting time: 21:00 CET

In attendance: Laurens Grinwis Plaat Stultjes , Rion Blake, Mel Piper, Jerona Van der Gevel, Jørgen Helgeland Stenløkk, Alper ERİŞEN, Baptiste Julien Blandet, Nina Heise, Jacopo Sartori, Andrea Miglietta, Jagoda Sadecka, Marc Gargante Oliva

Agenda

1. Introduction
2. Roll Call
3. Interaction and feedback between EC and organisational committee
4. Spot distribution for EQC
5. Non-Disclosure
6. Player Transfer Policy
7. (Snitch Programme)
8. (Tournament calendar)

Introduction

Roll Call

Laurens Grinwis Plaat Stultjes - Belgium

Rion Blake - Spain

Mel Piper - UK

Jerona Van der Gevel - The Netherlands

Jørgen Helgeland Stenløkk - Norway

Alper ERİŞEN - Turkey

Baptiste Julien Blandet - France

Nina Heise - Germany

Jacopo Sartori - guest; Tournament Director for EQC 2016

Andrea Miglietta - Italy

Jagoda Sadecka: Poland

Marc Gargante Oliva - Catalunya

Interaction and feedback between EC and organisational committee

Rebecca: What specific things does the European Committee want to have a say in for EQC 2016? It has already chosen the venue and specific deadlines for the process. Is there anything else the EC wants to be involved in?

Alper: I think the European Committee should decide on extensions to deadlines.

Jorgen: I think the Organisational Committee has the most information and thus should have the say.

Rebecca: We are talking specifically about the team submission deadlines; unfortunately some NGBs have their qualifiers after this date so may need an extension.

Baptiste: FQF hasn't agreed on new statutes and can't determine teams now. Furthermore, our qualifiers will be in late february.

Rebecca: We are talking specifically about who decides if deadlines are granted. Could a compromise be to give the EQC committee one vote within the organisational committee for that?

Jerona: I think the final say should be with the EC but this should definitely be with consideration of advice given by the EQC committee.

Jacopo: I also think that the European Committee should have the final say, I also like the idea of giving the EQC committee one vote in the EC.

Alper: What should the EC discuss specifically?

Jacopo: How the deadlines are handled since it's concerned with the NGBs.

Alper: motion to Vote

Felix: second

EQC Committee decides: 0

European Committee decides: 0

European committee decides, EQC committee can present: 9

EQC committee presents and has a vote with the EC: 0

European committee decides, EQC committee can present: 9

Rebecca: What other things would the EC like to have a say in?

Jerona: There should be a final roster check to sort out any transfer issues or double entries.

Rebecca: How specifically should this be implemented, so not every NGB needs to check 32 teams with their national rosters?

Jerona: This is a good question but this should still be considered.

Rebecca: So you are proposing that the EC decides what happens with roster checks?

Jerona: Yes

Rebecca: Should we vote on this?

Laurens: We talked about this last meeting and decided that the NGBs check their rosters.

Rebecca: Yes but we should still vote on this.

Laurens: Motion to vote on whether it is the NGBs to do the roster checks.

Jorgen: second

Yes: 7

No: 1

Abstain: 1

Rebecca: Based on the vote, the NGBs will be responsible for roster checks

Jorgen: What rights did we have last year?

Rebecca: It didn't work too well, since there were no defined rights. This is why we want to make clear who has what responsibilities.

Laurens: Are only teams of EC members allowed to participate?

Rebecca: i.e. who defines eligibility for EQC?

Jorgen: I feel like the EC should get a say on eligibility.

Alper: agreed, but do we not just accept anyone in Europe anyways?

Laurens: There are teams in countries that are not members (e.g. Slovenia, Slovakia)

Rebecca: Last year, there were two spots kept free for e.g. Spain and Ireland, but none applied.

Alper: Austria got a spot despite not being a member.

Rebecca: Who then is eligible? Should spots be left open?

Laurens: I have strong feelings that only IQA members should be eligible; if we allow random teams to participate, we don't have people on the same level; roster checks, rule sets etc.

Jerona: This is a good point that I cannot clearly answer; I'm in favour of letting newer teams from non-member countries enter. We could make the distinction between IQA-membership and EC-membership.

Rebecca: [Explains rules for emerging areas]

Jorgen: It seems very easy to become an emerging area, so this should be the minimum requirement.

Alper: We could decide this case-by-case

Rebecca: The issue with this is that there might not be any spots left by that point, so this would need to be decided now.

Laurens: In the recent IQA meeting it was recognised that Slovakia is so far the only country interested in becoming an emerging area; it is unclear how their standing is now. I agree that emerging status should be the minimum requirement but by what deadline?

Rebecca: Could we vote on reserved spots now?

Jerona: Should we first have a vote on whether it is the EC that decides eligibility?

Jorgen: Motion to vote on this.

Jerona: Seconded

Vote on whether or not the EC decides on eligibility for EQC

In favour of having the EC responsible: unanimous

The second vote would be about whether emerging areas should be allowed to compete.

Jerona: Motion to vote on this

Laurens: Second

Vote on whether or not emerging areas are allowed to compete at EQC 2016

Yes: unanimous

The third vote would be about countries outside in Europe that are not members or emerging areas.

Felix: Motion to vote on whether or not countries in Europe but not members or emerging areas are allowed to compete.

Alper: second

Vote on whether or not countries in Europe but not members or emerging areas are allowed to compete.

Yes: 0

No: 8

Abstain: 1

Rebecca: According to this vote, European countries that are not emerging areas will not be able to compete.

[Marc Gargante Oliva enters]

Rebecca: Is there anything else that the EC should have a say in?

Jerona: When it comes to finances, how should they handled in terms of responsibility?

Rebecca: Last year this was run by the EQC committee because they need that level of independence; profits from last year's tournament are with the treasurer of that committee.

Jerona: So the EC is responsible for profits/losses?

Rebecca: Yes. In terms of liability we currently don't have a bank account; it would not be fair for the EC to have to be accountable for possible losses. Are there any ideas to handle this? There isn't much of an alternative to having the EC approve every economic decision.

Jerona: In terms of bank account, maybe one of the NGBs can be responsible?

Alper: We have an official bank account but I don't think it would be appropriate for us to have it.

Felix: By law, the EQC committee would be responsible.

Jorgen: Let's imagine that there is a lot of missing funds?

Rebecca: We could table this now, since the costs for the venue should be covered by the fees, any profits/losses would probably come out of merchandise.

Jerona: I don't think we should table this now; I think we should decide now that the EC is responsible for both profits and losses.

Jorgen: I agree, we should decide this now even if it might not be a problem later down the line. On the top of my head, I could suggest that any losses be covered by the NGBs jointly.

Rebecca: I would suggest that this be divided proportionally by teams represented at EQC.

Jorgen: Motion to vote on whether or not net losses incurred from EQC are split between NGBs proportionally by number of participating teams.

Alper: Second

Vote on whether or not net losses incurred from EQC are split between NGBs proportionally by number of participating teams.

Yes: unanimous

Second vote would be the transferral of profits to the EC

Jorgen: Motion to vote on that.

Mel: Seconded

Vote on the transferral of profits to the EC

Yes: 10

Abstain: 1

Alper: Should the EC get a veto on regulations proposed by the EQC committee.

Rebecca: What sort of things would this be?

Alper: Mainly rules and regulations

Jorgen: It is good to decide this beforehand but wasn't the problem last year that the organisational committee was unhappy with vetos from the EC?

Laurens: Noone really complained last year; for some positions like gameplay, the EQC committee should have an advisory role to explain the reasoning behind proposed regulations.

Jorgen: EC is supposed to represent all of Europe, that makes it more qualified to make these decisions. The veto, if implemented, should have a high threshold to pass.

Marc: If losses are incurred by the EC, this would entitle us to have a say in decisions made by the EQC committee.

Rebecca: A veto-right will probably create hassles; a better way might be to have the EC in an advisory role for critical decisions that might be considered controversial.

Alper: A veto would only be a last resort.

Rebecca: It should not be a straight veto, but an advisory role for the EC to make controversial policies work.

Jorgen: If the EC has no veto, there wouldn't be any way to enforce critical decisions.

Jacopo: There should be a high majority to be in favour of this.

Rebecca: Agreed, there should be a several-step-solution (e.g. 50% for questioning a decision and 66% to then veto it if still not satisfactory). Would people be okay with such a solution?

Jorgen: yes.

Rebecca: What majority should this be?

Jorgen: There should be a high majority of a minimum of 75%; it should only be done if absolutely necessary. Jacopo, what do you think about this, since you were chosen before we are making these policies?

Jacopo: The EQC committee should have some level of independence, but if there is something that a high number of representatives disagree with, the EC should be able to contribute.

What would be the procedure for the EC to express their doubts about a policy?

Laurens: Last year, a rep from the EQC committee to the EC.

Felix: Should we establish such a policy then?

Rebecca: Are there any other points that need to be addressed?

Let's move to a vote on policies:

Options:

1. If more than 50% of the European committee has doubts about or cannot see the benefits of any given policy set by the EQC tournament committee, they reserve the right to question and work with the EQC committee to reach a compromise that will satisfy both groups. If a compromise cannot be reached or if the European committee is unhappy with the outcome of the compromise, a majority of 51% will result in the policy being vetoed.

2. If more than 50% of the European committee has doubts about or cannot see the benefits of any given policy set by the EQC tournament committee, they reserve the right to question and work with the EQC committee to reach a compromise that will satisfy both groups. If a compromise cannot be reached or if the European committee is unhappy with the outcome of the compromise, a majority of 76% will result in the policy being vetoed.

Alper: Motion to move to a vote

Mel: Seconded

Vote on the two options

Option 1: 5

Option 2: 4

Abstain: 1

Rebecca: A 50% majority will be what we're going with.

Rebecca: The next point will be large decisions in terms of finances; i.e. liability

Alper: We should decide on a fixed number (e.g. 1000€) above which the committee has to be consulted.

Rebecca: I would suggest excluding field rental and medical services from this.

Alper: That sounds reasonable.

Jorgen: How would this be implemented?

Baptiste: I would suggest sharing a google spreadsheet with all costs and receipts.

Rebecca: Yes, that's what was done last year.

Nina: There were two different budget sheets last year, which created confusion.

Rebecca: Would everyone be okay with a notification in advance of the expenditure (e.g. one week) of more than 1000€?

Jorgen: This is not so much about approving everything above 1000€ but more about acting when there is a problem with one of them.

Baptiste: If it is something outside of the regular budget it should be approved; if not it should be fine.

Jacopo: This sounds reasonable.

Marc: I like the idea of getting notified about purchases outside the budgets, but there could be a lot of smaller purchases that might change the budget quite a lot.

Rebecca: There should be EC members keeping a watch on the budget sheets.

Jacopo: Notifying for every purchase not in the budget would probably not be practical.

Rebecca: Maybe there could be categories within the budget? How about setting it as "everything 100€ above budget"?

Marc: Motion to vote on that

Jorgen: Second

Vote on the EC being given access to the budget spreadsheet and being notified if spending for an item exceeds the budget for that by 100€ or more.

Yes: unanimous

Felix: Should we have a policy for EQC committee reps coming in to report?

Rebecca: Yes

Felix: Motion to vote on Responsibility of the EQC committee to send a rep to the EC committee to report on large expenditures or new policies.

Alper: Second

Vote on Responsibility of the EQC committee to send a rep to the EC committee to report on large expenditures or new policies.

Yes: unanimous

Spot distribution for EQC

Andrea: There is space for 8 pitches, so 40 teams could work (48 will probably too much)

Jacopo: I already think that 32 would be better than 40 to not have it too big; especially to limit the number of people at the venue.

Mel: It's great that we have the space for 40 teams but we'd also need more volunteers.

Jorgen: There will probably be less volunteers but also getting headrefs is a probably already a problem; the bottom 8 teams would probably not bring more headrefs.

Rebecca: We could require teams to volunteer

Jorgen: I am not a fan of that, that would decrease the quality of refereeing.

Alper: Not all teams come with full rosters, requiring teams to bring volunteers would affect smaller teams much more.

Rebecca: Would it be worth it to increase the team number?

Laurens: Motion to vote on team number for EQC.

Alper: Second

Vote on team number for EQC

Option 1 32 Teams: 5

Option 2 40 Teams: 6

Rebecca: Next EQC will have 40 teams. How will these spots be distributed?

Laurens: I have looked into this, a good example is champions league; according to past performance; another option is by team number.

Jorgen: I like that Laurens' option takes both performance and team numbers into account to ensure a competitive tournament.

Baptiste: I agree, but it is also important to look at team numbers.

Mel: We have created a possible system based on that.

Baptiste: Similar countries should get similar spots for EQC.

Jorgen: The UK allocation is mostly based on performance, is that correct?

Rebecca: There are default spots.

Jacopo: In every allocation proposal there need to be allocated spots for emerging areas as well.

Nina: I would like to say that I don't think it is a good idea to allocate based on performance only. This could lead to somewhat of a devious circle.

Jorgen: I disagree slightly; each country still sends a number of teams

Rebecca: There should be written proposals discussed online and have voted on by the first week of december; ideally proposals should be submitted by Tuesday 24th of Nov.

Nondisclosure

Rebecca: This is just a point about new members being made aware of confidentiality. We were thinking about a document outlining what can and cannot be shared.

Jorgen: It would be good to have a document for new members in general.

Rebecca: Could you give us a list of things that were not immediately apparent?

Jorgen: Yes.

Baptiste: It would be better to organise an extra meeting to outline this.

Rebecca: How about a written document + a meeting with just one person outlining the rules and questions?

Agreed

Player Transfer policy

Rebecca: This is back on here since it might be difficult to implement this year. This is mainly due to point 5 “An individual member cannot be affiliated with two IQA-recognised governing bodies as part of a team.”

Baptiste: This will apply in France from december.

Rion: My example is that I’m a rep for one NGB but a player in another

Felix: That’s why we use the phrasing “as part of a team”

Rebecca: Can we publish these rules and give a timeframe for transition?

Baptiste: What is the timeframe you are suggesting?

Rebecca: Until the end of this competitive season; during this time, people are still allowed to be part of two NGBs as part of a team.

Felix: motion to adjourn the meeting

Mel: Seconded:

END OF MEETING: 23:59 CET

European Quidditch Congress Meeting

Date: 13th of December 2015

Location: Skype voice

Meeting time: 21:00 CET

In attendance:

Chair: Laurens Grinwis Plaat Stultjes

Secretary: Felix Linsmeier

Agenda

1. Introduction
2. Roll Call
3. Format and publishing of the minutes
4. Non-disclosure
5. Advisory roles to the Committee
6. European Snitch Programme
7. European Transfer policy
8. Tournament Calendar

Introduction

Roll Call

- Jørgen Stenløkk - Norway
- Rion Blake - Spain
- Nina Heise - Germany
- Jakub Siemiątkowski - Poland
- James Burnett - United Kingdom
- Baptiste Julien Blandet - France
- Laurens Grinwis Plaat Stultjes - Belgium

Format and publishing of the minutes

Jorgen: I suggested that the meetings include the votes for each individual country, so it would be clear who voted what.

Felix: [Explains the issue]

Laurens: We could do something like the IQA, nonconfidential issues in detail, confidential issues paraphrased

Jorgen: That's what I would suggest as well.

James: What would happen with mentioning the vote with confidential issues?

Felix: This would only work with non-confidential issues. My suggestion would be to implement the proposal made by Jorgen and Laurens [..]

Baptiste: Language translation of the minutes?

Jorgen: That's a good point, but should be done by the NGBs themselves if they feel like it's necessary.

Baptiste: We would like to have everything translated before the publication.

Laurens: We understand you but we are all very understaffed so don't have the means to translate all minutes into their language.

Felix: Yes, unfortunately we can't allocate any resources on translation for everyone, so if NGBs want to do the translation themselves, they are invited to do that but it won't be centralised.

Jorgen: English is our working language and so if people need/want a translation they can do so after the regular publication.

Non-disclosure

Felix: [outlines what was done during the last meeting]

Jorgen: Firstly, what can be shared publicly needs to be on a guideline, when do the meetings happen, what can be shared with the NGB, where can I find the minutes, who are the other representatives?

Laurens: Agreed.

Felix: So we will draft a document and share it with you guys to make comments.

Advisory roles to the Committee

Felix: explains the issue

James: I think it's a good idea to think about. We should make sure that we don't create positions for people specifically.

Jorgen: Agreed.

Felix: So we will open discussion on the Facebook group and then come back to this issue at a later point.

European Snitch Programme

Laurens: The problem we had was that there wasn't a good European overview on snitches for us to be able to have standards as to the quality of snitches. Mel offered us to use the UK Snitch programme a few meetings ago.

Baptiste: I agree, I spoke with Denis, our Snitch responsible, they proposed to create a European group specifically for this.

James: We do have this process and to restate Mel, would be happy to share it with the other NGBs.

Laurens: We could potentially aim for next half of the season/next season to achieve; maybe have responsables in each respective country to develop snitching there.

Nina: I don't think it is a good idea to give back to individual countries because there are varying degrees of experience and we'd like to send a certain standard.

Laurens: It's not really giving back to countries but rather having a person in each country to do field-tests.

Jakub: Just as an example, the league in Poland is very small and we couldn't provide experienced field testers; would we be able to provide international field testers?

Jorgen: I think we all somewhat agree that it should be centralised in Europe (Committee?). Possibly then in a few years we could decentralise to the individual countries. The current proposal would be to make a group of good snitches to bring together; possibly

with video tests and then give a rating to those snitches.

Laurens (to Jakub's point): I agree with Jorgen on this.

James (to Nina's point): I think there is a difference between training and certifying. We're more talking about the certification process, which would make a lot of sense to have a "committee" for.

Baptiste: I agree with Jorgen and Laurens.

Nina: I agree with James; we wouldn't want individual snitch certifiers per country but centralised.

Laurens: James, if the European group came into being and decided to use a system different to the UK one; how would UK react to this?

James: We would definitely like to have a standardised system, this would need to be worked out.

Laurens: Would it be necessary for (almost) every NGB to have a Snitch in this group?

Jorgen: It should probably be the best Snitches from Europe, so there could be more from one country.

Baptiste: It would be good to have a diverse committee.

Laurens: I think we somewhat all agree on the necessity of such a group and take a vote on that?

Jorgen: Motion to vote on the necessity of a centralised group of snitch certifiers.

Laurens: Second

Vote:

Yes: 6

No: 0

Abstain: QUK

Felix: So Jorgen will make a post to the facebook group and we can have proposals introduced in the next meeting.

European Transfer Policy

Felix: explains the document

James: For people's information: does this need to be approved by either NGB? Who makes the decision.

Jorgen: The point was to have policies in place so people couldn't randomly switch teams for tournaments (EQC qualifications)

Nina: To be honest, I don't see a point why it shouldn't apply in the off-season as well.

Laurens: I believe that this should apply because there are differing notions of "season" in different countries. To Nina: This doesn't apply now because a new season is a new member year.

James: Because this seems to be an issue for qualifiers and EQC it could only apply then.

Felix: The problem is that the first qualifiers are very early, even before the current EQC.

Baptiste: There should be a proper definition of a technical "off-season".

Laurens: Agreed. Also, member sign-up deadlines need to be taken into account.

Jorgen: It doesn't really apply in July because this is mostly play with National teams.

Laurens: It does for insurance reasons in Belgium.

James: What would “membership deadline” mean? E.g. for us it would probably be the day before roster submission for qualifiers.

Baptiste: We could imagine the end of september or middle of october.

Laurens: This transfer technically applies from the moment they’re registered with the NGB, so if they weren’t, they could just transfer freely.

Felix: If we want to talk about an actual timeframe, this should be done with more members present.

Laurens: Maybe there should be a “European Member Season”

James: Something that fits over what many countries are doing would be a good idea; a fixed European member season maybe not so much.

Laurens: It’s not that the NGBs should adapt their season to this but this would define a general “off-season” where transfers are possible.

Nina: Since transfers have to be evaluated on a case-by-case basis, is there no “reason” to be given?

Felix: That could be introduced.

Laurens: Belgium is the only NGB that had already implemented the anti-dual-membership policy.

Rion: Motion to go to a vote on the issue of using a form-based approach with transfer policies.

Jorgen: Second

Yes: France, Belgium, UK, Poland

No: 0

Abstain: Norway, Germany, Spain

Felix: Since there isn’t a clear majority of the committee, I will retract my point and we will decide this at a later date.

Tournament calendar

Laurens: Currently the IQA actually has a calendar to which events can be submitted via email

Felix: Since Jerona isn’t here today, we’ll table this discussion until a later date.

Jorgen: Motion to adjourn the meeting

James: Second

End of meeting: 23:10

