

European Quidditch Congress Meeting

Date: 10th of January 2016

Location: Skype voice

Meeting time: 21:00 CET

In attendance:

Chair: Rebecca Alley

Secretary: Felix Linsmeier

Agenda

1. Introduction
2. Roll Call
3. Developing regions EQC spots
4. Unfilled EQC Committee Positions
5. Any concerns about EQC
6. European Snitch Programme
7. Update on the IQA situation
8. European Transfer Policy
9. Tournament Calendar

Introduction

Roll Call

- Mel Piper - UK
- Nina Heise - Germany
- Jerona Van der Gevel - The Netherlands
- Michele Clabassi - Italy
- Laurens Grinwis Plaat Stultjes - Belgium
- Kai Haugen Shaw - Norway
- Lukas Linser - Austria
- Baptiste Julien Blandet - France
- Rion R. Pena - Spain

Developing regions EQC spots

Rebecca: It needs to be decided how countries express interest. It could be done from scratch or newly introduced. Last year we used a google form, it could be first come first serve or express interest and draw.

Kai: If there are more applicants we could decide based on the "level" of development/potential (also use gform). It's unlikely that there are more than one though.

Felix: Then there would need to be a deadline by which it is announced (if there's more than one).

Baptiste: First come first serve is not really practical.

Laurens: What if two teams from one nation apply?

Kai: The country should decide (between them).

Lukas: Yes they should just send one team.

Jerona: It seems very unlikely but there should be only one.

Nina: It should be established now that only one can be sent because it is not fair to other countries.

Rebecca: So what we can do is draft a form for emerging areas to apply by the end of the week and decide by development if there is more than one.

Jerona: Could we give the option for two teams to merge?

Laurens: It would be legal, because NGBs decide who to send.

Unfilled EQC committee positions

Rebecca: I would like to remind all of you that there are still unfilled positions. Please encourage people to apply!

Baptiste: Where are the positions advertised?

Rebecca: It's on the website.

Any concerns about EQC

Rebecca: Are there any concerns about EQC at this point?

Jerona: We have issues with our qualifier tournament, which will be delayed by 2 or 3 weeks. There hasn't been anything up about applications for extension.

Rebecca: This would be done by the committee.

Baptiste: Are the individual costs known yet?

Rebecca: This would be announced by the tournament committee, please contact them.

Kai: To the netherlands: could not the recent dutch tournament be used to determine the teams?

Jerona: Yes but it would not be representative and wouldn't be fair because people didn't know.

Rebecca: The biggest reason for the deadline is for other teams to be able to step in. It would be reasonable to submit a week or so after the deadline.

Nina: If a team from an NGB drops out can another from the same NGB fill it?

Rebecca: Yes, it's the NGB's to distribute.

Laurens: The deadline is the 15th of February and Andrea has already asked teams and NGBs about their intention to go, so we already know for some. If someone drops out, within two weeks someone from that NGB can fill it, after that it is distributed according to the list.

Rebecca: So the NGBs possibly needing an extension is France and the Netherlands.

Baptiste: We would ask for an extension until the 22nd of February.

Rebecca: Are the other members okay with this?

General yes

Jerona: We can't make an absolute statement so we will need to get back to you.

Rebecca: Would everyone be fine with the Netherlands getting an extension as well, especially since they know that they will be able to fill their spots?

General yes

Laurens: This was brought up in the context of 32/40 teams: it is not clear how we are going to deal with referee numbers (the lack of volunteers)

Rebecca: Check with the tournament committee but it is up to the EQC committee (referee coordinator)

Michele: Does every NGB have way to get referees?

Kai: Yes probably.

Baptiste: Can we ask NGBs to indicate how many refs they could send?

Rebecca: It is a potential solution but up to the EQC committee.

European Snitch programme

Kai: Nina had a suggestion before the meeting.

Nina: The idea was to get a European Snitch Qualification, because there need to be standards within Europe. There was a proposal posted just earlier today.

Rebecca: Were there any other proposals?

Kai: Not that we're aware of.

Rebecca: This would be a good base, it could be discussed and then voted on in the next meeting?

Laurens: Does this mean we would be forego the QUK option?

Rebecca: What do you guys think then how we should proceed? Should there be a subcommittee or discussion.

Kai: This has been discussed several times, a subcommittee would be best.

Rebecca: How does everybody else feel about this?

General approval

Rebecca: We will ask the group for people to be in subcommittees, is there anyone here who would like to volunteer?

Laurens: I can ask our snitch coordinator

Baptiste: I as well

Rebecca: Then please all ask your snitch coordinators to possibly be in the subcommittee.

Update on the IQA situation

Laurens: There have been some things happening, mostly about RB9 tests, which had some issues. Harrison has not been very forthcoming with answers.

Rebecca: What for example?

Laurens: It was mentioned that it would be free but apparently it isn't (15€ for a HR test for member NGBs and 6€ for non-members for AR and SR). There were also some issues with the registraton codes and it is not clear how QUK/USQ certification transfers.

Rebecca: Apparently, for world cup there will equivalency between the certifications. Is there a way for the QUK registry to be published?

Mel: I will look into that.

Rebecca: One of the first things discussed for world cup was a bank account, there is a possibility for the EC to get that bank account after the tournament.

Nina: When is the committee for WC going to be announced?

Rebecca: Hopefully soon.

Laurens: I would also like to hear from people about what they would like to get from the IQA.

Jerona: We have almost given up because it hasn't been very transparent; how money is used etc.

Kai: Mostly the bank account situation; also the late ref test situation.

Rebecca: More structure, a bigger number of people to organise things.

Laurens: I feel like the IQA is currently focussing on the wrong things. Accountability and transparency have been major issues; we're still at the same level as two years ago.

Rebecca: Would people be interested in having a meeting devoted to these issues before the next congress meeting.

General approval

European Transfer Policy

Felix: We didn't reach a consensus last time because people didn't really agree.

Rebecca: How do people feel about using the form-based approach.

Kai: It looks good but needs "team transferring to"

Rebecca: Are there any other comments?

Lukas: I would like to know where the form is going to be posted.

Rebecca: We can implement this form to the website.

Tournament Calendar

Jerona: It would be good to have a shared calendar for events.

Rebecca: We can get this running very easily; there is a way to automate that.

Is there anything else people would like to bring up?

Rebecca: motion to adjourn meeting

Kai: second

End of meeting: 21:32

European Quidditch Congress Meeting

Date: 24th of January 2016

Location: Skype voice

Meeting time: 20:55 CET

In attendance: Yeray Espinosa Cuevas, Nina Heise, Laurens Grinwis Plaat Stultjes, Jagoda Sadecka, Marc Garganté, Melanie Piper, Baptiste Julien Blandet, Jorgen Helgeland Stenlokk, Michele Clabassi, Chris Daw (Applicant for IQA Board of Trustees, part of the meeting), Nicholas Oughtibridge (Applicant for IQA Board of Trustees, part of the meeting), Karen Kumaki (Applicant for IQA Board of Trustees, part of the meeting)

Chair: Rebecca Alley

Secretary: Felix Linsmeier

Agenda

1. Chris Daw - speaking from 21:00CET - 21:10CET
2. Nicholas Oughtibridge - speaking from 21:15CET - 21:25CET
3. Karen Kumaki - speaking from 21:30CET - 21:40CET
4. Alicia Radford [possible]
5. Expectations for the IQA going forward

Chris Daw

Chris: [introduces himself, works for Quidditch Canada, member of several committees affiliated with the IOC/IPC, has refurbished and sold several companies]

Jorgen: How did you find out about Quidditch Canada/Quidditch in general.

Chris: I am often approached to help develop sports. I believe that Quidditch has a lot of potential and can become a household name.

Michele: What do you think Quidditch needs to do better to become a “legitimate” sport?

Chris: It already is, but needs to establish itself on a major level. There needs to be marketing and educating to alleviate the notion of a “Harry Potter” sport.

Rebecca: What is your favourite part of Quidditch so far?

Chris: The people. I have encountered a great amount of different people with different agendas. With this particular sport, there seems to be more openness and inclusivity.

Mel: Where do you see Quidditch internationally and as a sport in a year/5 years?

Chris: Very soon, proper representation of the sport on an international level, as well as before the International Olympic Committee. In the future, there might be the opportunity to approach the COC to become at least a demonstration sport.

Jorgen.

Chris: I pride myself on identifying conflicts of interest, recusing myself when necessary. I have had to do this even with Quidditch Canada in the past. Furthermore, the institution of

in-camera-discussions is an example of this, where I've had to remove myself from the discussion because of a conflict of interest position.

Rebecca: Thank you very much for giving us your time.

Nicholas Oughtibridge

Nicholas: [introduces himself, works in IT in the Health sector, used to be an active member of the scouting movement]

Mel: Where would you like to see Quidditch in one year/5 years.

Nicholas: Within the UK, within 5 years, Quidditch could be ready to become recognised by the Sports Council, where then there would be opportunities to public funding, taking the sport to "mainstream society"

Laurens: Could you elaborate on what you mean by "mainstream" and university teams?

Nicholas: Obviously, my experience comes mainly from UK Quidditch; I do have experience on the international level, where I was able to establish an international standard.

Rebecca: From your past experience, what kind of skill would you say you possess that might aid you in the establishment of quidditch?

Nicholas: Not much in the context of sport but I consider myself to be a consensus builder, which is crucial in order to find international agreement. I think I am able to make committees run. The Board of Trustees is not meant to run the IQA but rather to steer the actual Board of Directors in the right direction in borderline cases.

Karen Kumaki

Karen: [introduces herself, was International Manager, helped creating the new IQA]

Mel: Where would you like to see Quidditch in 1 year/5 years.

Karen: Within a year there finally needs to be the incorporation of the IQA. Responsibilities and committees need to be clarified and the members be made aware of their power. In the long term, I would like to see a more steady progression of events; Quidditch needs to start thinking about the bigger picture (grants, organisation etc.); in general be more steady and reliable

Marc: How do you think the board of trustees should work? What can you personally bring to the table?

Karen: I do not pretend to know much about board work, I will do research. I think that discussion needs to be public and transparent. First of all the best approach to bringing the IQA forward needs to be found out. Personally, I would like to represent the smaller regions.

Alper: What do you think of Quidditch becoming a recognised sport?

Karen: I do not see Quidditch be recognised on an international level (by intl. bodies) within 5 years. While I would like to see it happen eventually, I think we first need to establish ourselves.

Discussion of candidates

Laurens: After hearing the interviews, they seem to be quite different and I am not sure whether it would work out.

Rebecca: It would seem that Karen's responses are very similar to Chris' (in spite of Karen's lack of experience)

Marc: I would say that it would be a good thing to have very different players on the board of trustees can help bring in more than one perspective and take account of more things.

Rebecca: Nicholas and Chris have very different viewpoints (one more social, one more business), which might be very interesting.

Expectations for the IQA going forward

Rebecca: Where would you like to see the IQA in the future/have it direct its energy.

Jorgen: I feel like the first priority is for the IQA to figure out its responsibilities and goals, which then are worked towards. A good organisation will represent Quidditch internationally.

As NGBs, we should be cooperative with the IQA and support them as good as we can.

Rebecca: There should be clear goal as to how NGBs can support the IQA specifically.

Baptiste: I agree, it is currently not clear. It would be good for the congress to develop such best practices for NGBs though. We would specifically like to have certification be made available in different languages.

Laurens: I would like to talk about IQA communication. There have been issues in communicating goals to the NGBs. I would propose that the IQA notify NGBs several days before making decisions public to facilitate questions from individuals.

Michele: There should be a clear and public definition of roles within the IQA. Furthermore, the constitution should be worded unambiguously for interpretation to be clear. There should also be bylaws to address the interaction between roles and committees.

Marc: I don't have any specific points, but there should be a clear definition of bounds for people not to overstep them (a system of accountability).

Yeray: We would like to see better communication and for systems to work how they are supposed to.

Alper: We would like to have established official channels for questions to be asked and to be able to expect an answer within a specific timeframe. We would also to stress the non-profit nature of the sport and we would not like to see the IQA go down the corporate road.

Jagoda: We don't currently have a policy towards the IQA since we are still working on establishing the polish association.

Rebecca: Is there anything the IQA could help you?

Jagoda: Unfortunately not.

Nina: Especially communication is a major problem. Especially with Harrison, there seems to be a difference in philosophy, where some people might see congress to be a hinderance and democracy as a hassle.

Mel: The congress needs to be completely restructured because it does not currently work properly; only a certain number of people get a say. There should be a hierarchy between the actors for decisions to be able to be made.

Baptiste: We think that all NGBs should be represented in the IQA.

Michele: This is a long-term proposal, if possible, the IQA should help organisations get off the ground fit for an actual sport.

Rebecca: Accountability and responsibility has already been worked on by the EC. It would be good to get input on all issues from different countries to facilitate diversity and a democratic approach (which means that representative actually speak out).

Felix: The democratic process should be advertised more for people to be able to approach their representative.

Rebecca: If minutes are published, there could be a summary being made available for

easier reading. Members of the EC should approach the IQA and bring proposals forward about roles etc.

Rebecca: Another thing is communication, we should lead by example. If the IQA sends out e-mails, they should be replied to promptly.

Rebecca: What could NGBs do in order to make the IQA enforce their own regulations?

Felix: Let people go who are not adhering to regulations.

Rebecca: Yes but for this to work there needs to be a clearly established responsibility.

Accountability should be brought up at the IQA meetings. There are 11 nations in QE,

Europe can start discussion on issues.

Michele: It is also important what to do outside of meetings. It is hugely important to work as a subcommittee of the IQA as well as internal matters of QE.

Rebecca: People need to engage in discussion within the congress.

Jorgen: A proactive solution to the communication problem is a mutual agreement on e-mail response time.

Rebecca: We will draft a document about effective feedback to be read and ratified during the next few days.

END OF MEETING: 22:15

European Quidditch Congress Meeting

Date: 10th of January 2016

Location: Skype voice

Meeting time: 21:00 CET

In attendance: Mel Piper (UK), Lukas Linser (Austria), Jørgen Stenløkk (Norway), Alper Erişen (Turkey), Jagoda Sadecka (Poland), Yeray Espinosa Cuevas (Spain), Laurens Grinwis Plaat Stultjes (Belgium), Nina Heise (Germany)

Chair: Rebecca Alley

Secretary: Felix Linsmeier

Agenda

1. Introduction
2. Roll Call
3. Board of Trustees vote
4. Congress Restructuring Proposal
5. European Snitch Programme Sub-Committee

6. Terms of Responsibility

7. Feedback/Goal Setting

Board of Trustees Vote

Rebecca: Apparently, some members are refusing to vote due to mistrust in the IQA. Please vote, because this would actually be a step in the right direction.

Congress Restructuring Proposal

Mel: From experience, the IQA congress does not work efficiently, very few countries contribute and are actually involved. Restructuring would give more power to regional committees that could discuss specific issues and then send a representative to the IQA congress to facilitate the democratic process.

Rebecca: Congress would still exist and approve decisions but the discussion would be shifted towards the committees.

Felix: Would the representative give an actual representation of votes, so the vote wouldn't be skewed?

Rebecca: The vote would still be carried out by all representatives.

Jorgen: Wouldn't this take away from the actual discussion process (especially between continents)

Mel: There would be somewhat of a manager facilitating discussion.

Alper: What about regions like Uganda?

Rebecca: They don't really fit but there would still be benefits to implementing this.

European Snitch Programme Sub-committee

Rebecca: This is about the Sub-Committee that Jorgen would chair and bring decisions to the EC. Who has people (Snitch coordinators) interested in joining?

Jorgen: It would be good to invite people who are not part of an NGB, e.g. good Snitches.

Felix: Could we put out an open call for the membership on this committee?

Jorgen: That sounds reasonable.

Rebecca: There should be about 3-4 people working on the process and then there could be more people in on the decision process for actual snitch certification. Jorgen, would you be willing to create an application form?

Jorgen: Yes.

Terms of Responsibility

Rebecca: This refers to the document introduced several meetings ago. It will be presented by Mel at the next congress meeting. Please look it over and give input until next week so it could be corrected.

Feedback/Goal Setting

Rebecca: This was posted several days ago. Not many people have read it so far, please do so soon. It is very important to be able to give good feedback with regards to the future of the IQA and what they are supposed to work on so it is crucial that people go through it.

END OF MEETING: 21:51 CET

European Quidditch Congress Meeting

Date: 21/02/16

Location: Skype Voice

Meeting Time: 21:00 CET

In attendance: Rion Pena (Spain), Nina Heise (Germany), Laurens Grinwis Plaat Stultjes (Belgium), Melanie Piper, Jørgen Helgeland Stenløkk (Norway), Jakub Siemiatkowski (Poland), Jacopo Sartori (EQC Committee, part of the meeting)

Chair: Rebecca Alley

Secretary: Felix Linsmeier

Agenda

1. Introduction
2. Roll Call
3. EQC Update
4. IQA "Responding to queries"-letter
5. Application for Snitches

EQC Update

Baptiste: Just as information we currently have 3 teams who are guaranteed to go but the next 3 are unconfirmed.

Felix: [shares the budget and takes questions]

Rebecca: Are there any other questions to Felix or Jacopo?

IQA "Responding to queries"-letter

Rebecca: Motion to go out of camera.

Felix: Second

Rebecca: This point was brought forward by Jorgen.

Jorgen: This is regarding the letter about response time. It hasn't been sent yet because Michele wanted to have it approved by the Committee. We will upload it to the group and ask for approval.

Application for Snitches

Rebecca: There are some questions to be answered, the first one being whether the Snitch sub-committee will be in charge of setting the framework or also rating snitches.

Jorgen: Both could work. It would be practical to have the people stay on after creating the framework and then progressively move to a different makeup.

Laurens: I agree.

Rebecca: I would say that it would be preferable to have people set up the framework and then have a different group to rate snitches as there are different skillsets involved here.

Rion: I agree with Rebecca.

Felix: Since the setup group is already made up of Snitch coordinators, could the positions not at least be offered to them?

Jorgen: If the group is mainly composed of Snitch coordinators, I would prefer a different group to actually rate.

Rebecca: So it would be good to establish a group for the set-up of the rating system and then have a different group trusted with the rating process.

Jorgen: How would that group be chosen?

Rebecca: It would make sense to allow the set-up group to select the rating group.

Proposition: "The Snitch Rating Program committee will create the rating procedure and levels for snitches within Europe and once the program is approved by the European Committee, the SRP committee will hire people to rate snitches throughout Europe." We will draw up a terms of responsibility for the Snitch group and introduce it during the next meeting.

Felix: Motion to adjourn meeting.

Rebecca: Second.

End of meeting: 21:56 CET

European Quidditch Congress Meeting

Date: 13/03/16

Location: Skype Voice

Meeting Time: 21:00 CET

In attendance: Jagoda Sadecka (Poland), Lukas Linser (Austria), James Burnett (UK), Yeray Espinosa (Spain), Nina Heise (Germany), Laurens Grinwis Plaat Stultjes (Belgium), Baptiste Julien Blandet (France), Bram Vries (The Netherlands)

Chair: Rebecca Alley

Secretary: Felix Linsmeier

Agenda

- 1) European regulation on Jewelry (Mel Piper)
- 2) European regulation on tournaments and rosters (Laurens)
- 3) European Transfer Follow-Up (Rebecca & Felix)
- 4) Intra-NGB transfer policy (Rebecca)
- 5) Membership on the European Committee going forward - emerging areas vs. active participation (Laurens)
- 6) European Snitch Programme (Rebecca)

Roll Call

European Regulation on Jewelry

James: This is no rule change but more of a clarification. The jewelry rules are not abided with very well currently, which is dangerous and people should be aware. We have compiled an FAQ for this and could share it with everyone.

Baptiste: I agree with James about it being very dangerous. There should be a unified regulation.

Laurens: It's a good idea to unify the regulations, but too late for this year's EQC. It would be a good policy to adopt for the next season.

Rebecca: Would it be acceptable to implement a policy like this to the already existing tournament regulations and using it starting next season?

James: It is not so much a policy but the rules in general. There doesn't need to be a policy for it because it is already in the rulebook.

Baptiste: It would be too late to implement this for next season, because injuries because of this at EQC would be our responsibilities.

James: I personally agree that even taped jewelry is dangerous; on the other hand there have been no injuries in the past as well. The main issue is reminding people of the rules set in the rulebook.

Rebecca: Are there any proposals at this time?

James: Was this decision by the EQC committee done after lengthy discussion or just adopted from last year?

Laurens: It was adopted.

James: In that case it wouldn't be too intrusive to ask the EQC committee to change it due to concerns.

James: Motion to vote on suggesting an amendment to the jewelry policy for EQC.

Jagoda: Second

Vote

Yes: Unanimous

No: -

Rebecca: That passes, we will talk to the EQC committee to suggest a change.

European regulation on tournaments and rosters

Laurens: In two weeks there will be the Waffle Cup in Belgium. We endorsed this, but there was a merc-policy adopted that we do not agree with. We were wondering if it would be good to adopt a European regulation on official tournaments and the merc situation at those tournaments.

Baptiste: For France, this is not an official tournament and thus no full teams should be required.

Laurens: What we're looking for is a unified regulation on what is or isn't an official tournament.

James: I'm not sure if this is something the European Committee should weigh in on this; EQC is the only tournament that is officially held by the committee. The ability to regulate rosters at a European level does make sense but it is not clear whether Europe has anything to say about local tournaments. We would be happy to supply rosters to verify lineups but it should be up to the organisers to check/the responsibility of the NGB to enforce their regulations on tournament standards.

Nina: We agree with this.

Baptiste: In France, we communicate in advance what the regulation is for official tournaments, whether or not no mercs are allowed.

Laurens: The problem is that a "European" official tournament is not defined. As soon as it crosses a border, it concerns every participating NGB, thus a unified regulation would be good.

James: From a QUK point of view, it doesn't matter whether teams are taking official/non-official tournaments to tournaments abroad. There is a dichotomy between "official" status and teams not being able to field teams when travelling abroad.

Baptiste: From France's view, it is up to the organisers of the tournament to determine the status.

Laurens: For us it is also about representation; random mercs at official tournaments might make NGBs, tournaments and ultimately teams look bad.

James: We don't recognise foreign tournaments in our rankings so they do not affect us in a big way. An international definition would make sense and it would also mean that NGBs cooperate more.

Lukas: We would be in agreement with exchanging rosters for tournaments. It seems somewhat exaggerated to unify regulation across Europe as this could be left to the organisers.

Bram: Official policies might not be necessary yet, especially as NGBs start up and need competition (with possibly differing rosters).

Rebecca: At this point it seems like consensus that NGBs can exchange rosters for tournaments.

James: I would suggest that a specific contact within the NGB be appointed to check rosters for official tournaments.

Rebecca: We would ask that each NGB nominate one person to be the person to communicate rosters with to NGBs.

European Transfer Follow-Up

Laurens: Is the transfer document implemented yet?

Rebecca: We will embed it in the website.

Baptiste: Could you explain the issue?

Rebecca: This is the implementation of our regulation about contacting NGBs about transfers. We have created a form for people to contact both NGBs, which makes it more accessible to people.

Intra-NGB transfer policy

Rebecca: This is about the vote that was taken a while ago to stop people from transferring between teams. This does not apply to NGBs who already have a regulation that abide by European regulations.

Membership on the European Committee going forward - emerging areas vs. active participation

Laurens: We currently have issues with NGBs, currently mainly Ireland who participate in very few things. What actually are the requirements to be a member of the committee?

Rebecca: This goes back to discussions in the IQA congress to connect emerging areas more easily with their neighbours.

Baptiste: Communication is key in this issue.

Felix: Should there be some sort of provision for only emerging areas to be recognised as members?

Laurens: We agree and it is clear that any region "under the wing" of the IQA should be on the committee.

James: Is there any issue with using "emerging area" as qualification?

Felix: There is no real issue, it no clear "exit"-qualifications have been defined.

Laurens: In general, IQA-membership in some capacity should be the requirement for membership.

James: There should be more nuance than just IQA-membership, especially since there are naturally varying degrees of development.

Felix: Can there be a provision for the committee where membership (even if only emerging) is requirement for attendance and participation?

James: It would certainly not be hard for a region to become emerging and it would probably be a good indicator of activity.

Baptiste: Could there be a meeting every three months for emerging areas to be introduced?

Rebecca: I would like to remind the group that new members (also emerging) will be given a welcome document which gives an outline of all policies, meeting minutes and important remarks.

Bram: We agree with Belgium.

Laurens: Some NGBs might choose not to affiliate with the IQA because of policies already implemented. Are we required to enforce them?

Rebecca: There could always be a provision for leniency towards emerging areas.

We will put definitions for emerging areas and their situation within the European Committee into our terms of responsibility.

European Snitch Programme

Rebecca: There was a document posted a few hours ago. One of the more crucial points: no more than x members from the same NGB. What do people think about this?

James: This was first tabled on the last meeting I attended. I seem to remember that it was decided that a cap would not make sense due to very concentrated proficiency in certain countries.

Rebecca: We will go back and check with past meetings.

Baptiste: It would be good to limit it to a low number, around two members, to facilitate discussion and diversity.

James: There should be a provision in the document for the chair to make sure that diversity is encouraged.

Rebecca: It has already been outlined that this subcommittee would be standing and public; this would mean that it would remain after the establishment of the programme to evaluate the process. We will not vote on this this meeting, it will be fixed for phrasing and be voted in one of the next sessions/online.

James: Motion to adjourn meeting

Bram: Second

END OF MEETING 22:45 CET

European Quidditch Congress Meeting

Date: April 10, 2016

Location: Skype voice

Meeting time: 21:00 CET

In attendance: Mel Piper-QUK, Jerona - MQN, Yeray Espinosa - AQE, Marc Garganté - AQC, Laurens Grinwis Plaat Stultjes - BQF, Baptiste - FQF, Jørgen Stenløkk - NRF, Nina Heise - DQB

Chair: Rebecca Alley

Acting Secretary: Jørgen Stenløkk

Agenda

1. Introduction
2. Roll Call
3. EQC 2016
4. European Snitch Program
5. EQC 2017

EQC 2016

Laurens: We're in the final step of the scheduling (printing stuff and making the official schedules). Ref schedule is a bit behind.

Jørgen: Hopefully it will be out in a couple days.

Marc: Will there be livestreaming?

Laurens: Technical resources are there, but not enough staff. We don't have people dedicated to livestream.

Baptiste: Is there wifi?

Laurens: There should be.

Jørgen: I have my doubts. But the committee will have internet access (3G). There will not be livetweeting, just tweets with score updates after every timeslot.

Nina arrives.

Nina: Can a team have a banner with commercials for a political party? We have a team that's being sponsored.

Yeray: We should not let people have political commercials.

Nina: People outside of quidditch will see pictures. Do we want the sports to be associated with any religious or political party?

Bex: What if a team gets sponsored by KKK or similar. (Extreme example).

Mel: We should say "no" this EQC, and have a proper discussion before next time.

Nina: As the team is representing Germany, they will not be allowed by the DQB to do it. But should we have international regulations on it?

Laurens: In Belgium, you can't represent "bad" stuff on the team.

Bex: We'll talk more about this later, when people had some time (after EQC) to think.

European Snitch Program

Bex: Jørgen is too busy to be a chair. Does anyone else want to chair?

Baptiste: I can do it. I feel it's a very important program.

Bex: *Reads a short summary of the Terms of Responsibility (for the chair)*

Baptiste: That sounds good. I can do it.

Bex: Jørgen, can you have a short meeting with Baptiste after EQC and update him on what you've done?

Jørgen: Yeah, I can do that.

Bex: Let's get the application form up before our next meeting in two weeks.

Baptiste: Sounds good.

EQC2017

Bex: Do you feel you got enough info from the application? I and Felix can let you have a look over it before it going live this year.

Baptiste: I feel it's good if we get a lot of options to choose from. In France, we have a challenge going for people to organise the French Cup or EQC. Another point: The situation of competition: Before announcing the winning bid, it's important to check if the bid location is easily accessible. Also important for Visa.

Bex: But is the form applying to host good enough?

Baptiste: It's important to have a good and logical deadline for the EQC bid application.

Jørgen: Is this just about the location application? Or committee members?

Bex: Just location bid. I'll tweak the dates in last years application process and release it on the group and you can all have a look over it.

End of april - Bid application process released.

July 31st - Deadline for applications

August - Select bid

September - Hire committee members

End of meeting: 21:38 CET

European Quidditch Congress Extraordinary Meeting

Date: 24/04/16

Location: Skype Voice

Meeting Time: 21:00 CET

In attendance: Lukas Linser (Austria), Yeray Espinosa (Spain), Alper Erişen (Turkey), Laurens Grinwis Plaat Stultjes (Belgium), Bram Vries (The Netherlands), Jagoda Sadecka (Poland), Baptiste Julien Blandet (France)

Chair: Rebecca Alley

Secretary: Felix Linsmeier

Discussion about the positive and negative points taken from EQC 2016

Review from EQC Com (briefing by Felix):

- Nonplaying tournament director
- Some members of committee taking on more/unequal amounts of work
- Split up roles to ensure people have reasonable amounts of work (esp for playing members)
 - PITCHES - ideally find sports complex in the future; that has experience with sports events and understands what tournaments will need.
 - This year: expectations not properly established with hotel but also they weren't sure how to deal with such a large event
 - In future, go with something that it's established what kind of event they're dealing with regardless of cost
- Miscommunication
 - Solution = nonplaying TD, ideally with nonplaying ATD: very aware of responsibility and able to delegate and communicate effectively.
- People on committee and stepping up: some members did far more than scope of role; in the future go for nonplaying staff where possible to ensure people can take on the roles they're supposed to do -- do what's in the job description.
- Refs: in general, refereeing should be incentivized/NGB's should try to get more players to certify and train as refs; necessary for growth of sport and future events.
- Requirement for translation before we decide on place; requirement for local NGB to support translation through volunteers. Options: More translators, or hold event somewhere that people (esp medics) are sure to speak English
- Big takeaway is that in the future, no venue that has direct economic interest -- Sarteano had tourism, reputation, but didn't get direct economic benefit but the hotel defs did. Establish expectations off the bat.
- Other concerns are definitely there but they are for organizing committee more so than European Committee.

Rebecca: What would be changes that should be made to the bid package?

Jorgen: There should be a requirement to document playing surfaces in the bid package.

Rebecca: On top of that, there should be a "motivation letter" from the venue hosting this

Laurens: I don't think this is an issue if the venue has the proper facilities.

Rebecca: The issue of a non-playing TD, I have made a suggestion to have a TD who applies alongside a bid.

Jorgen: Since we made substantial profits there could be travel reimbursement/payment for the TD.

Bram: If this is done, it should be announced as soon as possible to encourage people.

Felix: In my personal opinion, organisers should not be too involved with a venue before the actual process to keep them from making "compromises".

Lukas: I agree, there should be someone who is actually passionate.

Laurens: I'm on both sides of this issue, there definitely should be someone on the venue side as advisor.

Rebecca: So a new committee role that has an advisory status? Thus the TD would not necessarily have to be local.

Felix: The TD should also have to make reports to the EC at congress meetings.

Review by members of the European Committee (document attached)

Rebecca: One of the most important takeaways from this is clearing up the pitch situation beforehand.

Alper: What can we do when pitches aren't ready prior to the tournament.

Jorgen: Some of the money should be used to scout pitches beforehand. Teams scouting would theoretically be enough but they need to be informative.

Laurens: Another point to make is that local teams are used to conditions there, so a scout from somewhere else would be important as well.

Rebecca: In this sense, the TD should be picked before the bid? Or could the representative to the EC take on the scouting?

Alper: It may be too much to ask from a committee representative.

Rebecca: Could it be someone from that NGB in general?

Bram: The NGB rep should be able to appoint someone from their NGB.

Alper: When releasing bid package, this information should be included so venues are prepared for visits.

Alper: How was the registration procedure for this year's EQC?

Jorgen: All teams had to present their waivers, rosters and numbers.

Rebecca: There were problems with volunteers; volunteers didn't show up where they were supposed to.

Laurens: A lot of volunteers left the field for hotel facilities.

Jorgen: Also this lack of volunteers is due to the changed schedule.

Rebecca: It might also be useful to have a European requirement for volunteers (especially AR/SR) at the beginning of the season.

Jorgen: This is a fair point. HRs shouldn't be required to maintain quality (this was also not a problem during the tournament)

Rebecca: There could also be a block-Referee requirement (i.e. Team X supplies an entire ref team)

Bram: This can work but the quality of reffing might be an issue.

Felix: Also, with ref "blocks", bias might be a bigger issue.

Rebecca: There should still be some sort of ref requirements.

Bram: Agreed, but they should be mixed up.

Lukas: Agreed, ref requirements should be in place.

Rebecca: So people seem to be fine with X number of refs to be required before national championships.

Rebecca: Something that concerns the EC is a proposed longer bidding process; and communication in general.

Rebecca: In general, is there interest in having a domain for EQC?

Alper: I have talked to Maria from the IQA about a subdomain.

Rebecca: Since the IQA doesn't have a bank account and proper facilities yet, this is doubtful.

Rebecca: Lack of Wifi on pitch was an issue (livetweets/livestream).

Laurens: This should be included in the bid package, it was promised this year but not fulfilled.

Lukas: There should be a media contact on the committee to maintain live coverage.

Alper: There should be clear consequences for not delivering on their promises.

Rebecca: Clear contracts with the venue should be drafted for next year.

Jorgen: Apparently USQ had a buddy-filming programme, where teams would have their games filmed in return to film games for other teams.

Rebecca: The biggest decision in the misc section is the number of teams to be reset to 32.

Jorgen: It would be easier to find volunteers, easier to organise, easier to find a venue; it's easier to allocate space etc...

Rebecca: This should be discussed with the full committee very soon.

Felix: Motion to adjourn meeting

Jorgen: Second

END OF MEETING: 22:32 CEST

European Quidditch Congress Meeting

Date: 15/05/16

Location: Skype Voice

Meeting Time: 21:00 CEST

In attendance: Mel Piper (QUK), Jørgen Helgeland Stenløkk (NRF), Baptiste Julien Blandet (FQF), Jagoda Sadecka (PLQ), Lukas Linser (QAT), Laurens Grinwis Plaat Stultjes (BQF), Alper Erişen (QD), Yeray Espinosa (AQE), Nina Heise (DQF)

Chair: Rebecca Alley

Acting secretary: Jørgen Helgeland Stenløkk

Agenda

- 1) EQC Budget** (if possible to have Felix call in)
- 2) EQC Discussion** (only if someone has anything to address)
- 3) Unified stance on harassment/implementing a system** (everyone)
- 4) European Snitch Programme Update** (Baptiste)
- 5) Equipment Loan to the IQA** (Rebecca wearing World Cup hat)
- 6) Executive Manager** (Rebecca)

EQC Budget

[Tabled due to Felix not being present. The budget will be made public before the next meeting in our Facebook group.]

EQC Discussion

Bex: We have no bids yet, but there's still a long time until the deadline.

Baptiste: 2 points. First of all, the Titans have gotten a lot of media coverage, which is good for coverage. Second point: Discussion for rules of transfers. This needs to be checked better next year, as France thinks several countries were too lenient of transfers/mercs.

Laurens: What do you define as an illegal transfer:

Baptiste: We observed that several players played for teams at EQC this year that was not their actual team.

Laurens: I think you might be confusing this with the ruling that allowed for merc players. I know two French teams, and other teams, used mercs.

Baptiste: I'll investigate the matter further, but I believe the cases I saw were not mercs.

Bex: Some players probably didn't see it as a problem as they switched between their 2nd team and their main team.

Laurens: A possible solution could be that EC demands that all members NGBs have an individual membership policy. Then we can have these roster list available for EQC, and compare them to each teams NGB-roster.

Bex: Who would do these checks?

Laurens: Every member NGB could have access to this database. Also, the Gameplay Coordinator for EQC could do all these checks. This database could also be used when it comes to transfers between NGBs (and teams).

Baptiste: One database for all the teams in Europe is a good idea.

Jørgen: One person should have the ultimate responsibility for the database.

Alper: A database is a good idea, but it's a lot of work. We already have problems keeping the overview of our own players in Turkey. Also, if NGBs doesn't follow the rules for rosters for EQC, they'd also not follow the rules for transfers.

Laurens: If the NGB-person who checks the roster, plays for the team he is checking, he could "cheat" the system, and claim that a player plays for a team which is not his actual team.

Mel: Every NGB should have a stringent transfer policy. Then we don't need this database.

Yeray: [didn't catch this point]

Alper: We should evaluate these problem cases [initially brought up by Baptiste] on a case-by-case basis.

Yeray: [clarification on previous point]: Some NGBs doesn't have a transfer policy, which makes it really hard to follow transfer policies.

Baptiste: Eg. in France we don't have transfer policies. The EC does have a transfer policy in place, but people didn't follow it. This policy is supposed to apply for any country who doesn't have their own policy.

Nina Heise joins the meeting

Bex: Summary:

Idea number 1: Create database with all rosters, and trust the NGBs to update it.

Idea number 2: Every NGB should have transfer policies, and make sure these are being followed strictly.

Idea number 3: Transfers and problems related to rosters should be judged on a case-by-case basis.

Who would want to be in charge of the roster database?

Laurens: Hire new staff.

Bex: Take it back to your NGBs, audit internally and see if policies exist AND are being followed to the letter, and we'll come back to it at a later point.

Unified stance on harassment/implementing a system

Laurens: It was previously established that all NGBs needs to have a form on their website where people can submit harassment, etc. There are no requirements on what we need to do as a follow up. What if players harass someone from another NGB?

Jørgen: Eg., if a Norwegian player harasses a Belgian player, BQF can't directly punish the Norwegian player in any way.

Bex: What do you do in a harassment situation?

Mel: We take statements from all sides involved. I feel both NGBs needs to be involved somehow (meeting, mails, etc).

Bex: What do you do in a harassment situation?

Alper: The board decides if there needs to be a disciplinary hearing. If there is a need for one, a disciplinary committee is formed. If they feel there is a need for punishment, there will be one.

Laurens: There should be an internal statement somewhere, where it says "if this happens, do this".

Alper: The policies from each NGB should be the one that goes into effect when a player gets a complaint. (So if a German player harasses someone, the German policies should go into effect against this player.)

Laurens: No NGB should contact the team they received a complaint about, but contact the NGB instead.

Bex: Should we make this into a policy? I'll draft it up. Any other points?

Laurens: Say a Turkish player is being harassed by a German player. Should the Turkish or German policies go into effect?

Jørgen: The German policies, as Turkey shouldn't be able to punish German players as they see fit.

Jørgen: The EC should have an appeals committee, if two NGBs disagree on the punishment for a harassment instance.

Bex: Then this committee can be an impartial and help the NGBs come to a solution.

Alper: The EC does not have the authority to ban a player from player quidditch, just from playing at international events eg. EQC.

Marc: This is all internal procedures, I don't see how legality is involved?

Bex: If a player was raped at EQC, this should go to the police and not to us, so that's relevant to legality.

Marc: But in this case I feel the EC should be allowed to ban the player from the sport all together.

Laurens: EC could and should be able to ban a player from international play, but can't ban a player from playing in a single country.

Bex: I'll add this into the policy I'm writing.

European Snitch Programme Update

Baptiste: Application form was created by Jørgen. 6 people applied. Selected 3 people from these: Christoph (Austria) , Marco (Italia), Kamil (Turkey). Waiting for answers for the first meeting.

Bex: Do you have access to the proposals for the snitch rating groups? [(1) QUK and (2) DQF proposal]

Baptiste: If you could send them over, that would be great.

Baptiste: The 3 applicants that were not selected, will be invited to test out the rating procedures.

Laurens: Can people still apply to join the programme?

Jørgen: No, the deadline is over.

Jørgen: When do you think you'll be ready to make the rating public?

Baptiste: If people answers my emails quickly, I'm hoping to have it done at the start of July. We could decide to publish the rating in October or September, the latest.

Bex: It's important to focus on quality over finishing fast.

Equipment Loan to the IQA

Bex: QE owns a lot of stuff left over after EQC. What does the IQA need to do to borrow this equipment.

Jørgen: EC is a subcommittee of the IQA, so the IQA should just get to borrow it for free.

Also, it'll just cost more money for the players if you need to buy it.

Alper: Equipment was already included in the WC-budget though?

Baptiste: Do you have a list of the equipment needed?

Bex:

4 scoreboards

4 snatch shorts

4 sets ref cards

8 whistles

all the walkie talkies

1 megaphone

Bex: So it's fine if we borrow this for free?

Jørgen, Mel, Nina, Baptiste: Yes

Laurens: Another point: Roster deadline is tonight. Matthew doesn't reply to emails, and I need to know the answer to what I asked a week ago. Can we drop a photographer or something to get an official "team medic"?

Bex: I'll check with Matthew, but it seems like it would be fine although there would be limits on scope of "team medic".

Jørgen: I'm wondering the same, please give me the answer as well. Also, your PDF where we were supposed to fill in rosters, is not editable.

Executive Manager

Bex: I have very little free time in the coming 8-12 months. I need to get a job, and I'm in placements. I feel I'm not doing all the work I should be doing for this committee. If you guys would rather have someone else in the committee, so we can make more cool stuff happen (like tournament stats on the webpage/calendar/etc), I'll be fine with stepping down.

Jørgen: I feel your doing a good job, and for small stuff (like tournament stats) we should hire other staff, because I feel it's not really your job anyway.

Baptiste: I feel your doing a good job too. For me it's not necessary to change the Executive Manager, but we could hire more people to relieve you of some work.

Bex: Putting out a job offer for a web-responsible person would make me and Felix very happy.

Jørgen: Why don't we just talk about a new position (or more) now, so we can get that process started?

Bex: There's several pages on the webpage that's hidden at the moment, because they don't look pretty and aren't complete. A calendar would be cool.

Jørgen: I'm pretty sure the IQA web director wants more tournaments on the IQA calendar.

Laurens: Can confirm.

Bex: Should we get a web-director then?

Jørgen: If the webpage can be better, then that would be cool.

Baptiste: I like the idea.

Bex: I feel they don't have to be at the meeting.

Jørgen: No, they shouldn't. We're talking about non-public info on our meetings, so they shouldn't be there.

Bex: Who is responsible for the web-developed?

Jørgen: Makes sense that the Executive Manager represents the EC well when it comes to talking to staff.

Bex: Should this person also be responsible for the social media?

Nina: This could work, but also needs a different skillset, so it won't necessarily work out.

Bex: I'll make a job description and post it in the group.

Meeting ends 22:21 CEST.

European Quidditch Congress Meeting

Date: 12/06/16

Location: Skype Voice

Meeting Time: 21:00 CEST

In attendance:

Chair: Rebecca Alley

Secretary:

Agenda

1. EQC 17 Update
2. EQC 16 Budget
 - a. Utilisation of funds
 - b. Deposit of the profits
 - c. General & Questions
3. European Snitch Program
4. Competition regulations 2016-2017 season
 - a. A and B teams
5. EQC bids?
6. EQC spot allocation
7. Complaint/harassment policy
8. Web person

Roll Call

Jørgen Helgeland Stenløkk - NRF

Marc Garganté- AQC

Nina Heise - DQB

Yeray Espinosa Cuevas - AQE

Laurens Grinwis Plaat Stultjes - BQF

Jagoda Sadecka - PLQ

Baptiste Blandet - FQF

Alper Erisen - QD

EQC 17 Update

EQC 16 Budget

Felix: Financially successful tournament despite other issues, we planned for worst case and tournament committee did a good job of that. Merch was included in first budget rather than putting it in after the fact and trying to figure out how to pay for it, in terms of what was purchased/how supplies were handled it was good. Turkish suppliers for shirts and trading cards, were very affordable and sold for a good profit. We now have surplus of 3385.87EUR -- 3185 merch profit; surplus of incidentals which makes up the other amount. Budgetary surplus of ~200EUR. Overall we can't complain, money now is property of Quidditch Europe, we can pay for things if we want them.

General rundown: would like to make suggestions of utilization of money. We've got 3385.87, it's not actually as much as it sounds like when you go through what we can/probably should do. This year we worked with about 1800 surplus from last year.

Suggest keeping about 2000EUR, down to 1800EUR if necessary, for next year's EQC.

Helped tremendously having buffer to have money in pocket to order merch, other equipment. Second proposal is to think professionally about QE. Finally create proper logo, pay designer? We've had no logo, just use EQC logo until replaced the next year. Think about our professional representation. Look unified, etc etc. Invest in good web

hosting/domain?? Currently have .wix domain, fine for what we need but not terribly professional. We can still run through wix but purchase of a domain will look nicer -- depends on how discussion goes with IQA.

James: get something like a logo design. Website is a cost to sustain - need to work out how we'll maintain profit into standing budget/what we'll take from EQC each year.

Felix: yes, we need to figure out. We hope there will be profit next year. Standing budget = good to consider. Past EQC's profit has been laying in a bank account so we haven't had budget. I can work on that on the side, not very much that we have but Felix can organize/draw lists of expenses. If we make a call between logo and website, I'd go with logo, makes representation of QE more professional. Comments on these suggestions??

Baptiste: financial surplus is good. Suggestion: it'll be necessary to do site visits for next year's EQC in August, use some of this money to help subsidize that?

Felix: yes, this has been discussed, Bex McLaughlin suggested this in EQC debriefs too. Suggest people think about this surplus, not sure how this will be handled -- one person inspecting all venues is massive travel costs, maybe we can de-centralize it via QE members.

Baptiste: partial reimbursement to people who scout??

Felix: okay. In past we've also got free accommodation for EQC committee since they're taking their free time to give to quidditch. We can also think about [?? SOMETHING IDK] as well, reimbursing money for all travel is too expensive but maybe partial reimbursement for committee. Reducing costs in general leads to equipment. Substantial part of equipment is for equipment - electronics, balls, hoops, etc. Much of this is still in Italy. If we can manage to store this equipment and re-use it, it could massively cut costs for next year. Use some of this money to pay for shipping and storage of equipment in central point. ?Frankfurt as much equipment will be shared with WC, also central. Keeping it in a central place would mean we can just ship to wherever next EQC is held. Game equipment in budget, hoops = ~2500EUR. 9 sets of Blue Hawks + parts. Also, scoreboards, balls. Worth a lot. Storage

would help us cut costs next year so we can work with less next year while maintaining standard. Build up central inventory of equipment we have.

James: will get v expensive when we send it from tournament to tournament. If we work out somewhere we can store it, it's more sensible.

Felix: store in city it was last used in??

James: that'd be difficult, need to find places EVERYWHERE -- ideally storage unit ni location that's accessible to some tournament committee members.

Jorgen: but remember only going to QE tournaments.

Felix: me, Nina can get to FRankfurt easily. If somebody has other place that works and is central that can be good too. Some figuring out on this... will look into shipping costs, may be able to use same shipping that Blue Hawk used to get it to Italy. Currently equipment is in Andrea's garage.

Baptiste: Ship from city to city once EQC bid is decided on, dont' store anywhere.

Felix: this could be reasonable but this depends on who applicant for EQC is. If city already has a team, it'd be easier, but if it's just a venue that might be more difficult -- venue may be unable to store things for the better part of a year. Doesn't seem reasonable to send 200kg of equipment in August and ask somebody to store it for 10 months. Will also have to figure out short term storage - will Andrea be able to keep storing, etc.

Baptiste: sell equipment following tournaments and buy new equipment every year?

Felix: this has been done in the past quite a lot, has worked so far, but for EQC, in Oxford Luke was able to re-sell equipment for us easily. This year, we need to try to sell 9 sets of hoops - one team might only want one set, so we need to negotiate with potentially 9 teams. So committee this year decided to hang on and try to re-use, because teams will only pay so much and it'll reduce our costs by a huge amount every year. Hoops are in prime condition still, we might need to replace some joints, but now we might need to spend 300-400EUR to ship instead of 2.5k to purchase new hoops.

James: selling equipment is less financially good for QE, but nice for development if we can sell it at discounted rate at club near tournament site. Can be nice donation and if people aren't interested.

Felix: if you're talking development, we could also make the argument about reduced costs of team fees/players if we have 2.5k less in the budget.

Bex: Also, will only be one local team, they won't need amount of equipment, all other teams will need to ship stuff -- teams generally aren't willing to organize that amount of logistics and it's too much to ask of tournament committee.

Felix: suggest vote before creating detailed budget? Just to get an idea of opinions?? And then vote on budget on fb?

Jorgen, Bex: sounds like a good plan.

Felix: easiest point - how do people feel about keeping 2000EUR as float/for tournament committee next year.

James: make sure we indicate that that 2000 is not for them to use and not give back, but it's something for them to return at the end and just use as money in pocket at beginning.

Felix: yeah, it was in budget last year but we were able to return it.

Laurens: any surplus might make team fee and player fee lower.

Felix: didn't suggest imposing on next committee to return surplus, it'd be us allocating money to EQC for committee's use -- no requirements. Are people okay with reserving 2000 for next year?

Yes: QUK, BQF, FQF, DQB, PLQ, AQE, NRF, AQC.

Not present: QD

Felix: point that needs working on in the next few weeks as it'd require contacting relevant people. Logo?? Some portion allocated to improving professionalism/brand of QE. combined with website? Should some portion go to improvement of professionalism? If yes, will differentiate in final budget.

Jesus: maybe give more time to come up with other ideas?

Felix: well this is indicative - are people interested in this. We can open discussion on fb to come up with more ideas of what people would like to see in next year too.

James: feels like logo/website is a specific place to put lots of surplus... might be development projects etc that we could put money to?? Don't rush into things? But also if we come back in a month and have nothing then yes.

Felix: purposefully didn't include estimates b/c I don't think it's warranted before extra research. Logo would be more payment for effort rather than professional design - looking at ~50EUR, website would be 70-100ish. Keep in mind these are my personal suggestions, if you have others let's hear them.

vote: yes = interested in pursuing website/logo design/increased professionalism potentially with part of budget.

Yes: QUK, NRF, AQE, AQC, PLQ, BQF

Abstain: FQF, DQB

Not present: QD

Felix: vote on shipping and storage?

Yes: NRF, QUK, PLQ, AQE

Abstain: FQF, BQF, DQB

Felix: lots of abstentions, will look for more information before we put this in, look into details. This is just a quick indication. Other questions on utilization of budget in general?

All: *radio silence*

Felix: last point, like James said from Mel's suggestion, is deposit of funds. (i.e. how do we get money out of a paper bag in Felix's room and into somewhere with a lock and key.) need securit. Looked into creating bank account for EC but ran into issues. Buuuuut need something more secure.

James: proposal from QUK, we use accounting software called Zero. allows us to keep multiple pools of money in same bank account. By routing transactions through software we make sure we don't spend money outside of that -- eg. impossible to spend BQC's money

for TUK. proposal, b/c Felix is in UK, deposit \$\$ into QUK bank account, set up fence on Zero so that money can only be touched by EC. Kept in safe place so Felix can't get in trouble, and will have it there until we find a better solution or need it next year.

Felix: NOT actually in UK anymore but still have UK bank account. But hey. Summary: QUK has offered to safeguard money and act as intermediary for us and next year's committee. Generally good idea for it to not be sitting in open.

Baptiste: Good idea to put money in bank, maybe not best idea to create it in UK b/c currency. Better to put it in area where we have euros so there aren't exchange fees. Many people in EC have euro bank accounts. This way we can send money within the Euro economic zone.

Felix: valid point, this is def a concern, converting into pounds and then euros might decrease profits/eat up some money. But one concern is that we don't have option to create bank account, would need to find NGB to store it with who doesn't operate out of personal bank account.

James: Baptiste is totes right, bank account needs to be in a euro country but atm it just needs to get into a bank account, QUK has most developed administration/bank account/finance which makes it the best choice.

Felix: other opinions? It's money that belongs to all of you.

Baptiste: ? competition of quality of bank... not sure if the British have better system, we have different rules between mainland and UK. similar rules between many countries in mainland. Easier to create account to manage online in EUR zone.

Felix: not sure how this relates to discussion, James' point was that we currently odn't have the option to create account anywhere in Europe and no NGB's have options really either, so by virtue of the fact that QUK has an account that's best. If other NGB's have similar possibilities with their banking please tell us and make it happen??

Bex: what NGB's are operating out of not-personal bank account?

Laurens: us

Alper: us

Nina: Germany is in the process of doing so

Baptiste: yes

Bex: soooo Belgium and France are alternatives?

Baptiste: possible to have financial director survey funds and ensure it's not spent incorrectly.

Laurens: we have been dividing money for our national team, it's basically separate thing within budget, just don't touch money, same system as Baptiste.

Bex: vote via fb, any NGB's without personal bank account, please talk to financial directors and supply the Committee with writeup including how money will be kept separate, willingness to take money, how finances work, etc.

Felix: will work up budget with my suggestions and open discussion for further suggestions on fb.

EQC 17 Update

Rebecca: We currently do not have any bids, do any members know of any plans to submit a bid?

Alper: We are currently in talks with different organisations and are waiting for responses/budgets.

James: We are thinking about submitting a bid as NGB but have also encouraged clubs to think about submitting.

Baptiste: Same as Alper, we are also currently in the process.

Laurens: There are also one or two teams in Belgium interested in submitting a bid.

Rebecca: Are there any unclarities, unresolved questions about bidding? [no]

Spot allocation

Alper: We should be working on a new system if we need one for next year (if we don't want to change it). Should we also consider previous years?

James: Last year's system worked well so there should be a good reason to change it if at all.

Alper: There could be points given to last year's tournament but what about past tournaments going further back?

Laurens: Yes, this would be a "European ranking" but it doesn't seem feasible now due to consistency of results.

Nina: At the moment spots are allocated according to the previous EQC's results. Should this number be reduced to account for lower team numbers?

Felix: I believe that it was 16 spots for results last year, so this would still work 50/50 in the future?

James: yes, it scales mathematically with increasing/decreasing team numbers.

European Snitch Programme

Baptiste: There have been three meetings of the subcommittee but have some questions going forward:

- How many people should evaluate snitches?
- What is the method of evaluation?

Laurens: Since you are the head of the subcommittee, this should be the responsibility of your committee to decide.

Rebecca: People on the subcommittee should have some experience in evaluating. If not, methods from other sports could be used.

Laurens: I would suggest trying to look up the old IQA/USQ snitch reading programmes.

Rebecca: I would caution against a community vote on snitch certification. It should be a fair system so people should not have bias.

Baptiste: We have looked at IQA and QUK certification systems but there is currently some uncertainty about how many people should evaluate snitches

James: It seems to me that there is some divergence in the subcommittee about how to proceed. It might help to give them a broad stroke sense for the subcommittee to work with? I would personally disagree with a big number of people voting on snitches (as opposed to a few experts)

Rebecca: Agreed

Jorgen: Agreed

Rebecca: So several people have suggested smaller numbers for a panel of snitch evaluators.

Competition regulations for the 16/17 season

Rebecca: To my knowledge, all policies that are on the website are in effect for the next season. Please inform your NGBs about all of these policies as they are shown on the website.

Laurens: In terms of transfers, I personally wanted a way of checking rosters from other NGBs; especially for tournaments that are not QE official but still international.

James: It should be on a request basis but yes.

Baptiste: Should we send out an email/message reminding people of the 'new' rules?

Rebecca: It is up to the NGBs to communicate this.

Baptiste: There should be a short QE communication be given each season about this information.

James: I agree with Bex to a large extent but it wouldn't go amiss to make some sort of memo or FAQ as QE to address this.

Laurens: The rules as published by QE are not strictly team-related but more NGB based; it should be the NGBs responsibilities.

Rebecca: James would you be willing to write some sort of FAQ about this?

James: Yes, can do.

Team/Club membership

James: In QUK there are several levels of membership, club and team membership: they are two teams for most purposes but it is easier to transfer between them than between separate clubs.

Laurens: In Belgium we only have one club with two teams; here the B team is automatically a member of A but not the other way around (they have to get transfer approval to do this)

Baptiste: In France, we are beginning to see these issues with clubs starting to want to create secondary teams. The problem currently is that it is unclear what B (and A) players can do within the club framework.

Alper: We have one club with secondary teams and we use similar rules to UK and Belgium but we allow some overlap between teams (3 B players in the A team but transfer requests for A going to B)

Rebecca: Does this mean that people can sign up for a tournament with two teams?

Alper: No, they have to be temporarily be removed from that roster.

James: As has been previously stated, it should be easier for overlap between multiple teams from one club to happen but still prevent people from be part of similar rosters.

Baptiste: Agreed.

Complaint/Harassment Policy

Rebecca: This was posted recently to the group, does anyone have any discussion points now?

James: I like the idea of following the defendant's NGB but should there be some sort of provision for the process to be overseen by people not from that NGB.

Rebecca: We will add:

- Consequences will be decided upon by the two NGB's involved in the procedure.

- The defendant's NGB will be responsible for implementation of the consequences
- Should consequences reach beyond the jurisdiction of the defendant's NGB, the matter will be brought before the European Committee

Web person

Rebecca: We've proposed the web manager application to the group, are there any comments or can we publish it? [no]. Who will lead the interviews (Felix/Rebecca/Mel?

Others?

Yeray: Are we going to develop the website new from scratch or continue using the current one?

Rebecca: We will continue using the current system

Laurens: I will help out with interviews

Rebecca: Are there any comments that are not in the agenda?

Laurens: I was wondering about meeting scheduling during the summer?

Rebecca: I would suggest at least monthly meetings so we can get building up our framework done and check in with current processes.

Laurens: Could we work on a EG bid package to make the IQA work on it quicker?

Rebecca: Could anyone help Laurens make this happen?

Laurens: I will post to the group about this.

Jorgen: Motion to adjourn the meeting.

Rebecca: Seconded.

[END OF MEETING: 22:56 CEST]

European Quidditch Congress Meeting

Date: 17th of July 2016

Location: Skype voice

Meeting time: 21:00 CET

In attendance: Nina Heise (Germany), Lukas Linser (Austria), Chula Bruggeling (The Netherlands), Andrea Miglietta (Italy), Baptiste (France), Laurens Grinwis Plaat Stutljes (Belgium), Yeray Espinosa (Spain), Alper Erisen (Turkey), Jorgen Helgeland Stenlokk (Norway)

Chair: Rebecca Alley

Secretary: Felix Linsmeier

Agenda

- 1) Introduction
- 2) Roll Call
- 3) Updated wording for Transfer Policy (Nina)
- 4) Snitch rating (Baptiste)
- 5) Bank Account (Baptiste)
- 6) Harassment policy (Chula)
- 7) Update on EG Bidding (Laurens)
- 8) EQC Spot Allocation (Alper)
- 9) Updated Budget + Approval of Expenses (Felix)

Updated wording Transfer Policy

Nina: Looking through our transfer policies we spotted that the wording is not very clear and allows for NGBs with transfer policy to still have transfers. A proposed new phrasing would be “only in the event that an NGB does not have their own international transfer policy that includes the restrictions as set out in this document”.

Chula: Since it says “as set out in this document” what if they’re stricter?

Nina: They could be.

Alper: Why does it say “international” instead of “internal”?

Chula: It should be internal.

Baptiste: I think it’s very important for all countries to have the same regulations.

Rebecca: There are already countries that have their own policies adhering to this and they’re only meant as “base” policies.

Felix: Could we move to a vote on this?

Nina: Motion to proceed to a vote.

Alper: Second.

We’re voting on the proposed phrasing: “only in the event that an NGB does not have their own internal transfer policy that includes the restrictions as set out in this document”.

In favour: Rest

Against: 0

Abstain: Norway, France

Snitch rating

Baptiste: Our proposition for snitch rating is a three-step process: referee test, assessment of practice and annual level control. Experience is assessed on a point based system. This then leads to a 4 level rating (Bronze, Silver, Gold, Diamond). We can run tests at world cup if people so wish.

Chula: There seem to be some confusions with the silver rating?

Baptiste: Explains.

Nina: How would this be decided? Could we get some time to consider this?

Felix: We can give some time to consider.

Alper: Is this going to be a requirement or could NGBs lower or raise the requirements as they want?

Baptiste: It would be a recommendation, not a requirement.

Chula: In the Netherlands, we have problems even get Snitches so if we had “minimum requirements” we may not be able to get them at all.

Laurens: If only level 4 Snitches can do international competition, we may not be able to get them for EQC for example. The classification should be used to assess game spots but not as “minimum requirements”.

Baptiste: Yes, it’s a recommendation as a “rating” but could also not be binding.

Chula: I would suggest to prioritise higher level snitches but not have a minimum requirement.

Felix: Let’s put this into the group and discuss further so it can be decided one of the next days.

Rebecca: Would this be official or just be a real test run

Baptiste: Only a test.

Felix: At world cup you would test in “real” situations, will you then also do other tournaments or just video?

Baptiste: We would test how practical both are.

Bank Account

Baptiste: It would be possible for FQF to open a bank account but hand over responsibility to operatives of the committee. We would only need address (via FQF) and signatories. There would be no costs associated with this. (There might still be transfer fees).

We could also indicate that FQF is “part” of the IQA and manage it that way, both options work.

Jorgen: What was the UK proposal again?

Rebecca: It would be similar but we would have conversion fees and also not have direct access.

Nina: How long would this take?

Baptiste: Possibly within days (we have people within the banking sector in FQF).

Chula: I’m somewhat confused about who the account would belong to?

Felix: This would be in the name of the FQF but handed over to us completely.

Rebecca: Who would sign for this and would we need a treasurer (or have it combined responsibility with secretary)?

Felix: I would propose to have the executive be signatories.

Rebecca: I think it is a bad idea for me to be a signatory. Should we create the position of a treasurer?

Baptiste: There should be a minimum of 2 signatories.

Rebecca: Agreed, this could be treasurer and another member of the committee.

Alper: How could signatories be changed if people leave?

Baptiste: We can change the signatories relatively easily.

Chula: Would it be fine if the signatory is not in France.

Baptiste: Internationals are fine (as long as it is within the European Area).

Jorgen: How much would fees be to the UK?

Felix: I personally have paid about 10€ per transaction in transaction fees + conversion.

Rebecca: We can have this discussed on the group as well to also include the UK in debate.

Harassment policy

Chula: Assuming there is a harassment policy at WC, Netherlands would like to ask if there are persons to approach in case of harassment? Such persons should ideally also be of at least two different genders.

Rebecca: As WC-committee member I can take care of that.

Update on EG Bidding

Laurens: I uploaded a document ages ago, please take a look and comment on it so I can send it to the IQA.

EQC Spot Allocation

Alper: I've taken a look and updated last year's numbers. I've created a new document with different options for a system going forward. As the UK has said, we shouldn't be changing too much though for reasons of consistency.

Chula: In one of the systems the Netherlands would not get a bid? I.e. multiple countries not getting a team based on performance?

Alper: We could change that algorithm to distribute to countries without bids first.

Chula: There could be a system where a base bid is given if no performance spot is given?

Jorgen: This takes away the point, there could be a system with half bids?

Chula: We should think about these issues now so we don't have this discussion every year.

Jorgen: Would it be possible to round all <0 to 1?

Alper: It would be possible yes.

Chula: Is there not a vicious circle where emerging areas have it harder to enter?

Alper: Yes, but performance is an indicator in many sports.

Laurens: The maximum number of teams per country would be 6 (for 32 teams).

Jorgen: Can we table this for more in-depth discussion?

Alper: Yes I will contact people who have been very vocal in this.

Chula: When is the deadline for the announcements of this?

Rebecca: Ideally this could be alongside the announcement of the venue.

Chula: It would be great if this could be announced before most national qualifiers?

Rebecca: A mid-september deadline would probably be the earliest we can do.

Jorgen: We're supposed to choose and announce the winning bid and the venue together. Since we're basing on performance of last season could we also base team numbers on last season?

Chula: This would be unfair to rapidly changing regions.

Rebecca: I would suggest a september 30th deadline and then announce oct 1st.

Nina: We could also publish system first and numbers later, they don't necessarily have to be together.

Alper: I don't think that it will be necessary to wait on team registration since it takes a lot of teams to change the spot allocation.

Chula: This might easily be reached by some countries still.

[The discussion of the budget is tabled]

Laurens: The board of BQF will change soon so this is presumably the last meeting I will attend personally

Alper: Motion to adjourn the meeting.

Laurens: Second.

[END OF MEETING: 22:45]

European Quidditch Congress Meeting

Date: August 7, 2016

Location: Skype voice

Meeting time: 21:00 CET

In attendance:

Chair: Rebecca Alley

Acting Secretary: Mel Piper, Kai Haugen Shaw (for last two points)

Agenda

- 1. Introduction**
- 2. Roll Call**
- 3. Snitch Programme (Baptiste)**
- 4. Update on EG Bidding (Laurens)**
- 5. Budget (Rebecca)**
- 6. EQC 2017 Bids (Rebecca)**
- 7. Tackling Harassment (Suggestions & moving forward)**
- 8. Injury Policy (Laurens)**

Minutes:

2. Countries in Attendance:

- NRF Kai
- QUK Mel
- AQE Yeray
- DQB Nina
- PLQ Jagoda
- FQF Baptiste
- AIQ Andrea
- BQF Laurens
- QNL Chula
- Bex Alley

3. Snitch Programme

Bex- Last meeting the testing scale for snitches was going to be tested at World Cup. Updates?

Baptiste: Was completed, decided that video is a much better way of testing snitches.

Bex: Who carried out the tests?

Baptiste: (Stefan?) from Germany and myself. Tested on 3 snitches

Bex: Issue is there are not many snitches currently, so hard to only allow certain quality of snitches to snitch events.

Laurens: May be better to do a test project of this system first with a few NGBs rather than big from start

Chula: Start with just rating, requirements when we know it can work.

Kai: Do we have enough footage from world cup to have different people rate the same snitch to see if there is consistency in results?

Baptiste: This should happen.

Chula: If you get a rating of 'fair' on each criteria, you end with a 'poor' overall rating.

Action: This subject was tabled for its own meeting with the subcommittee. Baptiste to put the documents into the QE group.

4. Updates on EG Bidding

Bex: Any updates on this from last time?

Laurens: No, waiting on people to comment on it

Nina: If the IQA rulebook is voted through the pitch size is reduced, meaning more venues may apply

Laurens: Until rulebook released, we can't do anything

Bex: If this is coming from the IQA, can we not get it sooner?

Nina: Voting closes August 18, if there is no specific time frame for European Games then we could wait until this has been decided

Laurens: Needs to go out asap, but is published by IQA, not Europe

Kai: If want it out now, we could add an asterisk next to the current pitch dimensions saying that they may change

Chula: Disagree, not fair on the bids who put in a lot of work if they actually don't meet the requirements. We should wait.

Action: Hand bidding package to IQA to release when the pitch dimensions are finalised.

5. Budget

Budget presented again to QEC, to be placed again in the Facebook group before a vote taking place to pass it. Bex explains that green indicates the money coming in, while red indicates expenses. Some, such as web hosting and domain name are not essential, but would be beneficial for professionalism.

Baptiste: Not necessary to pay graphic designer, if QEU pays, then members of NGBs will expect this.

Chula: Graphic designers should be paid

Laurens: Agreed

Bex: They deserve paying and would in the wider world.

Kai: Why specifically the graphic designer?

Laurens: A graphic designer is not the same as a normal volunteer for a tournament or committee, it is their job

Chula: Designers help add professionalism to us and to be taken seriously

Baptiste: Problem is all NGBs don't have the money to pay them

Chula: Some NGBs in Europe are already paying graphic designers.

Bex: In other sports, people are being paid for these jobs. This is a step in the right direction.

Andrea: We paid snitches at EQC, should pay graphic designer

Nina: Important to note that we actually make money from a designer's work through t-shirts etc. So they should be paid.

Andrea: On another part of the budget, there are hoops still in Gallipoli

Action point: Bex will put up the vote, which will vote through each part of the budget line by line. Before this goes up, Nina and Andrea will talk to Felix about shipping and storage.

6. EQC Bids

Bex: Vote is up, go and vote. We also need to decide who can do site visits, and whether Horspath needs visiting.

Bex confirmed that site visit personal costs should be in the budget and this needs amending

Laurens: Someone outside of the NGB bidding visiting the site would be good.

Chula: Close to Belgium, and going to London at the end of the month

Bex: Does Horspath need a visit?

Chula: We know Horspath

Kai: Unless something has changed, no need to look. In terms of the other site visits, won't someone still be biased if they are visiting because it is close to them?

Bex: Research can be done on travel costs for countries.

I am going to Warsaw

Chula: Can go to Belgium

Laurens: Can go to Poland

Baptiste: Can go to Poland

Kai: Can one person go to both? Then they will present on same criteria, but this isn't feasible right now.

Bex would be best for Poland as no bias.

Laurens: Would be better if people could go at same time so only one site visit.

Don't think one person is good enough.

Mel: Need to be realistic. While multiple delegates on the visits would be good, we don't have the budget or time to do this in the next two weeks, as site visits should

be seen by 20th August.

Nina: Agreed

Kai: Agreed

Chula: What do we evaluate on?

Laurens: Take the bid, check all facts are correct, conditions, distance from hotels, overall impressions

Chula: Unfeasible to go to all hotels, also already familiar with Belgium

Bex: Just working out the time frame from city centre to sit would work. It's all about being critical even if you've visited before

Chula: Would feel better if not only person

Vote on who should go for Poland between Laurens, Baptiste and Bex.

All delegates vote for Bex to go (QUK, NRF, AQE, DQB, PLQ, FQF, AIQ, QNL, BQF).

Action: When votes are in, those that need site visits will then be finalised, alongside invoices for any travel costs put in European Group and voted through.

Chula: Query about price of Poland bid, the deficit that there will be based on figures from last year.

Laurens: Worked out projected fees, won't be much different from this year as no equipment costs.

7: Harassment

Action: Suggesting holding a roundtable about tackling harassment, Chula will start a post and see who is interested. After the meeting they would present their results.

8: European First Aid Policy

Laurens - at LXG it was realised it is illegal for medical team (paramedics) to release names of those treated. The European policy for players to get a note to be allowed to play again by the paramedics would therefore be illegal. Should the policy be changed?

Discussion followed

Action: The conclusion was that we will have to change the policy, or figure out a new way to enforce it. Decision to ask players and NGBs to come up with solutions to the problem before next meeting, and then discuss it then.

Concluding remarks:

VOTE ON THE EQC bids if they have merit.

European Quidditch Congress Extraordinary Meeting

Date: 21/08/16

Location: Skype Voice

Meeting Time: 21:00 CEST

In attendance: Jørgen Stenløkk - NRF, James Burnett - QUK, Nina Heise - DQB, Robin Mier - QNL, Rion Pena - AQE, Jagoda Sadecka - PLQ, Baptiste Julien Blandet - FQF

Chair: James Burnett

Secretary: Felix Linsmeier

Agenda:

- 1) Belgian Bid**
- 2) Polish Bid**
- 3) UK Bid**

Belgian Bid

Felix: Are there any questions about the Belgian bid?

Robin: Did Chula check for how gender-friendly the facilities are?

Felix: She specifically said that she would check for it, we will have to wait for her proper writeup on that though.

James: Just to confirm are the fields big enough to fit 2 pitches each?

Felix: Yes.

James: How far is the big “main” field from the other, adjacent ones?

Jorgen: There is a map in the bid which gives a rough idea, probably about 5 minutes (but would be good to get confirmation on this)

Robin: I’m wondering about size of the changing rooms (there are two assigned to each pitch), are they gonna be able to fit 32 teams?

Jorgen: There doesn’t seem to be plenty of accommodation in Mechelen. But on the other hand Brussels (and other cities) are quite close.

James: Yes, the situation is similar to Horspath in the UK.

Polish Bid

Robin: I have the same question as before; how many teams can the facilities host? And how gender-friendly is the facility?

Jagoda: I wasn’t able to inspect them because they were preparing them at the time but they are University facilities.

James: How far are the facilities from the pitches (it looks like quite a way)

Jagoda: Probably 5 minutes from the closer, max 10 minutes from the farthest pitch.

James: How many teams are there in the city (i.e. people who know about quidditch things)?

Jagoda: There are 2 teams in Warsaw.

Jorgen: The pitches are said to be fenced off, but some are open to the forest (balls could fly off and cause delays).

Jagoda: Pitch 1 is open to the forest, the rest aren't.

Jorgen: Regarding the prices, they seem quite expensive (~10000€)

Robin: It is very expensive, although the rest of the bid seems to be quite cheap.

James: We'd have to calculate and see if the costs balance out.

Jorgen: We would have to find out what's cheapest for every player (this bid would be 15€ player fee for EVERY player)

Robin: The player fee could be higher though if costs are generally cheaper in Warsaw.

Jorgen: Essentially, the Belgium bid is the cheapest overall in facility costs.

UK Bid

Jorgen: Oxford seems to be somewhat of a "safe" option (we already know most factors here). It would be at least worth having the discussion on how often countries (places) can host a tournament.

James: Ideally, if all other factors were equal, we could host it in Warsaw, since it has been both in Brussels and Horspath before. There is not much that needs to be said about Horspath. We could get a lot more space by booking out more changing rooms and offering gender-friendly facilities. Transport and accommodation are good (albeit not ideal). Southern Cup and Valentines have shown that this is a reliable option.

Robin: What was the biggest tournament hosted here?

James: EQC 15, so it's a proven option. Another thing to consider is the referee/volunteer situation in the UK which is considerably better.

Jorgen: I partly agree, you'd still get a considerable amount in Belgium from Benelux and Germany.

James: I don't have the bid in front of me so I can't say anything on prices.

Robin: Due to exchange rate and higher costs for players this would be rather expensive.

Baptiste: Would there be buses going to Oxford on Sunday?

James: There are buses that could get teams to Horspath comfortably for an 8am start (or later). 7:30 can work, 7am would not.

Jorgen: The numbers: ~3000€ (exchange rate applies) for Horspath, 3000€ for Mechelen (can't have pitch markings) and ~10-11000€ for Warsaw.

James: From a refereeing standpoint, there really should be pitch markings.

Jorgen: It seems they can't do it because their football teams need the pitch on Monday.

Felix: How should this be voted on? Majority or alternative?

James: We could do an elimination of the "least popular"?

Baptiste: I would like majority vote.

James: So our options for voting on how to vote would be: Majority Vote, Majority vote with one elimination or Alternative Vote

Felix: Motion to vote on the options

James: Second.

Majority vote: -

Majority vote with elimination: FQF, AQE, DQB, NRF

Alternative vote: QUK, PLQ

James: Motion to adjourn the meeting

Jorgen: Second

END OF MEETING: 21:55 CEST

European Quidditch Congress Meeting

Date: 28/08/16

Location: Skype Voice

Meeting Time: 21:00 CEST

In attendance: Jørgen Stenløkk - NRF, Mel Piper - QUK, Robin Mier - QNL, Yeray Espinosa Cuevas - AQE, Jagoda Sadecka - PLQ, Alper Erişen - QD, Laurens Grinwis - BQF, Pau Pérez Casas - AQC

Chair: Rebecca Alley

Secretary: Felix Linsmeier

Agenda:

- 1) Secondary teams vs. transfer regulations**
- 2) Bid distribution algorithm**
- 3) Selection of TD**

Secondary teams vs. transfer regulations

Laurens: With the current regulation it was intended to limit competitive advantages by limiting transfers. On the other hand it is currently possible to be a member of a secondary team, which would give them a competitive advantage. It is not clear if this counts as competitive advantage or not.

Rebecca: Are there any regulations on keeping it to only allowing players to qualify and play at EQC for that team?

Mel: In the UK, players have to play for the team at EQC that they qualified with (unless there proper justification for transferring)

Robin: The Netherlands has a system where players have to have trained with that team.

Laurens: Originally we had a regulation whereby you could only play for your primary team but players weren't happy so we included a regulation that you could bring up to 5

"secondary players" to EQC. There were plans to change it at some point but Belgium was waiting for input from Europe on this. We feel that while you can get an advantage from playing for your secondary team but these secondary team "transfers" mainly affect developing teams.

Rebecca: Overall would that competitive advantage be significant?

Laurens: It would be if a league team that didn't qualify joined a team that did qualify; less so if it is a developing team that doesn't even have a shot.

Felix: As it stands, the possibility of playing for a secondary team undermines the intention of the transfer regulation, so we either need to address our current regulation or fix the loophole.

Rebecca: So it would be best to have a regulation like the UK's across the board?

Alper: In any major sport it doesn't work this way, you can transfer as you wish.

Felix: But in most sports there is a specified transfer window.

Alper: Yes but not for Champions League etc.

Rebecca: There is also a disparity in skill level between teams, so it wouldn't be fair to abolish the notion of a club tournament by allowing people to put together the best teams they can find.

Alper: I agree but there might be valid reasons for transferring.

Rebecca: That's still allowed.

Felix: Another thing to consider is that the current phrasing only says that NGBs must have a regulation, it doesn't specifically prescribe a regulation.

Alper: If we enforced that NGBs must have regulations, we should define a framework of what secondary means.

Robin: There should probably be a European regulation, but we should also think about how this policy might affect developing regions,

Laurens: If there's no Quidditch Europe regulation, teams will pretty much be able to demand whatever they want when it comes to EQC. It may not be enough just saying that NGBs must have a regulation on this.

Rebecca: Suggestion:

1. NGB's structured with primary and secondary teams must have regulations in place to ensure transfers between teams do not confer a competitive advantage following qualifying tournaments.

- a. These regulations may include:

- i. In an NGB with developmental level teams, players may transfer up to competitive level teams.

- ii. If a player's secondary team cannot field more than 14 players, they may transfer to that secondary team to make up to 14 players.

- b. If the team a player plays for at the qualifying tournament qualifies for any subsequent tournaments, that player must play for that team at the subsequent tournaments.

Robin: Could a regulation be included that limits the amount of secondary players (~5)?

Rebecca: Yes. Rewriting 2) ii. A team may take up to 5 secondary players, up to a maximum of 14 players, following a qualifying tournament.

Is there anything that should be prohibited?

Robin: This currently doesn't give an outline on "horizontal transfers". Also could this be posted to the Facebook group to discuss with NGBs first?

Rebecca: Yes.

Bid distribution algorithm

Alper: I posted several options for Bid distribution.

Rebecca: Did anyone have any problems with last year's algorithm?

Jorgen: We should keep it mostly to how it's been so far.

Mel: Agreed.

Laurens: We had some minor issues, where teams with very few teams still got a lot of spots.

Jorgen: Alper could you quickly explain the algorithms?

Alper: In 1) base bids were removed and only performance bids given (with NGBs with zero spots given at least 1 base spot). Other algorithms are variations on that.

Jorgen: Could Ireland be counted under Developing/Slovenia and Slovakia (as well as other developing Nations) be given their own spots?

Rebecca: They either need to be counted or none of them.

Jorgen: When is the deadline for being developing?

Rebecca: Not set yet but could be Sept 30. This could be included in the Algorithm vote. On the other hand precedent has said that developing regions are offered spots. Is it reasonable to vote on this?

Jorgen: yes.

Felix: Would it be reasonable to make all regions apply for spots (also non-developing), this would make it only a technicality for NGBs?

Laurens: Isn't the phrasing for Emerging areas and not Developing anyway?

Felix: Yes this is somewhat confusingly termed.

Robin: What defines Emerging Areas and Developing Members?

Rebecca: Emerging Areas are places with teams but non organised and Developing Members are organised and pay minimal IQA fees.

Robin: Is there a deadline for giving out those spots?

Jorgen: There doesn't really need to be because emerging areas can only be established by congress so that would define that.

Rebecca: Can anyone take this to congress and find out the requirements for

Jorgen: Yes, I can do it.

Laurens: Congress has to pass it based on Quidditch Development Index.

Rebecca: I'll contact Slovenia and Slovakia, also inviting them to Quidditch Europe. There will be a vote on Spot allocation with a majority vote. Numbers from NGBs will be due by September 30.

Selection of TD

Rebecca: Just as a headsup, we will post the TD application very soon, please look through them so we can release them as soon as possible. Please then make this known to people so we actually have applicants.

Alper: Motion to end meeting

Laurens: Second.

END OF MEETING: 22:13 CEST

European Quidditch Congress Meeting

Date: 18/09/16

Location: Skype Voice

Meeting Time: 21:00 CEST

In attendance: Jørgen Stenlokk - NRF, Robin Mier - QNL, Yeray Espinosa Cuevas - AQE, Mel Piper - QUK, Nina Heise - DQB, Kinga Robutka - PLQ, Pauline Raes - BQF

Chair: Rebecca Alley

Secretary: Felix Linsmeier

Agenda

- 1. i3saw Congress (Pauline)**
- 2. Transfers and defining developing teams (Robin)**
- 3. EQC 2017**
 - a. Team List submission (Rebecca & Felix)**
 - b. Secondary players on rosters (Nina)**
 - c. EQC 2017 Tournament Director (Rebecca)**
 - d. Referee requirements**
- 4. Executive Manager (Rebecca)**
- 5. Current votes (Rebecca)**

i3saw Congress

Pauline: We have been contacted about the possibility of taking part in a symposium on injuries. They have also asked if anyone would be interested in giving a paper (anything on quidditch but ideally quidditch related). Would it be worth someone goes there?

Rebecca: I believe Ash Cooper and Evan Edmonds are working on a paper.

Mel: It is actually finished, or at least there is a presentable version.

Rebecca: Any thoughts from anyone?

Felix: This would definitely be a good opportunity to represent and legitimise quidditch.

Rebecca: Would this have to be a scientific paper?

Pauline: Not necessarily but part of it should be (there could be two papers, one scientific, one general). The conference is in April 2017.

Rebecca: Mel, could you talk to Ash and Evan about this?

Mel: Yes will do.

Rebecca: This could be done through Quidditch Europe and also present something on our development. Felix and I can also talk this through outside of this meeting.

Pauline: The submission deadline for papers is the 30th of October.

Transfers and defining developing teams

Robin: We wanted to pick up this point from last time. QNL has two issues with this, namely

1. NGB's structured with primary and secondary teams must have regulations in place to ensure transfers between teams do not confer a competitive advantage following qualifying tournaments.

a. These regulations may include:

- i. In an NGB with developmental level teams, players may transfer up to competitive level teams.
- ii. A team may take up to 5 secondary players, up to a maximum of 14 players, following a qualifying tournament.
- b. If the team a player plays for at the qualifying tournament qualifies for any subsequent tournaments, that player must play for that team at the subsequent tournaments.

We are afraid of what this means for developing countries because in them you cannot really speak of competitive advantage.

Rebecca: What about using the Quidditch Development Index as indicator for this applying or not?

Robin: That may not work in all countries because it's not a clear indicator. Furthermore we would like to make very clear what developing and competitive team means; they have to be very clearly defined to make sure there are no issues.

Rebecca: Are there any thoughts or comments on this?

Pauline: In Belgium, you have to have 3 members to be developing and 7 players to be competitive.

Robin: The problem with the Netherlands in this case is that there is a different membership system. 7 seems like a strange number in this regard.

Felix: What about teams with more than 7 players that play "just for fun".

Rebecca: At the moment there seem to be some loopholes and also a lack of definitions.

Robin: I'm realising that with b. there might be difficulties because people will usually play for their primary team so never get to play for the other at qualifying tournaments.

Jorgen: If you play for a team that announces beforehand that they don't want to play at EQC and a player for that team wants to transfer to an EQC-competitive team, this isn't really covered. It feels like this should be allowed.

Rebecca: Could everyone please take these drafts and rewrite them in a way that works best for their NGB so we can compare and compile into one?

EQC 2017: Team List submission

Rebecca: Could everyone please submit the form for team numbers and submit team lists to quidditch europe@gmail.com

Robin: Does this include competitive and non-competitive teams?

Rebecca: All registered teams.

Tournament Director Application

Rebecca: We have only one applicant, how would you like to go about the hiring process.

Jorgen: We should be doing some sort of review by the committee.

Rebecca: Like a vote of trust?

Jorgen: Yes.

Rebecca: I'll publish it into the group.

Referee requirements

Rebecca: This was brought up in the group briefly because it was introduced rather late last year. The question is whether this should be decided by us or the OC. If we get a TD very soon this could also be laid into his hands.

Alper: Are we going to play with the IQA rulebook? As it is we don't have ref tests yet.

Pauline: It will be out soon.

Rebecca: We'll put this on the list of votes.

Mel: It would make sense to use the IQA rulebook because EG will use the IQA rulebook in order for refs to pass tests.

Felix: Actually it's more important to get people working with the rulebook we'll be using for EQC because we need much more refs for that.

Nina: Is there any good reason not to use the IQA rulebook? It would almost be a political move not to.

Alper: I brought it up so we could vote on it in the committee.

Rebecca: Please vote on whether EQC 2017 should use the IQA rulebook for EQC?

Yes: Unanimous

No: -

Robin: How do we go about this?

Pauline: The rulebook is already published, just the ref tests are missing.

Kinga: It may be very hard for smaller/developing NGBs to provide mandatory refs should such a rule be implemented.

Mel: There could be a rule about ratio between teams attending and having to supply refs?

Jorgen: We are currently not sure if we can send refs. We can't really force individuals without incentive, just teams...

Alper: We might also not be able to send non-playing refs because of costs.

Rebecca: How about mandatory playing refs? Should this be decided by the OC or EC?

Robin: What would be the consequences for not supplying refs?

Rebecca: There could be an extra financial load on them. First question is though, whose responsibility is it to impose?

Jorgen: It could be up to the OC.

Felix: It should maybe be up to the EC if it is decided on an NGB level.

Rebecca: How about giving the OC the leeway to suggest but also refer it back to the EC to decide on them.

Pauline: Agreed, but this should be made known as soon as possible.

Rebecca: This can be decided by next meeting when we have a TD.

Executive Manager

Rebecca: This is something that I've brought up with individuals already but would like to make known. I'll be stepping down as Executive Director and wanted to let everyone know so there can be a reasonably long transition period. We will publish the application soon and with an open end so we can find someone suitable for the position.

Current votes

Rebecca: This is just a reminder to vote on all current ongoing votes. The current deadlines are:

- Spot allocation algorithm: 24.9
- Team numbers/lists: 30.9
- Number of bids announced: 1.10
- Deadline for transfer/secondary team policy: 2.10 (To be voted on on 9.10)
- The vote for harassment policy will go up again

Alper: Shouldn't team lists be earlier than spot allocation algorithm to be able to plug in numbers?

Rebecca: This is in order for teams to be unbiased by possible team numbers.

Rebecca: Any other points?

Mel: I have been in contact with Ireland who are saying that they will be applying for EQC spots and are seeing sustainable player numbers.

Jorgen: Motion to end meeting

Rebecca: Second

END OF MEETING: 22:18

European Quidditch Congress Meeting

Date: October 16, 2016

Location: Skype voice

Meeting time: 21:00 CET

In attendance:

Chair: Felix Linsmeier

Acting Secretary: Mel Piper

Agenda

1. Introduction

2. Roll Call

Laurens-BQF

Mel-QUK

Nina-DQB

Chula Bruggeling - QNL

Yeray Espinosa Cuevas - AQE

Pau Pérez - AQC

Lena Mandahus - QAT

Martin Hofbauer- SQA

Jagoda Sadecka - PLQ

Alper Erişen - QD

Baptiste Julien Blandet - FQF

Stefan Scheurer - Ireland

David Jonsson, SvQF

3. Welcome and questions from new members

Felix: Hi new people! We're very happy that we're seeing a lot of new regions springing up and hope that we'll see some good things from all of you. Concerning this committee, as this is a subcommittee of the IQA the same membership rules as congress apply. If you are an emerging area or not yet listed with the IQA, you'll not be allowed to vote for your region. The reason for you to be here is to discuss current issues in Europe and especially to find out about any issues that newer areas might be having so feel free to share and contribute in this committee whatever you think might be important!

Any questions?

[New nations feel questions have been answered]

Felix: If there is anything at any point (and this goes to everyone else as well) feel free to share in the group or ask Rebecca, me or Mel our chair

4. Spain (Yeray)

Felix: our next point would be the current situation in Spain, Yeray could you give us a rundown of the situation again, what's happening and is there anything on top of what you and Rion posted some days ago?

Yeray: Runs through issue as described in the committee group, that this has been going on for a while. Hopes that people that have created this issue don't represent in the future.

Baptiste: Had similar situation in FQF in the past. A lot of issues come from the youth involved in the organisation.

Chula: Great to have a good understanding with your community, and to talk to them, but when those people get to this stage, the chance is gone.

[Yeray asks for Rion to come into the group as well to talk about it. Group accepts]

Felix: Anything you would like to address Rion?

Rion: Since at least February this year the issues have occurred. Refers to Facebook post, anger on membership fees going out. People have blamed Yeray the most as President. Lot of verbal aggressors and psychological too. Wednesday decided to dissolve, not the targetors are trying to get into the board. Not sure what you will see out of the NGB in the next few months. Some have done it face to face, also happened online, discipline difficult. Yeray and Rion were even unsure to go to the meeting.

Stefan: Just monetary? Or on different levels?

Rion: Last year Spanish cup, got a lot of stuff cheaper than anticipated. This year more issues, less contacts in that area, some prices went up. Player fees 12, team fees 120. People complained about these numbers. Aware there were issues, but fixed a lot of things. When things were trying to be fixed, went to another problem. Unprofessional.

Baptiste: Are people who attacked AQE active in the organisation.

Rion: From inside the board, on an assembly level and from outside

Baptiste: Are there any neutral members?

Rion: Some people [audio cut out] some great people that want to get involved but some that aren't. There are options for it 'not to go to hell' but that involves luck.

Baptiste: may be able to get a leader that doesn't play.

Rion: can try and look into it.

Felix: Regarding structural issues, has there been a decision whether you two will stay as interim members or will you be leaving us after this meeting?

Rion: Still talking about it, but as soon as we have a response, we will let you know what is happening.

Chula: What's happening with Spanish Cup?

Rion: Some teams still planning on going to Spanish Cup (about 8). It's probably going to happen but we're not involved in organisation any more.

Porras: Aware of what Spain is going through as so close, people likely to be on board are the harrassors, and will try to absorb Catalonia. Would like to get EC or IQA to do something. Before, there has been no issues. But new board will try.

Yeray: Confirms this.

Felix: I will say that as far as the committee is concerned, you have our full support as an NGB. and since you are an IQA member you will definitely be recognised

Chula: If Catalonia wants to keep being Catalonia, could not be forced.

Chula : Where we going to be making some kind of statement as EC about harassment of board members?

Stevo: May be easier to solve on club basis, anonymous websites being set up, you know who that would be. Not saying we shouldn't issue a statement, but may be more helpful that way

Rion: the problem is that the people who have been harassing are supported

Felix: if possible I'd like this discussion to be moved to the facebook group so we can decide whether or not to put out a statement. since this point goes deeper and also connects to Chula's ongoing request to have a broader discussion on harassment

Rion: They created this whole reality in which yeray is the origin of all the bad situations in the NGB and most people bought it

Felix: okay so we'll continue this discussion in the group

5. EQC

a. Referee requirements (Laurens)

Laurens: I'm EQC TD! With 40 teams last year we had a problem with referees, and as a committee we realised we should have a referee requirement, but nothing happened. This should be in place before the start of getting teams qualified for EQC.

Chula: Different requirements between members that are full, developing and emerging

Mel: I agree, the UK has split it up for regionals, newer teams have to provide non-qualified volunteers whereas longer-existing/more developed teams have to provide actual referees.

Chula: Also, larger NGBs should provide larger numbers of referees.

Laurens: Obviously non-playing volunteers are the best. Central location of Belgium shall help that. Where we are playing we have reserved housing, so could offer non playing accommodation for very cheap/free. However, new NGBs should 'prove' that they have referees available.

Chula: Are emerging areas able to do the certification?

Laurens: Emerging areas have to pay for the tests. But cant get hold of them.

Felix: Would it be possible to require the NGBs to provide them instead? This way, if teams were willing to bring playing referees, they can, but the NGBs could also try to source a number of referees from within their regions.

Laurens: That could work

Alper: Doesnt mean you don't know the rules because they can't provide refs, language barrier. Re Felix's point, don't have the funds to do that.

Chula: If we say the NGB needs to provide the referees. What happens if the UK can't provide that many refs? All six teams can't pay the price.

Laurens: Didn't think of this. What about if the NGB has to provide so many, NGB has to decide if this is an individual ref count for each of the teams or what they wish?

Felix: would it not incentivise teams?

Chula: But how can it work. E.g. France have language barriers, shouldn't punish all the teams because others couldnt do it

Felix: okay so I'm seeing that the consensus seems to be that some sort of requirement should be established but it's not clear who should be responsible. In order to keep this brief I would suggest that we discuss this in further detail on the facebook group. that being said, we should decide who sets these requirements, will it be the european committee or the organising team?

Consensus for EC

Felix: would move this debate to the group to further flesh out what ref requirements should look like. that being said, we'll make an effort to get this done quickly so it can be communicated to all teams and NGBs.

[Nina left meeting]

b. Hiring of tournament committee

Felix: This point essentially is that we'll be rolling out applications for committee very soon. Laurens, do you have any points regarding this seeing as you are TD and are there any comments or suggestions from NGBs concerning committee hiring?

Laurens: No

Alper: Who would pick?

[9:32:41 PM] [Felix]: so clasically, this would be between the secreteriat and the TD : i.e. Rebecca, I, (Mel) and Laurens. However, if any representatives would like to be involved in the hiring process please let us know and we'll happily take you on board. Applications will be taken via form and candidates will be interviewed

Laurens: If a position is not filled yet, and I've talked to them about it, does that matter

Felix: That's fine

Chula: non-playing referee and snitch coordinators, please <3

you can't figure out next games referees if you're still playing your own game

Felix: as it stands we will definitely make the crucial positions on the committee required to be non-playing. Is the committee okay with us deciding on a case-by-case basis when this rule can be more or less strict? i.e. if there is a graphic designer that is also playing (or treasurer etc...) is anyone opposed to the hiring team considering them?

Laurens: Case by case seems fine

Chula: Case by case for person or position?

Felix: Position

Laurens: Most important ones should be non playing but is going to be very difficult to enforce

c. Emerging areas spots (Stevo)

Stevo: There are 5 emerging areas and 3 spots. Would it be possible to combine teams?

Felix: the regulation for full members is that there is a merc policy where only if a team cannot field a full team they are allowed to supplement their rosters. that being said, the EC could decide to allow exceptions.

Laurens: The emerging areas spots you have to apply for. Not sure if it is a good idea to use that merc policy

Felix: As it stands, the goal of giving spots to emerging areas is so that can boost development in those areas. So it would have to be argued whether that applies when different regions merge teams

Lena: If all 5 apply, who chooses and how?

In the last year, it was meant to be done on first come first serve, but also motivation basis

Lena: What is the motivation basis?

Felix: What the reasons for application were, how it could help them develop etc, explaining the situation of their NGB. This year we could open up discussion to include members, dependent on situation.

Chula: If the idea of these spots is to develop that nation, im not sure merging teams from different countries would work.

Stevo: Understand the rules in place. If don't like the idea of one team of varying regions, when will the deadline be for applying for these spots? First come first serve is unfair.

Ten: No Slovak team will be applying.

Felix: Clarification, not just first come first serve. it is mostly based on the motivation of the applicants and if one emerging area submitted past the deadline or something similar, they'd have a disadvantage. we'll announce the deadline for emerging areas to apply rather soon so everyone can prepare their stuff and give them the opportunity to properly apply.

Chula: NGB applies? Or team?

Laurens; team

Stevo: Confusion

Mel: It should be NGbs not teams

Chula: Agreed, doesn't seem logical that an emerging area gets more spots than a developed nation.

Felix: I will say that there will be a definite disadvantage to a second, inferior application

Chula: For spots granted to emerging areas, not more than one team can come from any one area.

Laurens: Seconded

Vote: Unanimously in favour

Felix: So the regulation will be that only one team can come from any one emerging area

As it is quite late, I would suggest cutting the meeting short at this point and discussing the points further down the agenda in another meeting/on the facebook group

[discussion over 'emerging area and whether they have NGB]

Ten: You have to write an email with expansion staff, then you are an emerging area. No need for NGB.

Chula: Okay, we need to apply through teams.

d. Injury Policy (Laurens)

Current European injury policy would break belgian laws. All EC to check privacy laws for first aiders of whether they can or not.

Lena: Which laws

Chula: Will talk to Lena about this.

Chula: Motion to table rest of meeting

Mel: Seconded

Meeting ends: 22:30

6. Make a decision on wording of secondary team policy

7. Snitch program? (Baptiste)

Baptiste : We have not finished. The recovery was difficult, but it is on track. I know it takes that you share the results of the first tests.

Anyway, it's over before I left my position as President of the FQF (late November)

European Quidditch Congress Meeting

Date: 06 November 2016

Location: Skype voice

Meeting time: 21:00 CET

In attendance: Nina Heise (DQB), Chula Bruggeling (QNL), Kinga Robutka (PLQ), Yeray Espinosa Cuevas (AQE), Mel Piper (QUK), Pauline Raes (BQF), Pau Pérez (AQC), Lena Mandahus (QAT), Martin Hofbauer (SQA), David Jonsson (SvQF), Stefan Scheurer (Ireland), Baptiste Julien Blandet (FQF)

Chair: Rebecca Alley

Secretary: Felix Linsmeier

Agenda

- 1) Roll Call
- 2) Introduction
- 3) EQC 16
 - a) Ref requirements
- 4) Make a decision on wording of secondary team policy
 - a) Past wording
 - b) Switching over from B-Teams
- 5) Applications for Emerging Areas

Referee Requirements for EQC 2016

Chula: There was no clear consensus on ref requirements but most seemed to agree to set higher requirements for more developed NGBs. One system that might work is a minimum requirement of 1 ref for emerging and then more AR/SR/Snitch + possibly HR for more developed nations.

Rebecca: Would it be fair to require at least 1 Headref from an NGB.

Pauline: Why not require 1 HR per country and further ARs from teams?

Rebecca: How about this proposal:

- Teams from developing nations: 1AR
- Teams from full member nations: 3AR, 1SR
- Each full member nation: 1 nonplaying HR

Chula: The problem with this is scheduling as well as differing standards of reffing in different countries.

Pauline: Maybe HR count can be tied to number of teams attending?

Chula: Would we require HRs from emerging/developing NGBs?

Pauline: For developing I would suggest just 1 AR and then higher requirements for full members.

Chula: Oftentimes the most experienced refs come from the top teams, so non-playing might be an issue.

Lena: Teams could bring two playing HRs instead of one non-playing one?

Mel: What were last year's requirements?

Chula: 1 AR, 1 SR. Should there also be a Snitch requirement?

Rebecca: We could also do the HR thing for Snitches.

Mel: If ref requirements are imposed on NGBs that would be fine but there might be diversity issues. There could be a system where teams and NGBs decide together on what to do number-wise.

Baptiste: It's somewhat irrelevant what the current state of reffing is, there is still a lot of time until then to get refs certified.

Chula: In this regard, it would also help development.

Kinga: I'm a bit worried about requirements from NGBs that only send one team.

Rebecca: One person can have multiple qualifications though.

Chula: I disagree, you can't schedule people when they are multiple refs on the list but all in one person.

Rebecca: Our current options are:

AR/SR: 1SR, 3AR's per team for full member NGB's

HR:

VOTE #1: For full member NGB's with >1 team attending

- a. 1 nonplaying HR
- b. 1 nonplaying HR OR 2 playing HR's

VOTE #2: For full member NGB's with 1 team attending

- a. 1 nonplaying HR
- b. 1 HR, nonplaying OR playing
- c. No HR requirements

VOTE #3: For emerging area NGB's

- a. No HR requirements
- b. Some sort of HR requirements (TBD)

We could also use the Tiddly system of requiring teams to supply refs based on a point system?

Nina: We could do 1.5 points for full-time HR and 1 for part-time?

Rebecca: We'll move to a vote on whether to adopt a point- or number-based system.

VOTE ON REF SYSTEM

Option 1: Tiddly Method with amendments: AQC, QAT, AQE, FQF, PLQ, QUK, QNL

Option 2: Specific number requirements for refs: -

Abstain: BQF

Chula: Could we just convert the number-based system to the points?

Rebecca: Depends on part- and full-time but generally yes.

Proposal:

- Per developed NGB with >1 team: (teams*2)+3
- Per developed NGB with 1 team: (teams*2)
- Per emerging area: (teams*1)

Chula: Could we bump up the points but include goal refs and non-qualified refs?

Rebecca: Yes but this would over-complicate everything. In this point-based system, we wouldn't care about how teams get their points. This should ensure an overall good spread.

Lena: Could we just "recommend" to NGBs to bring HRs?

Chula: We already have UK, Belgian and German refs in the area that should be able to come.

Rebecca: What do people think about the above proposal?

Chula: Why does an NGB with more than one team need to bring that many more refs? I.e. "Per developed NGB with >1 team: $(teams*2)+2$ "

Chula: Are we worried that teams will go with the other extreme that teams bring only HRs and not the other way around?

Rebecca: Then we would have a lot of HR-qualified ARs.

Laurens: Some HRs set as ARs might complain about not getting paid.

Chula: EQC is not the tournament to let inexperienced refs get games.

Stefan: The disadvantage here would be abuse with a lot of non-qualified refs; there should maybe also be a minimum requirement for certain refs (i.e. HR) per NGB to make sure that we have enough of each.

Chula: If we do HR, AR, SR anyway we might as well do the first system.

Kinga: The point system would actually work better for us.

Chula: Assuming the deadline and point system; what do we do if we find out that we have a problem and "reserve the right" to impose further requirements?

Baptiste: Another suggestion, about this point each meeting and every NGB indicate if we have a new assref new certification and we can define a deadline of one to three four six for example certification, on time for example in december, is two assref. In this method, I think we can anticipate the situation in March.

Laurens: Could we have a standard set of playing volunteers that each team has to offer?

Mel: I still think that doing it by NGB would be easiest. In terms of numbers, can we use past numbers to gauge what we need this time?

Rebecca: We'll vote on:

- Developed NGB >1 team: $(teams*2)+2$
- Developed NGB 1 team: $(teams*2)$
- Emerging area: $(teams*1)$

Yes: QAT, AQC, QNL, AQE, DQB, PLQ, FQF, QUK

No: -

Abstain: BQF

Rebecca: We'll put this up on the website and send out the link to you to distribute.

Secondary team policy

Rebecca: The carryover from the last meetings is:

1. NGB's structured with primary and secondary teams must have regulations in place to ensure transfers between teams do not confer a competitive advantage following qualifying tournaments.

a. These regulations may include:

- i. In an NGB with developmental level teams, players may transfer up to competitive level teams.
- ii. A team may take up to 5 secondary players, up to a maximum of 14 players, following a qualifying tournament.

b. If the team a player plays for at the qualifying tournament qualifies for any subsequent tournaments, that player must play for that team at the subsequent tournaments.

Chula: Does this count with transfers between developing and full teams?

Nina: I find the point about competitive advantage to be very vague, could we make this more precise?

Chula: We're saying all of this about competitive advantage but generally, if teams get very few added players that wouldn't be a competitive advantage.

Baptiste: If we have players on the second team and second team is qualified to EQC, these players play on the first team. In the first team go to EQC too. If we play for second team too or play for team A too?

Nina: What about Club membership, i.e. Team 1 and 2? Should the regulation count with this in mind?

Rebecca: People seem to be okay with the regulation that you should play for the team you qualify with.

Chula: Are we updating the merc rules?

Rebecca: This would be an EQC discussion. We'll update the wording and vote on it online.

Chula: If I have a primary and secondary team and both qualify, but I've not attended a qualifying tournament, can I choose who to play for or am I restricted to my primary team?

Lena: I would say that they are restricted to their primary team.

Stefan: Does this also concern emerging areas or not (since they don't have recognised structures)?

Rebecca: Usually, if an emerging area can field a team that is seen as development, so it used to be a bit more lenient.

Chula: It seems a bit unfair to me if the merc regulation didn't apply here.

Rebecca: We could always make that apply to them.

Applications for emerging areas

Rebecca: Looking at last year's application:
https://docs.google.com/forms/d/e/1FAIpQLSeGeXAET1B7jgrfHbXZWxA-5vTeDA_t_vT9nIS9_ZNNpv62v0nQ/viewform

Martin: What do we do in a situation like Slovakia where there is an NGB but it is still an emerging area.

Rebecca: We'll change that to take that into account.

Other

Chula: A while back we had a discussion on what is and is not Europe. Robin and I summed up the discussion and the points made and there are several options ready to be voted on. This can be looked over and voted on at the earliest opportunity.

END OF MEETING: 22:56 CET

European Quidditch Congress Meeting

Date: November 11, 2016

Location: Skype voice

Meeting time: 21:00 CET

In attendance: Robin Mier - QNL, Lisa Tietze - DQB, Lena Mandahus - QAT, Jørgen Stenløkk - NRF, Martin Hofbauer - SQA, Kinga Robutka - PLQ, David Jonsson - SvQF, Alper Erişen - QD, Stefan Scheurer - Ireland, Héctor Cabrera - AQE, Mel Piper - QUK

Chair: Felix Linsmeier

Acting Secretary: Mel Piper

Agenda

1. Introduction
2. Roll Call
3. Secreteriat going forward (Felix/Rebecca)
4. European Snitch Programme

doc:<https://docs.google.com/forms/d/e/1FAIpQLSej3okUe76ecD3ixF5d5e4wKgRBRcxDI7uyurQ9c2LpggvzLw/viewform>

5. European Quidditch Cup 2017 (Laurens?)
6. IQA Setup (Mel, Laurens, Chula)

doc:https://docs.google.com/document/d/1YXhPPLopxX4feq-tiqmGhhH1P5PZpMp7SO_XnPn2xd8/edit

7. Defining Europe (Chula)

doc:<https://docs.google.com/document/d/1yj6XyHWJR0EaZWu76XRxiV7uz2NP-w320o9a5qx7Xo8/edit>

Secreteriat going forward

Felix: Since Rebecca is leaving for the IQA, you now have the opportunity to ask any questions.

Rebecca: I have been in office as ED of the IQA for the past one and a half weeks. Please encourage other people from your NGB to apply for Executive Manager of QE.

Felix: I will not be applying for EM role, and will remain as secretary

Rebecca: Encourage people from your NGB to apply. Any questions to me as ED?

Alper: Biggest problem with IQA?

Rebecca: I'm first working this out. There's a lot of distrust. I'm working on a survey for NGBs and community to work out what people want from us. Will be working with trustees in New Year to do a 5 year plan, and an organisational diagram so we know who reports to who which currently doesn't exist. Once we do this, trust will then be built-need to know we are going in the right direction for everybody.

Lena: Where do you see the IQA going?

Rebecca: Big question! First thing to get IQA to have a plan going forward. Would like to solve legal issues first, and also get the volunteers to get stuff done. So knowing where we're going and what people we need. Also people to help with the events, and emerging areas etc. I have a lot of 'pipe dreams' but need to get down and do things first so we function. Ideas like QuidCamp in Norway are really great, and to do more stuff like that would be brilliant.

[BQF Joined conversation]

Rebecca: Question for you guys. What sort of things would you like us to be asking in the survey?

Lena: Graphic representation of the IQA (organigram)?

Rebecca: That's what I'm wanting to do, newest one currently is 2013. So very inaccurate.

Stefan: Is there plans to react to the QP IQA Article.

Rebecca: It hasn't been addressed, and it may be a good idea. Would it be good to address it when survey responses are back? We need to be making sure we are listening to the community. Someone suggested every 2-3 I film myself answering questions from the community. WOULD this be useful?

Felix: Would give a lot of transparency, just about time constraints.

Robin: Public list of members on the website, with rank and links to websites and fbook pages for all IQA members

Rebecca: Helping people get in contact with relevant NGB? We're working on updating the website so will pass that on

Martin: It is great :) actually I would like to also hear in these kind of videos what is IQA trying to achieve in like next month

Robin: Contact addresses for IQA on website so we know how we contact that person? Email address for congress too.

Rebecca: Does that exist?

Robin: I don't think so.

Rebecca: Brian should be hopefully sort that out if needed, make sure you bring it up with him too. What would the email be used for?

Robin: Mostly way to be able to reach congress without going through representatives.

Rebecca: Organisational google drive.

Stefan: There is some contact details already on website, and how up to date that is?

Rebecca: Most are alias' that get forwarded to Nicole, soon me.

Alper: Budget at all?

Rebecca: Someone currently working on finance report. Hopefully by new year should have concrete financial statement. Pushing with board to have a financial statement open end of each financial year

Martin: In Slovakia, people aren't very good at English, so struggle to understand how the IQA works. Translations of website etc?

Rebecca: Firstly planning on getting translators working on the rulebook. Can only translate as much as we have volunteers. Please get people to apply. Some volunteer roles will be coming up over next few months. Currently have an intern from a Spanish university, if you know others that need that type of thing, we can do that too.

[Rebecca exits]

8. European Snitch Programme

doc:<https://docs.google.com/forms/d/e/1FAIpQLSej3okUe76ecD3ixF5d5e4wKqRBRcxDI7uyurQ9c2LpggvzLw/viewform>

Felix: Baptiste has left and committee dropped, so everything is back to square one essentially. It's a good start. The application form (above), does need updating with new email addresses. Did we have anyone on that committee as well?

Jorgen: I drafted the application, but that was all.

Felix: I will be talking to Baptiste again, to see anything else they have. As this is something we have been working on for over a year, hopefully we can get there soon. Any questions? If anyone else would like to volunteer to lead this, let me know.

Jorgen: There was a group of volunteers. Not sure if anyone is in contact with them?

Felix: I will be messaging baptiste about all of this.

9. European Quidditch Cup 2017 (Laurens?)

Felix: This is in as a placeholder. Any news about this can go in ehre

Laurens: Had first meeting last week. Next week another meeting. Discussed various things, placed message about teams submission in EC, will begin drafting email to go out to teams.

Felix: Any questions?

Stefan: When will you know about emerging areas spots?

Laurens: European committee decide.

Felix: We will see how far we get with the meeting today. European committee decides this, but we need to put in a way for NGBs to apply first.

Laurens: Offering special accomodation for emerging areas for free(?)

10. IQA Setup (Mel, Laurens, Chula)

doc:https://docs.google.com/document/d/1YXhPPLopxX4feq-tiqmGhhH1P5PZpMp7SO_XnPn2xd8/edit

Laurens: Has everyone read this?

(general nods)

Felix: what would you like to do to this?

Laurens: General idea for us to see what Europe think, then if good, we can see through congress

Lena: This makes the process much easier. I like it.

Alper: Generally like the proposal, but have issue with no more votes, proposal says every confederation will have one vote.

Laurens: Reason behind this being done was to respond to USQ in the AGM, about Europe voting as a unit essentially. This is why we tried to get every confederation to have 3 votes, so every confederation would be equal

Felix: Would there be a way to do it relative to players in area?

Alper: that sounds better.

Robin: More players need more voices

Felix: How does it deal with small emerging regions?

Laurens: If emerging, represented by emerging areas committee in IQA.

Felix: Fair. We are making decisions on European level here, but adopting this system

would transform this committee too-it would be a concrete body serving IQA.

Laurens: Yes, but can be solved through our own voting on our issues

Felix: Information flow from iqa to regions?

[david johnsson leaves]

Laurens: Each confederation has Chair, EM and secretary, that goes to IQA meeting. They go back to their confederation, and flow of information through them.

Jorgen: Good suggestion. Obviously IQA doesn't work that well now, so worth trying out.

Alper: If this is accepted, constitution needs rewriting. And the Terms of Responsibility.

Laurens: this was written before AGM, but wasn't talked about. But there is the ability to change the constitution. I can also provide the original conversation with Chula why things are said, then I can find this.

Felix: Is this something that should now be sent to IQA

Jorgen: Other countries not in Europe should be allowed to make comments on it. Obviously this may be more difficult for other countries to see the need for it that don't meet so often.

Laurens: Has been sent to Australia but no response so far as very busy. Other continents are trying to do the same in South America and Asia so it shouldn't be too hard.

Mel: This was passed to the IQA in some way, and there is support for this outside of Europe but this needs to be acted on now.

Felix: Any other comments?

Suggest that this document is amended and then sent to Rebecca, and also brought forward to IQA Congress. Firstly we should get a general opinion poll on this, propose a vote:

Vote on: Sending a European opinion Piece on the devolving of congressional functions to regional committees to the IQA

Alper: Seconded

QNL, DQB, QAT, AQE, BQF, QD, PLQ, SQA, QUK-In favour.

0 abstained

0 Not in favour

Motion passed

Action: Felix to get list of Developing and Emerging Areas. Laurens, Chula, Mel to rework and reword on this then sent to Rebecca, or QEurope can. This can also be proposed in IQA group.

(Kinga: Votes all went through at AGM)

11. Defining Europe (Chula)

doc:<https://docs.google.com/document/d/1yj6XyHWJR0EaZWu76XRxiV7uz2NP-w320o9a5qx7Xo8/edit>

Felix: this has been discussed in the group.

Robin: Europe is expanding a lot, and there are going to be moments where border countries will want to join. How do we define Europe so they know who to join. This is also important in relation to the confederations within IQA just discussed.

Felix: three proposals: Latitude and Longitude, or in line with timezones, or in line with European Olympics committee.

Robin: If going for UN definition or European definition, would have to think about Catalonia

Stefan: In rugby, Ireland counts as all of Ireland (Republic and Northern). Olympics is British.

Felix: A lot of NI athletes represent Ireland over UK

Laurens: Shouldn't be looking at those organisations as they're usually different. Aka, England, but Team GB in Olympics.

Lena: Got the atlas out. Co-ordinates and Olympics overlap a little. Georgia, Azerbaijan and Armenia are counted in some, but not UN. So going with one of these two would be best.

Lisa: At least for co-ordinates we would have a problem, as they don't have a capital in Switzerland, so would have to define it differently so would have to be 'capital or federal city'.

Felix: Timezones-how far does GMT +2 exist? Would have more countries such as Syria, Palestine, Israel, no Armenia, Georgia. Is there any reason these countries should be included/excluded?

Laurens: I included them mostly on European Olympic and UEFA. Israel can be an exception.

Alper: Is Cyprus included in co-ordinates?

Felix: Yes. Important we get this in place as we grow. Laurens? Opinions Co-ordinates vs European Olympic and UEFA?

Laurens: Used coordinates as countries can change borders or divide etc, so they will always be in the list.

Felix: If a strange borderline case occurred, could provide an exception

Lisa: Can't we change it to "coordinates of countries with their capitol (or federal city) within Eurasia"

Kinga: Find the coordinates unclear, not too much of a fan but realise outvoted

Lisa: Could say 'our rules are these coordinates' and a list of countries so you know

Felix: Or a part of the website with a highlighted map. Most people approve of co-ordinate view. Any good reason against?

Lena: Using co-ordinates is a good idea alongside a list for ease.

Robin: Co-ordinates only option that doesn't make us reliant on political issues.

Felix: Catalonia would also be fine as they have a capital, and count as 'region'

Motion:

All regions that have their capital (or federal city) on the Eurasian Continent within the following coordinates are eligible for EC membership:

North: Lat. 85

East: Lng. 50

South: Lat 35

West: Lng. -29

Lisa: Russia has 3 federal cities. So would they be three?

Felix: As abstract the idea is, its less likely to happen.

Robin: Seconded

QD, SQA, DQB, QUK, QAT, QNL, BQF, AQE, NRF-In favour
0-Abstained
PLQ - Against

Vote passes

Lisa: If any country is in Asia and Europe, talked to Chula about them being part of both? It would be nice to support growth in Asia

Laurens: Should be included in the confederation proposal?

Felix: Borderline, could right now decide to do as they wish, we can work on this on special basis

Alper: join as advisory, not voting members to share experience

Lisa: Agree-can offer help, and just act as advisors.

12. Application for Emerging area spots(?)

Adjourned to talk about in group. Will discuss application process on Fbook.

Lena: Any updates on when European Games are announced?

Felix: was asked at beginning of meeting. No update as of yet. Will have to wait for now.

Lena: will email Karen

Motion to adjourn

Alper: Seconded