

## **European Quidditch Congress Meeting**

*Date:* January 22, 2016

*Location:* Skype voice

*Meeting time:* 21:00 CET

*In attendance:* Jørgen - NRF, Chula Bruggeling - QNL, Lisa Tietze - DQB, Mel Piper - QUK, Laurens Grinwis Plaat Stultjes - BQF, David Mohamed - FQF, Pau Pérez Casas - AQC, David - SvQF, Héctor - AQE, Stefan Scheurer - QUIRE, Timotej Soklič - Slovenia, Lena Mandahus - QAT, Martin Hofbauer - SQA, Jagoda Sadecka - PQL

*Chair:* Felix Linsmeier

*Acting Secretary:* Mel Piper

### **Roll Call:**

### **Agenda**

1. Introduction
2. Roll Call
3. EQC Secondary Team Policy (Lisa)
4. European Second Division Cup (Lisa)
5. Secondary/join membership in NGBs (Mel)
6. EQC Update and pressing issues (Chula, Laurens)
7. EM Interviews and hiring (Jorgen, Mel)

### **EQC Secondary Team Policy**

([https://docs.google.com/document/d/1IAiVXsEPSJzPyV491Df\\_nPOR8urv-Yv4RFtkl9voQo8/edit](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1IAiVXsEPSJzPyV491Df_nPOR8urv-Yv4RFtkl9voQo8/edit))

Lisa: As it stands we should be thinking about a secondary team policy for the next season since some NGB have qualifiers for next year very early.

Laurens: With regards to early qualifiers such as Italy, they're trying to get in line with other countries, so this issue is quite up in the air.

Lisa: Are people with a primary/secondary team policy?

Jorgen: There aren't technically any regulations on international transfers?

Chula: There are rules for transfers between countries.

Felix: As of summer 2017 there is a European regulation that all NGBs must have a regulation regarding secondary teams.

Chula: As of now, it mostly comes down to what NGBs say is ok. The issue comes when there's only a slim transfer window in some countries.

Felix: The current regulation is that you can transfer but you have to notify both NGBs during the season after qualifiers.

Chula: I though we had a strict rule on transfers but looking at it it doesn't seem so.

Jorgen: The regulation states that there has to be a justification for transfer during the season, like e.g. moving etc. and then still play for the new team at EQC. My question would be if there shouldn't be the same rules for inter- as in intra-NGB transfers.

Lisa: Jorgen, would you just make all the intra-rules apply to between NGBs?

Laurens: Our Belgian membership policies state:

"Within the season, the changing of affiliated teams, is limited, but possible. Assessment of request of transfer will be on a case-by-case basis. Changes in permanent residence or place of education will often be considered an acceptable reason to change the Primary Team and/or Secondary Team. Changes in the Secondary Team are unlikely to be accepted unless this is related to a change in the Primary Team."

"If an Individual Member's primary team is a developing team, and their secondary team is a League Team and does qualify for the European Quidditch Cup, that Individual Member is eligible to play for their secondary team at the European Quidditch, BUT ONLY if that Individual Member is affiliated with their secondary team before the European Quidditch Cup qualifying tournament of the Belgian Quidditch Federation."

"Belgian Quidditch Cup is held at a Strict Roster Restriction, where an Individual Member may only play for their primary team."

Jorgen: I don't really like the primary/secondary policy, it is a big vague.

David: What about if I play a qualifier in France and then move to Poland?

Laurens: On the document linked earlier it is important to note that both NGBs have to be notified and the receiving NGB has to agree to the transfer.

Chula: The thing about secondary membership is is mostly for expansion reasons; top teams in countries are used to be able to field complete squads, but smaller teams may not (which is some of the reason for secondary teams)

Jorgen: Suppose that an NGB has a secondary team policy, how about situations where primary and secondary teams both try to get an EQC spot?

Lisa: This is not transfer rules but you're not transferring because you're already a member of those teams. The question would be whether that type of dual membership is allowed. If this wasn't a case there would also be a special rule needed to tackle A and B teams.

I could see a situation where there has to be affiliation to a team that allows for secondary teams.

Laurens: In Belgium there is a regulation with primary/secondary and club teams. We took inspiration from QUK in that there is an A/B Team rule that allows for 5 switchover players at any time within a club. You do have to give up that club status to switch other teams from other clubs.

Jorgen: I feel like there shouldn't be any "player locking" going on in the secondary team discussion

Jorgen: Having teams not allowed to gain EQC spots destroys gameplay though because it causes teams behaving differently in groups.

David: The other side of what Lisa said is that when developing teams finish higher than established ones without saying that they forfeit their spot, the situation with players being allowed to play is very unclear. In France, there is a "loan"-policy where you can be on loan for a developing team.

Chula: Isn't a possible solution to make sure that non-qualifying teams are separated, i.e. having EQC qualifier and national championships separately (like the Netherlands and Germany).

Laurens: Is Lisa's scenario likely though where teams forfeit?

Lisa: I was just thinking about players playing badly on purpose to make their primary (or secondary) Teams succeed.

Laurens: This sounds like match fixing though, which is a completely different thing.

What people in Belgium are doing is signing up for teams that they are most confident will get a spot.

Chula: Could you alleviate this by requiring primary team membership with the development team?

Lisa: In Germany, developing teams are not allowed to participate on official level.

Felix: So the question really is, should there be a unified regulation on this on the European level?

Lisa: At least DQB, with a secondary team policy this season, would like to have a stricter ruling on the European level, we're basically doing it because we are allowed to.

Mel: There's a lot of differences between sizes of NGBs, so this should be solved by NGBs.

Jorgen: If we just let countries do what they want, there could be advantages for NGBs doing this to get more/better teams at EQC.

Chula: It seems like there needs to be a reason for secondary team membership.

Lisa: In Germany there isn't.

Jorgen: Could people who are interested in this meet and figure out what could work on a European level?

Felix: Should we decide on whether there should be a European regulation on this?

Chula: I do think that there should be some kind of rule.

Felix: Could we reword intra-NGB policy to also include secondary team membership?

David: Since development teams do not play competitively, there isn't really a problem if secondary team membership is only allowed between development and established teams?

Laurens: I think that Felix's proposal is fair if it states that membership is allowed if it is not for competitive advantage.

Chula: So this sounds like there has to be a legitimate justification for secondary team membership?

Lisa: There should still be some guidelines for legitimate justification.

Laurens: Would we be able to make every single team automatically a Quidditch Europe team and have a second European organ deciding about any transfers happening within Europe?

Chula: This sounds great in theory but very cumbersome and hard to implement.

Felix: We'll table this point now, Lisa is willing to kickstart discussion off this meeting, please get in contact with her if you'd like to participate.

## **European Second Division Cup**

Lisa: It would be great to have second EQC-like tournament in order to take of some stress on everyone wanting to go to EQC.

Laurens: We're actually trying to set up something along these lines; this will be a smaller-organised thing but we will see where it goes.

Stefan: I like the idea, but would then the original EQC still have emerging-area spots?

Lisa: This would be a question if it was organised by Quidditch Europe.

Jagoda: Similarly to Laurens, we're going to organise Slavic Cup to establish "regionals"

## **Secondary/join membership in NGBs**

Stefan: This is mainly us asking for exceptions, in order to give northern Irish players the option to be a member of two NGBs (due to Intra-Irish reasons). A Spain-Catalunya regulation where people have to declare ahead of each season, but that wouldn't be feasible for Ireland. QUK is fine with this and the IQA doesn't have a regulation on it. Mel has already typed out a proposal.

Mel: There would be an exception for political reasons.

Chula: I'm a bit confused because you can already be a part of two NGBs but not play for two teams. Would this be a team being a member of both or players? Could they attend both Irish and British cup?

Mel: The team would have to choose which qualifier to go to.

Chula: What's the difference then?

Jorgen: I was wondering the same, wouldn't it make sense to just join the NGB they want to compete in?

Stefan: We wanted to avoid a situation where clubs in the same region have a different allegiance to NGBS.

Laurens: Are there currently any Northern Irish teams registered with you?

Stefan: Yes, the only Northern Irish team is a member of the Irish NGB.

Laurens: Could they not just choose?

Stefan: Culturally, Northern Irish teams would rather not have to make a choice.

Chula: How is that different?

Jorgen: Would it be possible to talk to the people being affected by this? This seems to be a very political reason that we've avoided in the past. Following our logic with Catalunya, it would make sense to allow this.

Felix: What reason do they currently have to play within QUK?

Stefan: Mostly culturally, they are very connected to both.

Mel: This is us trying to find the best solution to a weird cultural problem.

Felix: Please put up this document on the group and allow people to discuss this. Also please consider the "gameplay reasons" for a dual membership, it seems strange to have this dual membership if there's not a reason for it.

## **EQC Update and pressing issues**

Laurens: The first issue is ref/snitch related: There is currently no punishment for non-compliance with the ref-requirements. We'd like the EC to make a decision on this.

Lisa: For German winter games we implemented financial penalties.

Chula: We would have to settle on an amount because it would affect different NGBs differently.

Lena: This would be a punishment of the NGB?

Felix: Yes, the NGBs would have to pay it (they could offset it to their teams though)

Laurens: There could be a difference between NGBs (on basis of size or something) but in that case it would be an incentive for some NGBs to pay rather than supply refs.

Felix: I would agree with Laurens and say that a monetary punishment should be somewhat high to alleviate that risk.

Jorgen: The referee requirements are not that high, it's reasonable to require countries to fulfill them. We could take away future spots if NGBs don't comply.

Lisa: I don't think that that is a good idea because it is retroactive punishment.

Laurens: I would propose that we look at the “points” that NGBs have to supply. For every point we could ask the same sum as two HR tests.

Lena: Similarly to the point thing, an NGB that sends more than one team, they would have to pay more, related to requirements.

Felix: Let’s go to a vote on whether a point based financial punishment: An NGB who does not fulfill their referee requirements, will be required to pay fines of 15€ per half point missed from their total points required.

Chula: Seconded.

Vote:

Yes: Unanimous, except

Abstain: AQE

Jagoda: What is the consequence for non-compliance with that?

Jorgen: How about losing their vote in the EC?

Laurens: I don’t think they should lose their point, but we should think about Jorgens proposal in that case.

David: I think that teams are choosing teams from their NGBs and they should face the consequence for non-compliance.

Felix: Should they lose a spot or all of them?

Lisa: I think that we have to make sure to communicate this to teams as well as NGBs

Chula: I agree with that and I also think that NGBs should lose all spots as ultimate consequence.

Felix: Is there anyone who would like to speak out against this?

Laurens: You could actually keep on excluding NGBs for non-compliance with the fine.

Lena: So how long do they have time to pay?

Felix: Should they have to pay by the end of the season?

Lisa: Should there be a second deadline for new boards to pay by to still be able to get spots?

Chula: I would say that this should be handled on a case-by-case basis if people from the NGB get in touch about this.

Vote on whether NGBs should forfeit all their spots if they don’t comply with their fees:

Yes: Unanimously, except

Abstain: AQE

Lisa: Can you publish the current signup number so we can motivate refs to apply?

Chula: Yes.

Laurens: We can’t make the Belgian privacy laws work with the No-Play list. Medics can tell people that they shouldn’t play but not they can’t tell it to the tournament committee.

David: What if we have volunteer medics?

Laurens: In the end, medical staff on site has to be the last instance.

Chula: We should put anyone who gets taken to the medics on a list and do positive affirmation.

Chula: We would really like to publish public rosters, but we need legal names for this reason; we don't want to out people as well. Our current idea would be two columns, one with legal name and the other with chosen name which would be the one that we publish.

Lisa: How would this be published?

Chula: On the website.

Lisa: Personally, I would be against having full name lists on the internet.

Chula: Our issue is mostly with differences between legal and chosen names.

Felix: Could we publish this on the Events page (limited circle of people)?

Jorgen: Some people may not want to be on the web so the second column could be "published name".

Chula: Can we at least get a letter from the last name still?

Lisa: In cases of name confusion, the published name should be reasonably distinguishable, so agreed. Since they would decide on what will be published, this would also be fine to go up on the website.

Felix: We'll have these two columns then,

Laurens: It was decided that there should be a trophy that's taken from year to year but the same trophy is already in a very run down state. There should be a trophy for every year.

Felix: Judging by the silence, people seem to be okay with having a new trophy every year.

Laurens: I have also just received word that Sweden is dropping out

David: This is correct, we have not got enough key players to make it.

Laurens: Technically, the next emerging area should get the chance, since the deadline has not passed.

Felix: Since the deadline hasn't passed yet, this is what we'll do.

## **EM Interviews and hiring**

Chula: motion to move in-camera

Jorgen: Seconded

Yes: Unanimous

Jorgen: Mel and I have been looking over applications and interviews of the three candidates. We will present pros and cons of all candidates, then have a suggested candidates.

**Action Point: To try and get the new EM as observer in Congress meetings  
Online blind vote with deadline next week.**

## **European Quidditch Congress Meeting**

*Date:* 19 February, 2017

*Location:* Skype voice

*Meeting time:* 21:00 CET

*In attendance:* Jørgen Stenløkk (NRF), Anna Koivu (QAT - part of meeting), Kinga Robutka (PLQ) David Jonsson (SvQF), Stefan Scheurer (QIRE), Martin Hofbauer (SQA - part of meeting), David mohamed (FQF), Héctor Cabrera (AQE), Laurens Grinwis Plaat Stultjes (BQF), Chula Bruggeling (QNL), Lisa Tietze (DQB - part of meeting), Michael Škácha (Czech Republic), Nina Heise (DQB - part of meeting)

*Chair:* Felix Linsmeier

*Acting Secretary:* Chula Bruggeling

### **Roll Call:**

### **Agenda**

1. **Introduction**
2. **Roll Call**
3. **Defining Europe (Chula)**
4. **International team affiliation**
  - a. **Non-playing staff**
  - b. **Between teams of different continents**
5. **Gameplay: Unified score notation (Chula) [tabled]**
6. **Ireland & QUK Resolution (Mel, Stefan)**
7. **EQC Update**
8. **Primary/Secondary teams (Lisa, Chula) [tabled]**

### **Defining Europe**

Chula: In our december meeting it was decided to follow a coordinate approach for defining Europe; however we did not define the exceptions (territories and such), and in later discussion on facebook we said that this is an IQA matter. That being said they work much better when presented with something, so we would like to vote here and then see how the IQA responds.

Felix: Shouldn't really be a need for expansive discussion. It's mostly about borderline cases anyway.

Chula: The one about Exceptional Cases obviously is about borderline cases, but the later two aren't.

Felix: I'd suggest we very shortly go through the proposals, and try to go through this. Let's start with point 2, exceptional cases.

Chula: The proposals are as follows:

**Proposal 1:** These areas fall outside of the proposed definition of Europe and should not be eligible for the European region as defined for quidditch purposes.

**Proposal 2:** These areas are related to regions that fall inside of the proposed definition of Europe and should be eligible for the European region as defined for quidditch purposes.

**Proposal 3:** If players in these areas are considered part of an NGB that falls inside of the proposed definition of Europe, these players and teams should be eligible for the European region as defined for quidditch purposes. If this area has their own NGB, these NGBs should not be eligible for the European region as defined for quidditch purposes.

David: For France there might be some cases that fall under this, but I think they could join a nearer NGB, instead of France. Like French Polynesia, if they want to create their own NGB, I think that would be better for them.

Lisa: If they want to make their own NGB, because they're for example culturally or geographically closer to somewhere else. But if Greenland says "we belong to Denmark" then they simply fall under Denmark and thus under Europe. So I think the third option is best. Also for reasons like growth, support, and getting help, it might make sense to still fall under Europe.

Felix: I think it's not so much growth, but I think it may realistically come up in terms of eligibility for national teams. In theory, if we allow a territory to join, they could reasonably also play for the national team.

Lisa: But that's why we need to bring this proposal to the IQA, so they can officially agree or not. But I agree with Chula that it's best to start with a proposal, because that makes the process easier.

David: Does defining an NGB automatically define a national team? Like I'm thinking about football, and in France we have Guadeloupe, which has a national team/selection, that is not official to the FIFA

Lisa: Catalonia has their own national team, so yes.

Felix: In response to David, it doesn't immediately mean a national team, but one of the requirements for eligibility is that you started playing quidditch in country X. So if for example a French overseas territory joined FQF, they technically started quidditch under France.

David: So if they created their own NGB, they can't play for France.

Jorgen: But if they have the Nationality they could.

Chula: Yes, looking at Bonaire (the Caribbean Netherlands), it's officially a municipality of the Netherlands so they could. On the other hand, they are on the other side of the world, and we would feel strange about making them play within the Netherlands.

Stefan: Might it be an option to have an option similar to Spain and Catalonia.

Lisa: Is it the case that in Catalunya they have spanish citizenship but can't play for Spain if they choose Catalunya? I have a similar case in Norway, where I can technically play for both.

Chula: If Bonaire decides to become its own NGB, would they not be part of Europe anymore?

Lisa: If they want to become an NGB they should play with their closest region, if they wanted to belong to the Netherlands for example, that would also be fine.



Kinga: I basically agree, it would be extremely unlikely that they would want to play with Europe.

Laurens: I agree with Lisa.

Felix: So I'm stopping the discussion here. Shall we go to a vote?

Kinga: Second.

Felix: Could every representative please indicate which proposal your NGB would like to support?

Proposal 1: No votes

Proposal 2: No votes

Proposal 3: DQB, AQE, PLQ, FQF, BQF, QAT (6)

Abstain: SvQF, SQA, NRF (3)

Felix: Okay, so proposal 3 passes.

Felix: So going to the next point, that would be voluntary vs default membership.

Lisa: I'm not sure if we have to vote on this. Because our wording was "eligible", which is not a requirement, but an option.

Felix: That's correct.

Lisa: Also, about the next point, with the European region vs the European committee. It's a bit short in the minutes, but we did talk about it last December. We said if people want to help out in the Asian committee, for example, even though it's related to regional tournaments, it should be possible. You cannot be a member in two committees. However, if you want to help out - in a non-voting, observing membership or similar - that should be totally possible. So you wouldn't need to be a member of both, but help.

Felix: So generally, I think the issue here - I'm not sure that there's structural issues, we did actually talk about this, the possibility to promote growth and all that - I think for practical purposes, everyday life, we'll have to consider this point with regards to EQC spots, and that's actually in one of the proposals.

Because in the past there were a set number of developing region spots that were given out to members that weren't represented in the European committee. Personally, tend to think that in order to be considered for EQC spots - we can't say anything about EG, that's IQA - you should be a member and partake in discussion and meetings by being a member, in order to be considered for guaranteed spots.

Chula: I would agree with that.

Lisa: All of these proposals sort of include however that you can be a member of both committees. I would add a new proposal that says basically the same, but with the extra addition that you cannot join two committees as a voting member. However, you can join a second (or more) committees in an advisory role.

Felix: How do people feel about the exclusivity of certain tournaments? As the third proposal states, is it unreasonable to say that if a team participates in for example the Asian Quidditch Cup (AQC) or equivalent of EQC in that region, is it unreasonable to say they should not be playing in EQC?

Kinga: No, I think that's not unreasonable. I think they should, for region-level tournaments, be exclusive, so you would need to choose.

Felix: Would it be an issue to add the advisory clause? Lisa, how would you have phrased that?

Lisa: As an NGB, you can only be a member of one regional committee. However, you can have a function as advisor, without voting rights, in another committee.

Felix: Would there be requirements? Or could we for example have a US person join as an advisor?

Lisa: I don't really think so. Imagine, for example it makes sense for Turkey to join the Asian committee because of geographical reasons. But say they aren't willing to join because of time commitment or something. Why would we hinder another country who's willing to join?

Chula: As long as it's a mutual understanding, we can easily include this advisory function, because they aren't a member, nor do they vote.

Lisa: I completely agree, I would still include it in the proposal so it's out there for people to see.

Laurens: You just mentioned continental membership. Currently, all members of the EC get an automatic spot for EQC. Those who weren't part of the EC yet or are not, they can still technically apply for emerging area spots (if they are). Does that mean that an NGB within our definition of Europe, are not competing in another continental cup but are a full IQA member are not eligible to get a spot?

Chula: To be honest, how hard is it to join the facebook group?

Felix: So we've added a fourth proposal.

Laurens: I was also thinking say political reasons. Say Ukraine joins quidditch. They technically have enough teams, but their main staff is pro-Russia and don't want to join Europe. But the Western teams might want to still join Europe, but they're now not allowed because their NGB staff is pro-Russia, and anti-Europe.

Michael?: But isn't that an inter-NGB problem?

Laurens: But we should still think about it?

Lisa: Add something about "exceptional cases can be decided on by European committee"? Cases like that would be very much case-by-case, and would not really be able to put into a policy. Teams like that would, hopefully, reach out for help/possibilities.

Laurens: I like that. For example, also if Algeria would just start quidditch, and EQC is played in Spain, we might want to give them the option to join one time.

Lisa: So not defining anything specific, but say case-by-case.

Laurens: Yeah, but just good to have it in there so we don't exclude anything.

Chula: I think we can always just say that any exceptions to this policy can be made on a case-by-case basis.

Felix: Okay, so new proposal.

"Membership of the European Committee is not a requirement to take part in the European Games or the European Quidditch Cup. As long as a country or region falls under the definition of Europe as used in quidditch, they are allowed to apply to take part in European tournaments. A guaranteed EQC spot, however, does require an NGB to be a part of the European Committee.

A member of the European Committee may not be an official member of another regional committee. If an NGB chooses to take part in other continental tournaments, they lose their eligibility for European tournaments. An NGB can only participate in tournaments under one continent/conference/federation.

NGBs may choose to join the European Committee in an advisory role. This does not give that NGB voting rights and does not make them eligible for spots at the European Quidditch Cup. Advisory membership is decided by the European Committee on an individual basis.”

Felix: Could we move to a vote on this proposal?

Lisa & David: Second

Felix: Please indicate whether your NGB is for or against this proposal.

In favour: PLQ, SQA, DQB, FQF, BQF, AQE, QNL, NRF (8)

Against:

Abstain: SvQF (1)

Lisa: So can we officially decide to add the “Exceptions may be decided by the European Committee on a case-to-case basis.”

In favour: PLQ, BQF, SQA, FQF, DQB, AQE, QNL, NRF (8)

Against:

Abstain: SvQF

Lisa: I’m leaving you, Nina is going to join.

Lisa (DQB) leaves at 22.13. Nina (DQB) joins at 22.13

Felix: Okay, lovely, approved. This took much longer than intended. Next topic, international team affiliation.

### **International team affiliation**

Felix: Should you be allowed to be a non-playing member of a team - like a coach, or other nonplaying function.

Chula: This is partly because of the Netherlands and Belgium and there’s a team starting up on the border; we have a Belgian player that’s heading up a new dutch team. He is not expecting to play for the team, just coaching and being a president. He is fine with that but would like to know if this is okay.

David: In that case he would be a member of two NGBs but only in that case.

Chula: You can already be a dual member, just not playing.

Michael: Also for Czech Republic, we have our nonplaying coach, who is a player for a German team at EQC. We would like to have her as a nonplaying coach.

Felix: I’d like to suggest we need to look at context, and a bit less the specific regulation. We had the regulation because we wanted to make sure no team would gain a competitive advantage. Keeping up that spirit, I don’t think having nonplaying staff from a different NGB would give a competitive advantage, and as such I feel it should be fine.

Laurens: Just to keep in mind that Prague Pegasus and Darmstadt are potentially meeting each other. I suggest it is fine to be a nonplaying coach for a different team in another country, but you cannot be both a nonplaying coach and player for two teams at the same tournament.

Chula: Yeah, that would be my proposal as well.

Felix: So should we say coach, or nonplaying in general?

Chula: I'd say nonplaying in general.

Nina: But if you have two teams during the season, and you can just not be with both during a tournament, then concerns like match fixing would still technically be the same, right?

Chula: But then secondary players have the same issue?

Chula: I don't see the difference between secondary team policy and helping to coach a new team (across the border). Teams that are nearby each other help each other out. Just affiliation should not be a reason to exclude people because it promotes growth. The reason why I think that people shouldn't be part of two teams at one tournament is that it has to be clear which team they're there with.

Laurens: I think with non-playing staff positions, this not only applies across boundaries, but intra-boundary. That could technically mean that a Brussels player is the coach of Liège Leviathans.

Nina: I was thinking about our later proposal about secondary teams. Maybe it should have a provision saying that there has to be a growth aspect to it...

Chula: I don't think this one is about new teams and expansion. It's so far very normal to guest-coach at a practice, sometimes in a more formalised way with teams practicing together or similar; if we say someone can't be the official NP coach of a team, that isn't going to stop them from coaching.

Felix: So should we have a regulation that focuses on tournaments?

David: Would we have to do this for all tournaments?

Laurens: At EQC, rosters will be sent in to EQC, and they will only have the rosters on there. Coaches are not, they do not have to be affiliated with NGB already. We're going to be opening a separate form to submit non-playing staff. In the future, I would like to have that changed so staff are included on the rosters.

Chula: I think what David meant more is that in practice it may not do much. If we tell X that they're not allowed to be a nonplaying coach for team B if they're playing for team A, that may not be very effective, because they can still coach from outside of the player area for example.

Felix: We can only do international policy regarding EQC. For EQC, I would suggest you cannot be affiliated with a second team, and thus cannot be in the subbox for a second team as a nonplaying coach. You can do whatever you want outside of the player area, just like every other person can. With European play in general, there's really no reason to limit nonplaying staff in other NGBs. So NGBs can choose their own regulation if they so choose.

Laurens: This was a general comment on what Chula was saying, that anyone can coach, even if they're not in the pitch boundaries. In other sports this is the same. In practice you cannot do anything about coaching from outside the boundaries, and that's fine. It's just that in theory, they cannot have official coaching privileges.

Felix: So do most people agree that for the purposes of EQC there should be a clear separation?

\*general agreement/non-committal from members\*

Felix: So we already have the regulation about multiple teams, so if we add..

A Player may choose to be a member of a Team within a different NGB in a non-playing function (e.g. to coach or otherwise support the team).

For the purposes of European competitive tournaments (specifically EQC) a Person cannot be affiliated with more than one team in any function.

Laurens: BQF motions for a vote

Chula: QNL seconds

Felix: We're voting on whether to include the above regulation into our policy that already exists.

In favour: AQE, DQB, QNL, SvQF, FQF, PLQ, BQF (7)

Against: -

Abstain: NRF, SQA (2)

Felix: Okay, we'll add this to the policy then. If you already know people affected by this, please let them know.

### **International team affiliation**

Nina: Currently the regulation says a member cannot be affiliated as a player with two teams from different NGBs. I wouldn't see an issue with club membership outside of Europe, since it doesn't give a competitive advantage, since there's currently no intercontinental club tournaments.

Chula: We had some questions about this, because some teams have gained some players from the US. We could say that we cannot accept those players.

Jorgen: I can see it be a competitive advantage. Like I can see how it could be a problem for someone if they can only be a member of a European NGB or the US for example. Like if a US player could be in a European country for a while, join a team there without having to lose their US membership, that could give a competitive advantage to the specific team.

Laurens: What if there's a very rich player who wants to go back and forth? They can do that, and it's not something we technically want. But then in other sports, there's not really any sport that allows players to be part of multiple NGBs. And while yes, the competitive advantage might be very minor or nonexistent, there are certainly situations in which it could be an advantage. For example, a player that is only in a country for a limited time might join the NGB, help a team qualify for EQC, and then go back home, without having to lose their 'regular' NGB.

David: Can we put a limit on how much you can transfer within a season?

Felix: We do not have jurisdiction in countries outside of Europe however. We can say you only allow a player to join if you check with the non-European leaving NGB that they signed out there, which would be the same system as within Europe.

Anna (QAT) leaves at 23.05

Chula: If we do allow people to be a part of another NGB that affects player numbers on an IQA level (this is a minor thing).

Felix: As it stands, we may not even need to vote, because the current policy does theoretically also counts non-European NGBs as NGBs. In this case, since we do not currently have any other real proposals how to otherwise handle this, I would probably table this point, and suggest to NGBs to work on a 'good practice' approach. So do check with other NGBs if they transfer in or out, also outside of Europe. And we'll leave the current regulation as stands.

### **Unified score notation**

Tabled until next meeting because of time constraints.

## **Ireland & QUK resolution**

Felix: Where did we end up last time?

Chula: We asked if someone from Northern Ireland could explain the situation.

Stefan: Shall I add Conor into this conversation?

Felix: Go ahead.

Conor Ardill (Ireland guest) joins at 23.12

Felix: Right, so Stefan has said that you could explain the situation with Northern Ireland a little bit more.

Conor: So basically, we're seeking a halfway solution which will allow Northern Ireland to be part of both Quidditch Ireland and Quidditch UK. The reason is we're trying to be pre-emptive about the political situation in NI. History: NI was taken over by UK, but then a large part of NI which considered itself to be Irish led to people breaking away to be with Republic of Ireland, and another part wanted to be with the UK, so there was sort of a civil war. This bleeds into sports, with certain sports being considered Irish sports, and others UK sports. Because quidditch prides itself on being inclusive and progressive, we're trying to keep politics out of it, so we found the best way for us to do this is- because it's a university sport, the easiest teams to play with would be Irish teams. But because the Republic of Ireland is technically outside of the UK, we would have to leave Quidditch UK. So we would like some sort of solution that would allow players to be part of both QUK and QIRE. QUK and QIRE are happy enough to let NI teams to play in both leagues. It would be somewhat of a perfect solution because it allows NI quidditch to grow without having to involve itself in politics.

Felix: Thank you. One of the main concerns was how to keep it separated on paper.

Conor: If it's a list of registered players, the players theoretically exist on both list. We can categorise them as NI, and then QUK and QIRE decide for which membership they count.

Laurens: What do Ireland and QUK want from Quidditch Europe now? With this information?

Conor: I think Stefan is better placed to talk about this. But I think we just want to do this the official way, and through the proper channels. And then grow the NI community. So we just want to make sure everyone is okay with this in the European community so we do not have to revisit this issue later on. So we just want to take the steps pre-emptively.

Stefan: Mel last type already typed up a proposal. So our question for you would simply be if the European Committee would be okay with the fact that NI teams would be a part of both QIRE and QUK, under the condition that teams would need to decide at the start of the season for which EQC route they're trying to compete. But they would be full members of both NGBs.

Michael: What happens if a new team forms after the season start? Will they decide on which one as they form?

Conor:

Nina: This is going back to Laurens question earlier, we're basically discussing an addition to a policy, or a new policy?

Laurens: Isn't that kind of odd? To say a team in NI is very good, for example, and should belong to the top six of QUK-

Let's say you have chosen to qualify via QUK, and you do qualify for EQC with Northern Cup (UK), and then after you participate in the Irish Cup (or similar) and you finish first there, the second team goes to EQC? While they actually shouldn't have qualified but due to the team winning in another competition, they now still get to EQC.

Conor: The political realities of this is why we're doing this. Our goal is not to get an easy ride to EQC or anything. The goal is to allow as many teams across the Republic of Ireland and Northern Ireland to crop up. Identity politics drive this country insane. We're just trying to keep this out of quidditch.

Stefan: Laurens said it's a bit weird that the winning team will not go to EQC. I think it was the case last year in Spain where the Boggards won the competition and before they already said they wouldn't go because they didn't have the money, so the second or third place team went. So it happened before.

Hector: Boggards was the team that could not participate, they had the second spot, just clarifying.

Felix: Technically, the NGB itself decide who the spot goes to, and they can do that on whatever reason they want.

Chula:

Conor: At the end of the day, there's a limited number of quidditch tournaments. And different tournaments are having different levels of prestige. If we already solved the problem of making sure we don't have a competitive advantage with trying to compete for two EQC spots, we just want to allow our teams to gain as much competitive quidditch as they can.

I think if you limit Queens and Dublin to only play each other for the first couple of years, we risk quidditch here dying once again. So we just want to give our players as much experience as we can.

Stefan: It's a sense of belonging. If all QUK teams are allowed to go to Northern Cup and Southern Cup, and the NI teams aren't, then I feel that's not really being allowed to be a part of QUK.

Chula: We could say we just revisit this discussion/situation every season. So we accept a certain proposal this time, and revisit that proposal and see if we want to keep it or change it every season.

Conor: That seems fair, so we could just try things out.

Felix: Thank you very much Conor for coming in and explaining the situation.

Conor: I appreciate being allowed to speak here. Enjoy the rest of your night.

Conor (Ireland guest) leaves at 23.50

Felix: Current proposal is allowing the dual membership, and QUK and QIRE will figure out exactly what they do with that themselves. Do we feel like we're at a point where we can vote on this?

Laurens: I think it's at the moment an inappropriate time to vote on the proposal, and would like a little more time after this new information.

Chula: So the current suggestion technically only says we give the European Committee gets the power to give exceptions for political reasons. It does not yet give anyone that exception, or explain exactly what the exception in the case of Ireland is going to be.

Suggestion: "In exceptional circumstances, due to political reasons, teams can be registered with two NGBs, but this must be cleared by the European Committee. However, a club

allowed to be part of two NGBs in this way needs to decide at the start of the season through which NGB they want to try and qualify for tournaments like EQC”

Felix: That would make sense. So it would be a two-step process anyway, we could do the first step now.

Martin Hofbauer (SQA) leaves at 00.03

Michael: So are we only talking about Ireland, or all countries?

Felix: The above proposal would theoretically be for all countries. We would discuss each one on a case-by-case basis.

Chula: Motion to vote on adding the above quoted policy.

Kinga: Second.

In favour: QNL, PLQ, AQE, DQB, FQF (5)

Against: SvQF (1)

Abstain: BQF, NRF (2)

Felix: That passes. It does mean we have not made a decision on Northern Ireland's particular situation, but we're understanding the unique situation they're in. Our concerns are mostly on a practical level, not on an ideological level, so we are committed to figuring out a situation that will work for all parties involved.

Stefan: Will we be able to decide during the next meeting?

Felix: Yes. We'll start another Facebook discussion, and any concerns can be posted there. We will have a vote next time.

### **EQC Updates**

Chula: Please keep in mind that the roster submission deadline is the 26th of February. Please also make sure that you fulfil your ref quota in time!

Laurens: Earlier we received an email from a team sending in their roster directly to us. They should have already send in their roster to you as an NGB, the deadline passed 10 minutes ago.

Laurens: Also, the team fee deadline has passed. We will be making sure that all teams have paid after the weekend.

Jorgen: When is the group draw?

Laurens: It will be announced next week.

Chula: Motion to end meeting

Kinga: Second

### **End of Meeting: 00:18**

Felix: The next meeting will be on the 12th of March



## **European Quidditch Congress Meeting**

Date: 12 March, 2017

Location: Skype voice

Meeting time: 21:30 CET

In attendance:

Voting: Jørgen Stenløkk (NRF), Lisa Tietze (DQB), Martin Hofbauer (SQA), David Jonsson (SvQF), David Mohamed (FQF), Alper Erisen (QD), Héctor Cabrera (AQE), Chula Bruggeling (QNL), Laurens Grinwis (BQF), Lena (QAT, 21:58)

Nonvoting: Stefan Scheurer (QIRE)

Chair: Felix Linsmeier

Acting Secretary: Chula Bruggeling

### **Agenda**

1. **Introduction**
2. **Roll call**
3. **Secretary**
4. **Gameplay: Unified score notation (Chula)**
5. **Ireland & QUK Resolution (Mel, Stefan)**
6. **Secondary membership (Lisa)**
7. **EQC Update**
8. **Snitch Committee**

Meeting starts 21.30

### **Secretary**

Felix is working on it, something will go out next week

### **Gameplay: Unified score notation**

<https://www.facebook.com/groups/576293432429382/permalink/1299028143489237/>

Chula:

Felix: So does anyone have any comments, questions or concerns?

Jorgen: I think the reason it was brought up was I saw a score which wasn't intuitive to me, working with the second system.

Lisa: I agree that it's sort of unintuitive [the 'backwards' system]. Having specific signs for specific time periods is easier to remember. But getting people used to the other system would be less of a mess on scoresheets, because you need less signs. You don't have to put something in brackets [the overtime signifiers].

David: I think the second system would be only occasional. It would only be sometimes. So if we get a system, I think it should be clear.

Lisa: But that point doesn't really speak against using Cory's system. If we don't have a lot of overtime generally, we would still signify the last catch by an asterisk, it's just that it's in the first time.

Alper: So how would a second overtime match look without a snitch catch in 2OT?

[explanation]

David: I think for habits for regular players, keeping the star for the regular time would be the best. Generally, if we had a ? or a degree, people have to remind that it's only an exceptional situation, and you don't have to explain to other people who are looking to the scoresheet that the star is the last period of the game, etc. It would be difficult to explain.

Chula: That just depends on how you explain it to people, and how you're thinking about it.

Lisa: For the sake of a better system, it might be worth it to put some more effort into it, and be a little less intuitive at first.

Stefan: I'm going through this article that Cory wrote, and just to reiterate: the star is the last catch, the ^ is the one before, the degree is the two before. Why make it complicated?

Chula: The 'forwards' system needs extra characters to signify an overtime. 90\*-110, can be with a 90\*-90 score and then 90\*-110 in overtime, or 90\*-110 just in regular time.

Felix: Sort of taking consensus, if there a clear division?

Lena: I think the forward system makes a lot more sense. Because we have been using the forward system mostly, I think? The backwards system would take some time getting used to.

Alper: Can we find a different character than the degree? Not always easy to find the degree

Lisa: An apostrophe maybe?

Chula: We can change the details, the current question is mostly which system to use.

Felix: We could decide on a system now, and make the actual signs a Facebook post or something.

Alper: Team A catches in regular time, Team B in overtime, Team A in second overtime.

Héctor: So from my point of view, the question is whether

Lisa: I still want to say though, even if we use the backwards system, we would still use the asterisk as most people know it, because most games do not go to overtime. So most games would still be annotated as asterisk.

Felix: So would that confuse people?

Chula: I think as long as we all agree on using the European standardised system, we should be fine? It would be on all scoresheets, and the way people learn it.

Vote: Which general system do we want to employ as the standardised European score notation: the 'forwards' system or the 'backwards' system.

'forwards' system

An asterisk (\*) indicates snitch catch in regular time

A caret (^) indicates snitch catch in overtime

A degree (°) indicates snitch catch in second overtime

Needs extra signifiers to let people know how many overtime periods there were (if any)

'backwards' system (Cory's system)

An asterisk (\*) indicates snitch catch in the last period of gameplay

A caret (^) indicates snitch catch in the penultimate period of gameplay

A degree (°) indicates snitch catch in the ante-penultimate period of gameplay

Needs no extra signifiers to let people know how many overtime periods there were

Forwards: SQA, QD, QAT

Backwards: DQB, QNL, FQF, AQE

Abstain: NRF, SvQF, BQF

Lisa: I think this is a thing where really a great majority needs to agree, because if a lot of people don't like it, it's not going to work. So I think it's good to have more discussion, with more people.

Stefan: Wouldn't you expect this to be a problem elsewhere? Did someone not yet solve this?

Chula: It's not really a 'problem', everyone has their own systems currently. It would just be nice to have a standardised, international system.

Felix: Since it's a gameplay decision, let's go to Facebook.

Jorgen: I think we use a modified Belgian one?

Lena: I think we've been using the USQ one

Jorgen: Maybe we're using that one?

Chula: I think QNL uses the Belgian one.

Lena: here's the USQ one: <https://www.usquidditch.org/files/USQScorecard.pdf>

Stefan: Maybe we could use stickers or something for the rosters.

Lisa: Personally I also like room for tracking score statistics. Not necessary, but useful.

Coaches like it, but they're not often able.

Chula:

Héctor: I think it's important to get the signatures in the main page, and not the second page, in case by accident the sheets get separated.

David: Maybe we should, on the second page there's a column for cards. Why on both sides?

Chula: You need space to write out a reason, which you can't do on the front. But you want to quickly see if someone already got cards, for example.

Jorgen: Would it make sense to discuss this on FB along with the other score thing? We could make some visual examples.

Felix: Yes, but I'd like to do some discussing here first.

Chula: I think it would be useful to make a list of things we absolutely want.

Felix: So teamnames, tally, and scores.

Next would be the mid column, which does need to include the score, spread out over periods, and times.

Chula: And the score annotation system.

Felix: You do need carded offenses, player (name and number), type of card.

Martin leaves, 22.49

Alper: Should we not vote on whether we want a standardised scoresheet first?

Chula: Motion to vote: Do we want to create a universal, standardised European scoresheet?

Alper: Seconded

In favour: DQB, QNL, FQF, QAT, AQE, NRF, SvQF

Against: -

Abstain: QD

Felix: Do we want to move this to Facebook?

General consensus: yes

Felix: I'll make a post on Facebook soon then.

Chula: If we could finish it inside a week/week and a half, that means we could use the score system and scoresheets at EQC.

## **Ireland and QUK**

Stefan: Last time we had Connor here, who's the representative from a club in NI. [See also minutes from last meeting.] He explained the situation there. In NI, everything gets politicized and the identity issue is still very much an issue. (More so in specific parts than others.)

There's traditional unionist sports and traditional nationalist sports, and we try to be upfront about it and as progressive as we think quidditch is. So we try to be progressive about this issue as well, so our target together was to solve issues before they arise, and wanted to avoid quidditch getting politicized. Our idea was that NI feel themselves to be part of Ireland as well as the UK, and we wanted to reflect that in our NGB, so they can be part of both the Irish NGB as the QUK one, without having to choose, without seeming nationalistic or unionist. The EQC issue came up, and we decided to solve this by declaring your EQC qualifier at the beginning of the season.

Felix: So in the previous meeting, we accepted the following: "In exceptional circumstances, due to political reasons, teams can be registered with two NGBs, but this must be cleared by the European Committee. However, a club allowed to be part of two NGBs in this way needs to decide at the start of the season through which NGB they want to try and qualify for tournaments like EQC"

So we accepted a framework into which this would be allowed to happen. We would now need to vote on whether we grant QIRE and QUK this possibility. We would have to keep in mind whether we and the spirit of quidditch, what quidditch stands for, and on the other hand any other circumstances this would be counter the idea of this proposal in the Irish case.

Alper: How about transfers? Does this mean they can get players from the UK and Ireland as well?

Felix: In the current system this would mean they would still have to follow regulations. So even though the teams can be members of both NGBs, as I interpret it transfers between NGBs would still have to follow the rules.

Chula: You can transfer between countries anyway?

Stefan: Isn't the current ruling that you cannot transfer after your EQC qualifier?

Felix: The current policy is that you cannot transfer for a competitive advantage after your EQC qualifier.

Stefan: So wouldn't the policies already in place not cover this situation anyway?

Felix: Yes, that's what I meant. There would be a case to be made can Irish players just easily transfer to the UK, because they now would be a part of QUK as well?

Chula: But transferring is already easy? I can transfer to a QUK team as long as the QUK team accepts me (and I cancel out of QNL team).

Alper: I mean that the NI players have a political reason to be part of two NGBs. But if a QUK player would transfer to the NI team, they don't have a political reason to be part of those two NGBs.

Stefan: I think the only 'advantage' you gain would be access to an extra tournament.

Felix: So that's on QUK and QIRE to deal with, and they already agreed to do so.

Chula: So this affects all teams within Northern Ireland? And we would vote on this for all teams, current and future, in the region, and we do not need to vote every time.

Chula: Motion to vote: Teams within the Northern Irish region have been accepted as having exceptional circumstances, due to political reasons, for which these teams can be registered with both QIRE and QUK, according to the following policy:

"In exceptional circumstances, due to political reasons, teams can be registered with two NGBs, but this must be cleared by the European Committee. However, a club allowed to be part of two NGBs in this way needs to decide at the start of the season through which NGB they want to try and qualify for tournaments like EQC"

Lena: Seconded.

In favour: QNL, QD, DQB, FQF, QAT,

Against: -

Abstain: AQE, NRF, SvQF, BQF

Vote passes.

Alper (QD) leaves 23.16

### **Secondary membership**

Lisa: Basically of course we don't want people to gain an advantage from having secondary team membership, because we have the rule you cannot transfer teams between the qualifier and then EQC without a legitimate reason. But if you have a secondary team, you don't technically switch teams, because you already had the team.

This would be fine if you have a secondary team for expansion or growth and expansion for example. We don't want to punish people for helping with growth. But we also don't want people to sue this system to gain a competitive advantage. So we're trying to create a system in which only people who help promote growth get a European committee approved/acknowledged secondary team, and only those people would be allowed to play for their secondary team at EQC.

David (SvQF) leaves 23.21

Felix: This regulation does not currently overtly state that these regulations would only count within one NGB. It's currently not clear up whether a starting team in Sweden could accept a secondary player from a different player.

Chula: That's already covered under a different European policy, in which you cannot be a member of two teams in two NGBs.

Felix: I think it's good that it's limited in terms of time. Would there be a possibility for a 'regrowth' status? If they have less than a certain number of players and would like to expand again?

Chula: I'm not sure if that would count as expansion? You're not creating a new playing opportunity, because you could already play there?

Lisa: It would be really hard to regulate. Numbers of players are always fluctuating, teams are often struggling. If they really disappear for an extended amount of time, and it has ceased to exist.

Chula:

David (FQF): You can keep track with license. You can keep track who is playing where and whose teams get many members, and whose teams get no members. We could do something like that for NGBs.

Lisa: I think that's a different point, which would need to be discussed separately.

Chula: I think most NGBs do keep track in some way, because you need that info for the transfer policies and to accept transfer requests. I just think it's really difficult to formulate a proper policy around this.

Felix: So we'll look for more input on this. We have a recognised need for some form of provision. In that case, let's quickly move on to EQC updates.

### **EQC Updates**

Chula:

Héctor: What happened to non-player members in rosters?

Chula: Email about that will be send out this week.

David: Can we still add more referees and volunteers?

Chula: The deadline has passed, so not really.

Felix: I have two extra points. One, just to tell you that we're fairly well-situated in terms of the financial situation. There will be the merch stand again, which had presales on the website, but that's now closed due to paypal issues. Further sales will be on site.

Lena: I was wondering if teams can sell merchandise, and if so if they can do so at the merch table.

Felix: Yes, teams can sell merchandise at the site. There won't be a specific table. If you want a table, you're allowed to bring something yourself.

Secondly, Laurens and Louis in order to facilitate payments for EQC created the bank account for EQC that's currently operated under the name of European Quidditch Cup which we will try and transfer over to the European Committee. We're gonna try and put my name on it as well, so we can use it for the committee in general. If this doesn't end up happening for any reason, we're not sure about that yet, we'll be working on properly setting up a bank account anyway. Just so you're aware that this is being worked on. This is also why I mentioned we want to hire a treasurer in the near future, so we can have someone properly being in charge of our accounting as well.

Chula: I imagine the EQC final account spreadsheet will be shown to this committee at some point?

Felix: Yeah, once it's finalised we'll be sharing it, as well as an updated EC budget/account. I should probably also mention I've been in contact with Rebecca Alley, the IQA wants to include our financial situation in their financial overviews. More info will follow.

Does anyone have any last questions for EQC?

Jorgen: Can you check your correspondence? We noticed some people said they hadn't gotten a response yet.

Chula: I will make sure to make a round of all of our correspondence tonight or tomorrow.

### **Snitch Committee**

Chula: We probably need to get a new chairperson for the Snitch Committee.

Felix: Yeah. Let's say we will advertise for people to join the Snitch Committee, and try to collect previous information for handover.

Chula: Do we have some form of policy for committees? Like who's eligible to join, that kind of thing?

Felix: We do, somewhere. And quite a bit of the hiring process is up to the chairperson.

Chula: Is there anyone left from the old committee? Besides Baptiste, that left, of course.

Jorgen: I think the rest of the committee wasn't part of the European Committee, so unsure.

Felix: We do have some stuff left from the previous committee, so there's some stuff that we can handover.

We should probably also allocate them to the Quidditch Europe space somehow. Some sort of Google Drive situation, I'll figure something out.

### **Other**

Chula: Just a reminder, there's an IQA meeting coming up. I'd like to see our "Defining Europe" proposal ready to present by that meeting. Also, if you want to 'upgrade' your IQA membership, now is the time to apply.

Chula: Motion to close the meeting.

David (FQF) & Héctor: Seconded.

Meeting closes 0.00

Next meeting is on April 2, 2017.

## **European Quidditch Congress Meeting**

Date: 2 April, 2017

Location: Skype voice

Meeting time: 21:00 CEST

In attendance: Lena Mandahus (QAT), Alper Erişen (QD), Héctor Cabrera (AQE), David Jonsson (SvQF), Kinga Robutka (PLQ), Nina Heise (DQB), Michael Škácha (CFA), Chula Bruggeling (QNL), David Mohamed (FQF), Mel Piper (QUK - joins 21.40)

Chair: Felix Linsmeier

Acting Secretary: Chula Bruggeling

### **Agenda**

- 1. Introduction**
- 2. Roll call**
- 3. Update staff situation**
- 4. Approve “Defining Europe”**
- 5. Score notation continued**
- 6. EG Equipment loan**
- 7. European Snitch Programme questions**

Felix: Please in future, double check the calendar and if you don't have anyone available, let us know earlier, so we can anticipate better.

### **Update staff situation**

Felix: So far we've had no applications, for either secretary, treasurer, or web manager. The deadline has passed for three days now, so we will extend the deadline. Can everyone please share in your local communities when I put it online?

I have some people in mind and I'll pester them myself, but it's always better to have more applicants.

### **Approve “Defining Europe”**

Document in Skype

Chula: I completed the document we already had with the information we got down the line. The people in Europe have already seen what this is (so it's essentially clear but should then be approved by the IQA). We'

Felix: There's also a chance that I'll be in Congress meetings from now as well, as the Executive Manager.

So should we go over the document again? Or do we just say we've gone over this all already in the past, and we just approve this document?

Essentially we've decided on a geographical reach of Europe, based on longitudes and latitudes, as well as some specific cases. Besides we've decided on voluntary vs default membership, and because of phrasing we decided membership is voluntary and not mandatory. We also had some discussion on whether or not tournament eligibility is related to European Committee membership. For EQC, guaranteed spots go to committee



members. Lastly, we decided you can't be on two committees, except if you're part of a committee in an advisory role.

And of course, we give ourselves leeway in terms of

Alper: Did we have a vote on the tournament eligibility related to membership?

Felix: Yes, we passed a vote during the February 19 meeting.

Alper: Ah, I missed that meeting. Okay, that's all.

Felix: Any other comments or questions?

Chula: Move to approve the document.

Kinga: Seconded.

Felix: Please indicate whether you're in favour of this document in the chat.

In favour: DQB, PLQ, QAT, QNL, FQF, SvQF, AQE (7)

Against: QD (1)

Abstain: -

Felix: That passes. Alper, if you want to, can you explain why you voted against?

Alper: We believe that you should have to be a member to attend European Events.

Chula: We essentially did it because EG is an IQA event and we don't really have authority there.

Alper: I was thinking more of EQC.

Chula: Essentially there is guaranteed spots for European Committee members. However, because we give our emerging area spots, if we require European Committee membership, that would be a problem for those spots/teams.

Alper: So emerging areas can't join the committee?

Felix: Well, they can, but not as an official member. They're more of an observer.

Alper: In general, my thought is that if you're not a member of the European Committee you shouldn't be at a European tournament. You said you can't get emerging area to the European Committee and thus that would be problematic for EQC. But I remember in the Congress they said they can join, as long as they're not voting.

Felix:

Alper: I'm thinking of the future. What if Quidditch Europe at some point had membership fees. People that don't pay membership fees probably shouldn't be at tournament.

Felix: That's fair. If we would have membership fees, I would probably agree with you. As it stands now, we say they're allowed to apply, we don't say they're guaranteed to join.

For now, this document passes. I'll find out if I'm allowed to put it forward myself on behalf of the committee, or otherwise I'll ask someone else to do it for us.

### **Score notation continued**

Felix: We talked about this quite a bit during last meeting. Unfortunately, because both me and Chula were busy with EQC, we didn't have time to finish it. The valid point was brought up that this should be a majority vote, so we should involve everyone.

We talked about standardising score notations, to what we kind of named the 'forward system' and the 'backwards system'. We did have a vote, but we didn't get any kind of majority.

How would people like to proceed?

Lena: Since we're not many people today, can we just make it an online vote or something, so everyone can take part?

Felix: We could. We would need to have some way of discussing the advantages and disadvantages as well.

Chula: We could open a new Facebook discussion, give a week of discussion time or something, and then do an online vote.

Alper: I was going to ask if this is going to be a general suggestion or this is going to be enforced. And if it is, how?

Felix: Essentially the committee can decide what reach it wants to have for itself. This would definitely apply to EQC. The committee could decide it wants to impose on NGBs that all national NGB tournaments would use it as well. Essentially, it can have the reach that we want it to.

Mel Piper (QUK) joins, 21.40

Felix: It would make sense to at least standardise the system somewhat. EQC would be the absolute minimum. It would make sense to at least try and have it be in effect for national tournaments, but for things like fantasy tournaments they can just continue doing whatever they want.

Are there any other comments?

Nina: I'm just wondering if there's any legitimate advantage to the forward system, other than the fact that we're used to it.

Kinga: I think the fact that we've been using it for so long and people are used to it is a very legitimate advantage in and of itself. We see the logic to the backward system because we've been so involved and discuss it, but it's going to be much harder for other people to pick up on.

Nina: But like, we're changing rulebooks every season, and people need to get used to that too. So I think people are very much able to get used to it.

Alper: People are complaining about rulebook changes too. So if you change the system, they will complain as well.

Felix: The way it's phrased in the last meeting's minutes, seems confusing to me. It says 'asterisk indicates snitch catch in the last period of gameplay'. But don't you always have a snitch catch during the last period?

Chula: No. Think for example about overtime where you run out the clock.

Felix: Ah. So if you have a snitch catch and you go to overtime, but then first overtime ends due to time, and you end second overtime by a goal. Then you would have, in the backwards system, a degree symbol for that snitch catch in regular time, and that's it.

Chula: Correct.

Héctor: We also talked about the possibility of changing the degree symbol, I think.

Felix: Yes, the symbols itself are up for discussion. Okay, so how would people like to proceed with this.

Committee in general in favour of an online vote.

Felix: Okay, I'll put something on Facebook, and we'll go from there.

## **EG Equipment loan**

Felix: This is not really a question, but maybe Alper, you can give a quick intro?

Alper: As EG TD, we would like to borrow some of the EQC equipment. We would of course transport them from Felix to Norway and back again. We're also buying some spare parts, and would then give it to the EC after.

Chula: Would the IQA be okay with giving us the spare parts?

Alper: I've talked with Bex and she was okay with it.

Felix: Essentially, to give some clarification. We've also got quite some things from World Cup as well, like the electrical cables. So essentially, it's somewhat of a system where we lend out the stuff for free, and in exchange we receive leftovers. We also did it this way for German Winter Games for example.

Chula: What happens if something breaks, for example? Are we reimbursed, or do we just say "oh well that happens", or..?

Felix: We are reimbursed.

Chula: Could we write a policy of how equipment loans work just so we have it on paper?

Felix: Yeah, I'm essentially happy to write one. I can do that. Probably be introduced in the next meeting or so. For the current case, are there any valid concerns about loaning the equipment to EG?

If nobody has any concerns, we'll say European Games can use our equipment. I'll write a policy so we have a framework for future cases.

### **European Snitch Programme questions**

Felix: So, last topic of today. European Snitch Programma. Abdel unfortunately couldn't be here today. But he's happy to take any questions through meeting minutes.

Alper: Can we have a document or something like that that outlines progress and what is done and supposed to be done in the next months or so.

Felix: Yes. We can ask. So I've essentially given Abdel what we had in our old documentation. I'm actually not very happy to put you on the spot like this David, but I've heard from Baptiste that there might be some documents on the French drive. So if you could perhaps take a look at the French drive and see if there's any documentation about the Snitch Programme on there?

Alper: I remember people have been selected for the committee. And now new people have been selected for the committee. I'd like to know if people were replaced because they were inactive, or..?

Felix: I'm not sure why, to be honest. It's probably down to the fact that Baptiste left and then we didn't hear anything from the committee anymore. So we don't actually have any groups or something to take over, so they compiled the documents that they did, and then nothing else came from it.

Chula: Were the old people contacted?

Felix: I'll have to double check that.

Chula: So, is Abdel currently in charge of the committee?

Felix: Yes.

Alper: I think it would be good for the snitch committee as well to maybe talk to the ref development team.

Felix: Yes, that seems like a good idea, to have some similar categories and processes. Obviously they're different, but they're also the same.

David: So I've found some documents. Where should I put them?

Felix: Just send them to the Quidditch Europe email, and I'll compile them to a new document so we can all use that one.

Chula: Please take a look at the secondary team document before next meeting, so we can have a useful discussion and vote on it then.

Chula: Also, next meeting is scheduled when an IQA Congress meeting will almost certainly happen, so we'd need to reschedule.

Felix: Right. And probably to a later date, because the weekend before is Easter.

Nina: Congress meeting is actually the Saturday, not Sunday.

Felix: Okay, then we can keep the meeting.

Felix: Also, we might want to schedule an extraordinary meeting for EQC follow-up.

Chula: If you have any feedback on EQC or anything around EQC, please feel free to send an email or start a Facebook chat or whatever. Evaluation forms should go out next week as well.

Michael: Is there any news on refunds for the bus?

Felix: Not yet. We are working on figuring out our situation with the company first. But we're working on it.

Chula: Motion to finish meeting.

Michael/Nina: Seconded.

Felix: The meeting is hereby officially over. Time is 22.17

## **European Quidditch Congress Meeting**

Date: 23 April, 2017

Location: Skype voice

Meeting time: 21:00 CEST

In attendance: (17 voting members total, quorum is 9)

Laurens Grinwis (BQF), Kinga Robotka (PLQ), Pau Pérez Casas (AQC), Nina Heise (DQB), Michael Škácha (CAF), David Jonsson (SvQF, leaving at 23.23), David Mohamed (FQF), Chula Bruggeling (QNL), Lena Mandahus (QAT, starting at 21.56)

Chair: Felix Linsmeier

Acting Secretary: Chula Bruggeling

### **Agenda**

1. **Introduction**
2. **Roll call**
3. **IQA Congress discussion/update [suggested in camera]**
4. **Approving EG Tournament Director as temporary EC member/discussion on communication going forward**
5. **EQC Update (Chula/Laurens) [suggested in camera]**
6. **Score notation the 3rd**
7. **Important topics for the next two months**
  - a. **Website**
  - b. **Logo**
  - c. **Update terms of responsibility with roles/drafting statutes**
  - d. **Improve work in the EC/improve attendance and discipline**
  - e. **Committee Transparency**
  - f. **Open discussion/topic suggestion**

Felix: Ireland has been promoted to a Developing Region for the IQA, which makes them a voting member in this committee.

### **IQA Congress discussion/update [in camera]**

Nina: Motion to move into camera.

Kinga: Second

### **Approving EG Tournament Director as temporary EC member/discussion on communication going forward**

Felix: Since we currently don't have quorum, I'd suggest moving the actual vote to when we have reached quorum. But we can start talking about it now.

The past three years, the TD or crucial EQC (and EG) members have also been members of this committee. But now for the first time, we're finding ourselves in a situation where this isn't the case. First of all, I don't think we have any issues with Alper staying on the group for a little while longer. But we should talk about whether we should have such a thing as a

general rule about our European tournaments having someone on the committee on a temporary basis if they're not already a member.

Laurens: I do believe that it would be easier, thinking about the situation we had in 2015 - recap: EQC committee and EC committee, and a third group which had some members of both for communication reasons - a lot of information and clarity got lost because it wasn't sure who was supposed to be doing what. The last two years this was not really an issue. Having the tournament director or ATD join in discussions about the topic of that tournament definitely into the European committee. However I'm not sure if they should be there for things unrelated.

Chula: In QNL we have a somewhat related issue at the moment where the national team manager is not a board member, but we'd like to

Felix: My comment was mostly about them being a reporting member. And then ideally we'd

Kinga: So would we want them to have access to the Facebook group? Because we discuss quite a bit on Facebook and just leave voting to the Skype meetings. And I'm not sure if we're all happy about making it a rule that they have access to the group. I'm happy about them being invited to the meeting, but not sure about the Facebook group. I know it would be useful because Facebook is quicker, but not sure.

Michael: Maybe we could do like a Facebook chat and then invite them for meetings. But besides that allowing them to invite them to the Skype seems fine.

Felix: I attempt to want to say let's not have Facebook chats when there's stuff involved that probably needs some sort of tracking off. I kind of would like to have the entire European committee on Slack, but seeing as most people use Facebook more.

Nina: I'd like to say I agree with not adding more people to Facebook, because we talk about a lot of confidential stuff there. I do agree with having them at meetings though. Maybe we could have a second Skype chat and if anything comes up they can post in there?

Chula: I think Slack has some kind of guest access or restricted access where someone only has access to particular channels. Or you make all channels with the committee private channels and have some public channels for extra people.

Felix: So are we in agreement that TDs should be able to attend meetings?

Chula: I'm in agreement that they should have access to the parts of the meeting that are directly relevant to them.

Felix: No objections, so I take that as a yes then. We'll probably ask for confirmation of Alper's temporary status as soon as we can vote on that, or at least give qualified approval [with quorum]. In general, it seems like a sensible idea for people to have access to us and give updates and all that good stuff.

Chula: Only EQC and EG, right?

Felix: Yes. Technically EG is bigger issue than EQC, because EQC is directly our thing because we're supposed to be in the loop anyway. EG it's useful for us to have this information but technically it's an IQA tournament so they technically wouldn't have to keep us in the loop, but obviously we'd like to have them here.

There could be a situation where for example you have a look at World Cup. If that ends up being in Europe again and there are updates that need to be shared with the group, and exceptions might be decided upon on an individual basis then.

David: Couldn't we say that it concern all the competition organised by European Committee? But maybe sometimes we will have the Iron Cup or lower ranking in national rankings.

Chula: European Games is not organised by EC. We could maybe say IQA and/or EC organised?

Felix: Or we could make it more general? We've had observers in the past, for example with the Ireland issue. Maybe we could say in general that EC allows tournament directors from tournaments to participate in meetings on an individual basis?

Chula: How about instead of talking now specifically about EQC and EG, we write a policy about observers in general, and then we can use that whenever we want?

Felix: Since we already started having observers, there probably should be a regulation somewhere that specifies it. Since this seems to be not really controversial and we've done it in the past, would you like me to write a policy or do it now and get it done and over with?

Michael: Maybe you could do the draft other than do it now, because most of the group here is having a second meeting for this weekend.

Chula: How about Felix writes a draft and we can discuss said draft in the next meeting?

Kinga: Or on Facebook?

Felix: Yeah, we could also make an approval vote on Facebook, that would work. I'll draft up something and share it with you all then.

### **EQC Update [in camera]**

Chula: Motion to move to camera.

Kinga: Seconded.

Lena Mandahus (QAT) arrives, 21.56

### **Score notation**

Felix: I'm a bit unimpressed by this because technically we said the deadline was yesterday, and we had some votes today. However, I will accept the votes as they stand now. Since the current vote is 7-4-2 that makes 13 people.

Lena: I voted for two options because our NGB couldn't make much of a decision.

Felix: Okay, so 12 votes, that's still quorum.

David (FQF): I have an issue with this because I'm really sure I voted but I can't find my vote on Facebook.

Kinga: Same here.

David (FQF): Vote for Forwards system.

Kinga: Vote for Forwards system.

Felix: Making it 7-6-2. I'd probably suggest eliminating the backwards system, and have a head to head in the committee group.

Chula: The Forward system is rather similar to the Catch/No Catch system, especially with a recent slight change: what if we do not put the degree sign (°) if there's no overtime.

David: The Catch/No Catch system is for the reading of the score. With only stars or degrees you don't see who caught when.

Chula:

Kinga: If I have to choose and we have to break the tie I can support the Catch/No Catch system.

David (FQF): Same here.

Felix: I think we should still have a head-to-head in the Facebook group.

Chula: It would be useful to have a couple of fictional gamescores written down in both notations, so we could easily see what it would look like, and what the difference would be.

Felix: That can be arranged.

### **Important topics for the next two months**

Felix: So the last point of this meeting is setting sort of a mid-term agenda. Something to keep in mind in the next few months. This is something that I sort of thought of in response to something Chula suggested. Have some sort of game or action plan for any given period of time so we know what we are currently concerned with. These are some things that from discussions with other people have come up in my work, but I'd also open up suggestions from you to add to this. I do see that not always you might have ideas right now, so you'll always have the chance to bring something up to add to this at any pint, either in this meeting or to me personally.

So the first thing is the **website**. This sort of goes along with the hiring of a web manager. There weren't any objections to hiring Noah, so I'll consider that accepted. Unfortunately having him introduce himself in this meeting wasn't able, but he'll introduce himself fairly soon. On the topic of the website we should think about making some changes to it. Sort of going along with what I'm going to be talking about in point e. The two things I'd like to say about the website just now is **improve transparency and also improve visibility**.

One of the questions I gave applicants was how we could improve visibility. One of the answers that I got and that I also thought of myself is we should improve our presence on the website, and also social media. Which means on a practical standpoint first get a proper webhosting - no more wix sites and crazy wix domain names - on a proper quidditch europe.org and improve individual aspects of the website to make it easier to navigate. Also for example something that came up just today then also specify which NGBs are full members, developing regions, emerging areas (and their voting powers) and also on social media announcing the minutes and any public decisions that we make (that aren't in camera). So essentially following up on our meetings with posts about what has been decided and thereby improving participating because people get the chance to speak with their representatives about what they like and don't like about what we're doing. So somewhat extending democracy downward to regular members who can talk with their representative.

Also extending committee transparency, having these minutes published very visible. So people can make these contributions and generally make it easier for the general public to know about Quidditch Europe. A lot of people know about their NGB because it's very visible. People also know about the IQA and RDT, but not everyone knows there's a level in between. I'd like to have a semi-campaign that improves our visibility across the community. This is mainly one of the reasons why hiring a web manager was such a big thing for me. Because I frankly don't have the time to do all of that, and this can be a good step towards



that. Over the next few months expect some regular updates about that, and we'll get the chance to talk about this in detail in other meetings.

Laurens: Would you like NGBs to join in the 'crusade' of making Quidditch Europe more active. Like having NGBs also post the Quidditch Europe things on their own social media and websites?

Felix: Some NGBs are already doing this. Essentially it would be very helpful if NGBs also publicised at least the minutes when they're uploaded, so share posts that are made by Quidditch Europe, but also sort of introduce their communities to regulations that we introduce.

Chula: Could we say that every NGB who has a website, of if you don't have a website, do it on your Facebook instead, to have the information that you're part of Quidditch Europe and with a link to the Quidditch Europe website. Just so it's very visible that you are a part of this and that it exists, and maybe that would help with traffic towards our website and Facebook pages?

Felix: Yes.

Felix: Next point, the **logo**. Something that was actually budgeted for last year which we didn't end up having time for was get done as soon as possible is having our own logo to improve that visibility as well. My two questions about this that I have are what should it be in terms of what it looks like and what it takes inspirations from - and I'm happy to have this moved to Facebook because it's not one that we can do on the spot - but because we are a subcommittee to the IQA, should we have some resemblance to the IQA logo, should we have permission from IQA. Is this something we would approach a designer for or would you like to put out a contest for and essentially have a committee decide out of the different options.

Chula: In terms of resemblance to IQA, their logo is just colour and letters so we probably shouldn't try to resemble it.

Michael: I think a competition would be a good idea since there are lots of people with good ideas.

Chula: I do think that if we want a competition we should have some guidelines and restrictions in place beforehand. Just to give some kind of direction.

Felix: I definitely agree on that point. Other comments?

Chula: Oh, and just make it very clear before any kind of competition exactly what it means to enter your design into the competition, and what it means when your design is chosen, and exactly what we can and cannot do with it, as well as what the designer can and cannot do.

Felix: So do we want a contest or approach a specific designer?

Michael: We could do a contest and if that doesn't work out approach a designer afterwards?

Chula: What was the budget?

Felix: The budget was 50 euros.

Nina: The reason I'm against the contest is that a lot of people would put the same amount of work into it then, and only one person would get paid for it.

Felix: I'm just going to ask the question on the group then and get some more input about it.

Felix: Another thing that came out of private discussions was that we have frequent issues with **roles within the committee**, and something that became clear is that we don't

currently have a proper document or section in the terms of responsibility that outlines the roles within the committee. For one, it doesn't specially mention what the secretariat does (EM, Secretary, Treasurer, etc) and it would probably be a good idea both in terms of us knowing exactly what those tasks are but also in terms of having a proper organisational setup to include these in our documents. This opens up the question of how do we implement this, and one way is to just include this in the terms of responsibility, the other way is to draft a new document which at first sounds like a daunting task with the goal of potentially incorporating as an organisation - still within the IQA frame, but as a way of possibly at some point to get the benefits an incorporation has - such a document needs to exist, and the second way would be to start working on such a document now and then having it ready when it's actually time for it.

Chula: It would be useful to have a second document that lists the positions of this committee, their roles and a description of requirements with regards to appointment and structure, who appoints who etc. I feel those are separate issues from the terms of responsibility document, which outlines what we as a committee are supposed/designed to do.

David: Agreeing with what's been said.

Kinga: I agree with what you said.

David (SvQF) leaves, 23.23.

Felix: Penultimate point is improve work in the EC and improve attendance and discipline. Which is my very polite way of giving you a talking to. Essentially, what I'd like to say is that we do rely on participating even though we're making jokes about autocracy from the few people that talk here. Any input you give is very much appreciated, and any that's not given is something that is missing very much. What I'd like to have known is that in the future I would like - and I think the committee does need - a better discipline regarding attendance of meetings. We can't have a situation where only 9 of 17 voting members are attending meetings, and then only a fraction of those being vocal in meetings. In general, I'd like to ask every here - mostly the ones not here as well - ask them to participate more and be more vocal, and when you are giving tasks then carrying them out at least within the deadline. We saw from the score notation debate that while the deadline was Saturday, the vote changes during Sunday.

Michael: Maybe we could send the agenda points earlier? Also as a reminder that there's a meeting soon.

Felix: Yes, this is probably something I need to somewhat scold myself about. I need to remind myself to give you these reminders.

Chula: I would suggest having a rolling agenda. That way we would make sure nothing is forgotten about - the secondary team membership gets moved and dropped at the moment, for example - so we'd always know these things were still being discussed, and you'd always have some sort of agenda ready to go. And then we can set specific agendas for meetings as well of course, but you'd still have the larger agenda.

Lena: About the reminding, we already have a list of dates in our Quidditch Europe calendar. We, the ones here, probably don't need the reminder. But maybe some reminder would help the ones that are not?

Maybe we can make Facebook events again, besides the Calendar, because then you get Facebook reminders as well?

Felix: In the same vein as what Chula said with the rolling agenda, I'd like you to **suggest topics** that you'd like to have discussed in the near future.

David: There's two topics I'd like to talk about in the future. The first is how can we make some control about EQC rosters. Because now it's NGB that are controlling their own team rosters. And there's always a way to trick rosters. Like we talked about secondary membership, and I've heard rumours that some rosters were tricked on last EQC. I don't want to accuse anyone or point fingers, but we might need to figure out a way to have better control about it.

And the second point is to discuss the way that we can manage national tournaments and EQC qualifiers, because for example a lot of teams in France would like to make the National French Cup at the end of the season, and we don't have anything else that could be the EQC qualifier. So we'd like to know or discuss how it could be possible to have the qualification the season before.

Chula: Especially with regards to transfers in between seasons if the EQC qualified teams are already known.

Laurens: I have been thinking that there should be some kind of international database. However, we are kind of restricted by giving personal details of people only allowed to the NGB for now. If someone signs up to the NGB they would have to know you'd be sending that information to the NGB and also to all of Europe.

Chula: For European Games, I could not find 'being a member of an NGB' as a requirement for participating in EG.

Nina: To keep in mind, not all NGBs work with individual membership.

Felix: So is there anyone else who currently knows of another topic they want to add?

Michael: I've never seen Slack mentioned before. We could maybe talk about that some more.

Felix: Yes, that's a good suggestion.

Micael: And maybe other suggestions in general.

Laurens: This is mostly about the IQA, but I think it could also be talked about in EC. Whether or not the IQA should be responsible for EG, and whether EC should be also responsible/involved.

Felix: Okay, anyone else?

Kinga: Motion to adjourn the meeting.

David & Lena: Second

Felix: Okay, thank you for turning up! I'd very much like for there to be more people at these meetings, let's work on that. Other than that, we'll get Noah settled and hopefully get working on website stuff soon, as well as the suggestions and votes we talked about today. On that note, good night and until next time.

Meeting adjourned at 23.40

## European Quidditch Congress Meeting

Date: 21 May, 2017

Location: Skype voice

Meeting time: 21:00 CEST

In attendance: Mel Piper (QUK), Pau Pérez Casas (AQC), Lena Mandahus (QAT), David Mohamed (FQF), Kinga Robutka (PLQ), Héctor Cabrera (AQE), Lisa Tietze (DQB), Michael Škácha (ČAF), Chula Bruggeling (QNL), Noah Vissenberg (Secretariat, part of the meeting), Laurens Grinwis Plaat Stultjes (BQF), Stefan Scheurer (QIRE, 21.17)

Chair: Felix Linsmeier

Acting Secretary: Chula Bruggeling

### Agenda

1. Introduction
2. Roll call
3. Introduction Web Manager
4. Extending the search for Treasurer and Secretary
5. Summary Felix' meeting with the IQA Trustees [suggested in camera]
6. Input about score notation policy
  - a. Score notation
  - b. Scoresheets (brief input)
7. Secondary team policy [read the document Lisa and Chula posted!!] [get Jorgen to join]
8. Discussion on platforms for EC: accessibility vs coherence

### Introduction Web Manager

Felix: Noah Vissenberg will give an introduction about themselves

Noah: I'm Noah, I'm affiliated with QNL, I will be your new Web Manager. Which means that I will probably be doing a lot of things on the website to make sure everything looks nice and is up to date, and probably obsessing over putting photos one pixel to the left.

Felix: Thanks for joining us. I can already say you've been a massive help so far to me personally. I'm happy we're starting to share the work with a few people now, instead of everything by certain people.

Laurens: What are the near future plans for the website in general? From both Felix and Noah.

Felix: This is also something we should decide on a committee basis. It would be quite sensible to rework the website/move it to a different website builder, so if we're reworking the entire page we might as well rework it from scratch. Mid-term goal is to have a website on a different platform and in the short term Noah's direct task is to keep the website updated so we have all the minutes and policies and all that on there.

Chula: QNL recently reworked the website on the basis of one.com and wordpress on the recommendation of Laurens and it's working well. Also because we already have accounts there, we can refer people and give them a discount, so if anyone is looking into a new platform for their NGB or what not, let us know and we can set you up.

Stefan Scheurer, QIRE, joins 21.17

Felix: I'd also like to see us sharing and promoting our meeting minutes more in the future. And also promoting ourselves as an organisation/committee more, a lot of people don't seem to be quite aware Quidditch Europe exists as some sort of mid-level between NGBs and the IQA.

Stefan: I think it's difficult to get people to read the meeting minutes because they're quite long. Maybe we should also publish like a short, graphic version with just the main points. Like if it's just one page people might read those a lot more than the whole 10-page documents. It might be a lot more engaging. I would be willing to volunteer for that, if necessary.

Felix: That sounds like a really interesting way of doing things.

Mel: We publish ours but I think most people don't quite care enough to read them. Some sort of summary that is shared through social media would be an interesting idea.

Noah: I'm also willing to help with graphic-like summaries if there's a tl;dr from the notulist.

Felix: The page from us as an organisation/committee is often confused with the Quidditch Europe group, that's also something to work on.

Stefan: If there's some sort of background we could use for a document, then we can just put the main points on there and go from there as a start.

Felix: I could give you what we're currently using as the template for for example the EQC bid package.

Stefan: I'll put something together and we can see if you all like it or not somewhere soon.

Felix: Thank you Noah for making the time to chat with us.

### **Extending the search for treasurer and secretary**

Felix: As Lisa posted we've ran into the issue of not being able to find either a treasurer or secretary. To admin, we didn't advertise it as much as we potentially could have. We could simply re-open the application, put a new deadline on it, and advertise it like once a week or something. We could potentially ask Jorgen if he'd like to get involved with promoting things through his advertising skills.

Lisa: I just figured i should bring it up because the previous deadline was passed quite a while ago, so we should probably officially decide that we want to try once more. And hopefully get some of the bigger NGBs to help share it as well.

Felix: Some gentle nudges to specific people to try and volunteer often helps more than just an advertisement. So if you know anyone who has the sort of skill sets these positions need, perhaps at least mention it to them for them to consider. They might not have considered it otherwise.

Lisa: It was an open application, right, not a form? We've seen with DQB that filling out a Google Form, with the same questions as what you would have people write as an application, seems to work better to get volunteers. You get the same kind of information, it just makes it a little easier.

Michael: I agree with Lisa, because it's easier for people to just fill out a document instead of having to write something themselves.

Felix: I tend to agree that it is easier, and we've done it for the Web Manager position. I tend to think that for positions that have quite some impact on our work, we should have some sort of proper application because it's quite hard to sort of get a grip on the people that are

applying through a form. If we could work out some sort of system that has an extra step after filling the form, like a proper motivation afterwards, that might work. It does have advantages the info that is on a CV in an application.

Noah leaves, 21.27

Michael: Could we do it maybe combined? Fill out a google document and then just let them write an application letter after.

Felix: Potentially

Chula: What if we do the google form to make it easier and then send follow up emails asking for more free-form motivation. This would make them happy about being considered and being moved up through the application process but doing it as a response might increase participation.

Lisa: You can create in Google Forms free-form answers. You can ask them to write their motivation inside the Google Form, and still put the same amount of information.

I agree seeing the CV for example would be nice, but since we didn't get anything this time, using a Google Form might be a step to getting some more interest.

Hector: Giving the situation, I'd support this proposal that it's forming about the 2-step process, as Michael and Chula were saying.

Lisa: Yeah, I think a 2-step process would also be fine.

Felix: So that seems like a bit of a compromise. Making it a 2-step process and having people move on to the next step might be a bit of a 'reward' that works well with people.

Mel: I think a Google Form also seems a bit less intimidating. Writing an application might seem a bit daunting, while filling out a Google Form might look a bit more accessible.

Especially for the people that aren't experienced with job applications.

Felix: So it seems consensus is reopening the application procedure for these positions with a 2-step process. I'll see that we'll get on that and publish that as soon as we can.

Lisa: If you need help making the form, I can help.

Felix: Appreciated.

### **Felix's meeting with the IQA Trustees**

Chula: Move to in camera?

Kinga: Seconded.

### **Score notation**

Felix: Score notation. The first point is writing a policy about score notation.

Lisa: Yeah, we need a policy if we want everyone to officially use it, otherwise it's not mandatory.

Felix: Since we decided which system to use and decided how it works do you think we need to vote on the wording on the policy or do you think we can just keep it simple since we already talked about all this and we just need to find some fancy wording.

Chula: I was gonna suggest that we put a sort of time period on it so it's something like a trial. After which we'll rediscuss and see if we'll keep it or not.

Lena: i think we've discussed this so much, someone should just make some fancy wording about this being the official system for the near future.

Michael: Agreed

Hector: Agreed

David: Agreed

Lisa: There's not really a place to put this in our current policies, so we kind of need a new policy. Maybe we should have a new policy about things like scores.

Felix: I'll take a look what is possible and get this started this week. Any comments on writing a policy on this.

Lisa: I motion to have a written out policy with a Facebook vote asap.

Chula: I'd like to have it voted on before the end of May.

Felix: It should be simple. We could probably do it this week still. Everyone: do you think we need that policy to back the announcement and explanation. Does it look silly that we announce that we're doing this with the explanation and the policy afterwards, or would that be fine?

Lisa: it would be nice to have it together but I guess it's fine?

Felix: Let's say get the policy written as soon as possible have it up as soon as we can so we can take a look at it early next week and if there's debate or unclarities we go ahead and do the explanation only, otherwise we can do it all together and announce it all by late next week.

Lisa: sounds good.

Lena: Sounds good

Michael: yes

David: Yes

### **Gamesheets**

Chula: I would like to ask whether we want the score tracking system, and if so, does it need to be on the front or can it be on the back?

Retroactive motion to move out of camera from after the IQA discussion

Lisa: I agree, if it's a thing that we want, it should be on the front for easy access.

Michael: Front

Chula: I do think we could fit it on the front if we want it there, by making the top banner a bit more concise, and then there would be some room at the bottom.

Laurens: This ties into what Lisa was saying earlier about not liking the standardised scoresheet mandatory. We're coming up with a standardised scoresheet but if most people agree that they won't want to use it why do we bother.

Lisa: I think it's a good thing to have for things like EQC and EG. But let's say there's an NGB that has a small tournament that doesn't feel like everyone needs to sign all of the boxes. Maybe you decide you don't need all of these things. And I think it should be fine for an NGB to decide they don't feel the need to have all of these things. I want to have it mandatory for things like EQC and EG, but not for inter-NGB and fantasy tournaments.

Felix: As a response to that, I tend to agree that the needs of some NGB might be different. I do see Laurens' point about a standardised scoresheet is actually standard. As sort of an olive branch, I agree we can't control any fantasy tournament or whatever. Do you think it would be an idea to have something alongside the scoresheets sort of guidelines what you would be allowed to change. For example, you need to keep the rosters on the front and the

scoretracking, but you can change the signatures, you can change the logos, etc. Would that perhaps work?

Chula: [later]

Kinga leaves at 22.42

Lena: I think a standardised scoresheet is a good thing, but I'd just make it recommended and not mandatory. Lots of NGBs would probably use it. If an NGB wants to change it, that should be their decision.

Lisa: I definitely see Chula's point that it makes things easier and faster if it's mandatory, but we cannot control what NGBs do at their tournament. I think it's really stupid to have it mandatory.

Chula: I'm wondering if the objection to a mandatory sheet is because you want to remove things or because you want to change things.

Lisa: Mostly about removing things that they don't need.

Chula: yeah, so I think that's actually fine. We could say you can remove whatever you want, you just can't replace it with a different thing. So you can swap an element out for blank space, but not for a different element.

Lisa: Is translating fine by the way.

Felix: Yes, translating is absolutely fine.

Laurens leaves at 22.50

Stefan: Yea, like what Lisa said, if we write a policy make sure you mention translations because people would worry.

Lena: So should we make some different versions in different formats?

Felix: Yeah, we can just publish a couple different formats.

Chula: Motion to vote on The scoresheet being mandatory for NGBs to use with the ability to remove but not replace whatever elements they don't feel the need to use.

Lena, David, Stefan: Second

In favour - 8 - FQF, AQC, QUK, AQE, CAF, QIRE, QNL, QAT

Against - 1 - DQB

Chula: Motion to vote: A translation is not seen as a replacement, and translations of the scoresheet are allowed

Lisa: Second

In favour - 9 - QNL, DQB, CAF, AQC, QIRE, FQF, AQE, QUK, QAT

Jorgen Stenlokk joins the meeting, 22.55

Felix: We'll take into account the suggestions so far, and should hopefully have something closer to a final scoresheet fairly soon.

## **Secondary Team Policy**



Felix: The document about this has been posted several times in the past, so it should be familiar.

Lisa: We want to prevent to have all star teams through secondary membership but we also want to support that teams can start new teams and promote growth. Because of that we'd need to define what is a new player, what is a new team, what is growth, etc. The numbers in the document especially are open to discussion.

Jorgen: So my first suggestion is the ability to make any team their secondary team if they found a new team, instead of just their old team. That means that if they move to a new city, they can still start a new team but play competitively with the new close competitive team.

David: In France we were discussing about preventing all star teams by transfer by saying that players have to be linked to the region where they're gonna play. So at least all the best players will not be in the same region, so then you wouldn't have that kind of trouble.

Lisa: But if you move across the country and want to still play with your old team, shouldn't you be able to continue playing with them?

Felix: So how would you like to proceed.

Chula: I think we'd like to have the discussion out of the way now, and then vote on whether we agree on this and want someone to turn it into a policy.

Jorgen: Especially for Norway, we'd like the option to say that a team that says they're not trying to qualify for EQC would automatically count as a new team.

Felix: Norway is kinda specific in a way that they have a community with teams that are non-competitive.

Jorgen:

Chula: Motion to have someone turn the proposal into a policy and continue the discussion about the policy instead of the current proposal.

David: Second

In favour - 10 - NRF, QAT, AQC, QUK, DQB, QIRE, FQF, QNL, AQE, CAF

Mel leaves at 23.14

Michael: I kind of feel that this Norwegian problem would be similar with emerging areas, for example Serbia.

Chula: Emerging areas might be exempt from this anyway? They don't necessarily have an NGB structure, so they don't necessarily have policies. They join EQC in a different way anyway.

Felix: So how exactly does this prevent all-star teams?

Chula: explanation

Felix: But then why not just found a new team to be able to make that all-star team?

Lisa: But then you get new teams out of it? I guess that's the best way to 'abuse' a system.

David: You're talking about this being related to EQC qualifiers. What if we give out a spot through a league? Does every game within the league then follow this rules?

Lisa/Chula: Yes

So how do we prevent non-Norway teams to abuse this?

David: With this way to define a new team is it possible to exclude the new team from the calculation from EQC places for NGB? If you create new team that won't compete for EQC, it's a way to prevent the cheating.

Chula: Oh, that's actually an interesting proposal. So the NGB doesn't get an advantage because they are disadvantaged by having less teams to base EQC spots on.

Jorgen: I think it disproportionately disadvantages smaller NGBs.

Chula: The biggest issue is that while what we're talking about is logical in Norway, if we apply the same policy in other NGBs, that becomes a very advantageous competitive advantage for those NGBs.

Lisa: What is we make the policy with the ability to make exceptions approved by EC on a case-by-case basis.

Chula: And then the NGB has to write a motivation and stuff, a report of sorts, so we also cover the transparency issues of why they get an exception.

Lena: That sounds like a good idea.

David: Sounds good to me.

Lisa: Motion to close the meeting

Chula: Seconded

END OF MEETING: 23:51

## **European Quidditch Congress Meeting**

Date: 4 June, 2017

Location: Skype voice

Meeting time: 21:00 CEST

In attendance: Lena Mandahus - QAT, Lisa Tietze - DQB, David Mohamed - FQF, Jørgen Stenløkk - NRF, Michael Škácha - ČAF, Andi de Alfonso - AQE, Laurens Grinwis - BQF, Chula Bruggeling - QNL

Chair: Felix Linsmeier

Acting Secretary: Lena Mandahus

### **Agenda**

- 1. Introduction**
- 2. Roll call**
- 3. EQC Spot distribution**
- 4. QE Working Platform**
- 5. Future relationship between QE and IQA [suggested in camera]**
- 6. Secondary membership proposal**
- 7. Approving Score Notation Policy**
- 8. Inspiring (re)development**

### **EQC Spot distribution**

Jorgen: we should clarify something so we have it ready when the team numbers come in. It's about the ranking of the spots. Some countries will gain, some will lose a spot.

Distribution sport draft:

[https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/15d2WObKyEds4sy3s-Z7\\_eV4nu29L2WtdGW9hm xJ5ooM/edit#gid=551516391](https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/15d2WObKyEds4sy3s-Z7_eV4nu29L2WtdGW9hm xJ5ooM/edit#gid=551516391)

We need to decide how we fill in the slots in purple, it's not sure where they will go. I just wanted to bring up the issue, we don't have to decide on it now.

Felix: Did you essentially take the proposal and moved teams up?

Jorgen: I haven't done anything, there's this year's EQC rankings. There's one well ranked and one not so well ranked Norwegian team. If Norway only gets to send one team, we should decide how we fill in that 17th slot.

Laurens: You should look at which country (here France or Germany) has the most teams in top 16, and if that is equal, then look for the teams in top 8, that means one NGB is stronger than the others

Jorgen: one issue with that: UK have 4 teams in top 16, France have 3. Why wouldn't the 5th UK team move up? If you move UK up, it'd be unfair to Catalonia

Felix: I wonder why you move teams up so to speak? The way I understand it we'd have gotten the same results if we did it like UEFA does it.

In 2016 we had a base bid for everyone, then performance spot, and number spot. In 2017:

Every country would get a performance & number spot. If you don't get a spot - you'd get a base spot so they could still send a team to EQC. Jorgen pls explain more

Jorgen: Used the same algorithm ( distribution file), made a copy and changed it. This spot distribution could happen. I know Norway is on the tipping point between 1 and 2 spots. I know they can end up with 1 spot. In that case, norway's second rank (rank 17) is going to be open for some other team to be in, that that's sort of the problem

Felix: your proposed solution would be to move up teams/NGB in the ranking?

Jorgen: not sure about the best solution. Maybe move all the teams up and whoever gets an extra spot gets a spot as ranked as lowest of the teams and then they have to prove themselves.

Laurens: I agree with that idea. It doesn't matter too much in this case, because it's outside the top 16 so it doesn't matter much for the pots. Who didn't have a spot this year will be added to the bottom

Lisa: I want to try to explain it differently. If we say those top8 teams are pool 1. These are the teams from last year who ranked 1-8 and these NGBs come into pool1. If one NGB would not get any spot anymore (or cease to be an NGB) we'd have an extra spot. Do we then move the other teams up or who takes over that spot or is the new NGB/team filling the empty spot?

Chula: Didn't we have this problem this year as well? We had uk teams and then went down in teams and then uk lost their spots, and I think we just moved everything up one spot. I don't see what the problem is?

Jorgen: This year, when countries lose spots, it's fine to just move up, cause you go from 40 to 32 teams, if you take away 8 spots you move everyone up, and the question is where do the 3 ????. No NGB grew, so the amount of teams in the NGBs stayed the same.

Chula; if Norway loses as spot & Germany gets a spot, does the German spot go where the norway spot was or does it go at the bottom?

Jorgen: yes

Chula. Putting it at the bottom seems like the easiest solution

Felix: Did we move teams up?

Laurens: It was based on the percentage. Uk had more teams than they could send so ??

David: Last year it was a mix between performance and teams per NGB, but I don't understand this ranking. What are we gonna do with this ranking?

Jorgen: It's used for the group ranking/seeding.

David: Can we do something like in other sports where we can decide which teams can come? iN france, if we have a new team, it's normal they're last in seeding and an experienced (EQC) team would be at the top, but it could be that a very experienced team could end up at the bottom of the seed

Lisa: this is what Jorgen wants to figure out, cause you judge teams that way. It's unclear & intransparent if you do it like this. If you have a better solution than putting the new additions at the bottom & moving the rest up

Laurens: it's about quality. If they qualify, they have the right to be there. You do have the best European teams at EQC. Until we keep every NGB in EQC and we can't find a good solution. There are better teams who do not qualify for EQC and can go into top 16, but they can't because their country doesn't have that many spots. Solution: remove NGBs from EQC - but don't think we're willing to do that yet.

David: I meant something like: Liege was in the 2nd pot, but their advantage was them being Belgian, it's an advantage for that team.

Chula: This is similar with BQC and Velociraptors. They were a new team and went unseeded. Makes for weird groups, but it's the most logical thing to do because we cannot say how good a team/NGB will be. It's easier to put them at the bottom even if it creates weird groups.

Laurens: reaction to David: yeas Liege had an advantage from previous performances in Belgium, but they qualified, and they could be in top 16, it makes sense for them to be there. If you push everyone up, eventually an emerging team can be in second seed and that doesn't make any sense.

Chula: Why would an emerging area become second seed? I'm confused

Laurens: if would be unfair for a new team at EQC to already have a spot in top 16. I think that was what David was saying. I understood he found it unfair that Liege gets a sport in pot 2 because Brussels Qwaffles was because they entered round of 16 before. But new teams should enter at the bottom. If you suddenly have new teams then you could have an emerging NGB in 2nd seed

Jorgen: discussion has moved on to general discussion of the system, not the original question

Lisa: David was talking about a case like Raptors at BQC where a new team should be seed 1 but enters at the bottom, and it prevents unseeded teams from advancing because they have that strong team in their group.

David: What I want to say is that we don't have to use national ranking for seeding.

Felix: Would people be okay to move the discussion to facebook and have a written outline/proposal and discuss it there

Jorgen: Yes, I just wanted to bring it up and open up the discussion.

Jorgen will make a facebook chat for people interested to help with this

## **QE Working Platform**

Felix: Issues on how the committee operates. Things get forgotten, we're not good at keeping track of things going on. For the future it would be good to have a platform/system to work with.

Lena: I think Slack is a really good way of keeping track. Trello is also a great way of keeping track of things. QP also uses this to good effect.

Jorgen: We use it for EG but you need to log on to actually check it.

Chula: Notifications - you can either have the phone app or just get notification emails.

Lena: I agree with Chula and also you can differentiate notification for key words, channels etc.

Felix: I've used Slack before, you can keep track of several things, different channel for meetings,... Etc. However, it would rely on compliance of NGBs. That would have to be actively done and might be an issue with the already low attendance.

Lena: We tried using Slack in QAT and it hasn't been properly accepted yet, but we could have discussions on slack and then remind people on slack?

Chual: don't see how people would be more or less active on slack than on facebook, don't think the platform makes a difference

Felix: no difference in participation but in awareness.

David: you can use applications to set up reminders. Slack is limited in keeping history if you use the free version. It won't make people participate more.

Felix: would you be confident that we can adopt the platform? (quick unofficial vote)

CAF - yes, FQF - yes, NRF - blank, QNL - yes, AQE - yes, DQB - abstain, QAT - yes

### **Future relationship between QE and IQA**

Lena: Motion to move this in camera

Lisa: approved

Lena: motion to move out of camera

Michael & Chula: second

### **Secondary membership proposal**

Felix: Lisa you said we can vote on this on facebook, are there points to clear up?

Lisa: something that needs to be added/changed

Chula: any vs. previous team, Jorgen asked about changing 'any' team to 'previous' team to prevent super teams.

Lisa: moving, then starting a new team somewhere?

Jorgen: didn't we talk about this last time? And then Lisa said people could 'cheat' this rule and form super teams like that?

Chula: would be easier if this followed regular transfer rules instead of having exceptions.

We wrote a policy and in there we changed it to 'previous' now. It's not time to people look at that and make comments/improvements to this. It's better to move this to facebook now.

Lisa: to make it clearer, we could put a footnote about the previous team. Explain 'if you are a new player moving to a new region this is how you can do this' in a footnote.

Felix: would you like to bring it up on facebook

Chula: best solution: Put it on fb, but a deadline on changes/comments, then have a vote if Lisa agrees.

Lisa: yes

Felix: fine on my part. Can you put this up again tomorrow to remind people and have it voted on my next week?

Lisa: yes

Felix: 2 more points on agenda, can't do any of these because we don't have quorum we cannot approve this. Same for the last topic, but Mel already started working on this, there is no reason to discuss it without her. If nobody has other points I will conclude the topic.

Chula: motion to close the meeting

Lena: second

## **European Quidditch Congress Meeting**

Date: 25 June, 2017

Location: Skype voice

Meeting time: 21:00 CEST

In attendance: Emil Kjærgaard Held - Denmark [not voting], Michael Puntschuh - SQV (Switzerland) [not voting], Stefan Scheurer - QIRE (Ireland), Héctor Cabrera- AQE (Spain), Kinga Robutka - PLQ (Poland), Michael Škácha - ČAF (Czech Republic), Melanie Piper - QUK (United Kingdom), Nina Heise - DQB (Germany), Martin Hofbauer - SQA (Slovakia), Jørgen Stenløkk - NRF (Norway), Laurens Grinwis Plaat Stultjes - BQF (Belgium), Chula Bruggeling (QNL)

Chair: Felix Linsmeier

Acting Secretary: Jørgen Stenløkk

### **Agenda**

- 1. Introduction**
- 2. Roll call**
- 3. Approving new members**
- 4. Secondary Player Policy [input from NGBs with pre-existing regulations; address concerns]**
- 5. Approving Score Notation Policy [Felix]**
- 6. IQA Proposal**

## Minutes

### 1. Introduction

Felix: 11 attending, 9 voting. Denmark and Switzerland not voting.

Switzerland (Michael): We have been approved.

Felix: You will not be voting, as we have not been informed by the IQA about this.

### 2. Roll call

### 3. Approving new members

Felix: It's a good practice to approve new members. We should also make sure everyone in the European Committee should have a clear task (member, observer, etc.). Suggest to start with approving new members and discussing the "clear task" thing next meeting.

Norway (Jørgen): That's fine.

Felix: Denmark (Emil) and Switzerland (Michael) are new Emerging Areas in the Committee.

Norway (Jørgen): Motion to approve Denmark as a new EC member.

Slovakia (Martin): Seconded.

Denmark approved as new EC member with 9/9 votes.

Slovakia (Martin): Motion to approve Denmark as a new EC member.

Belgium (Laurens): Seconded.

Norway (Jørgen): Motion to approve Denmark as a new EC member.

Slovenia (Martin): Seconded.

Switzerland approved as new EC member with 9/9 votes.

Chance for new members to introduce themselves:

Switzerland (Michael): We're Quidditch Switzerland. Currently 3 teams. NGB founded 3 weeks ago. Hoping to get a national tournament going in early fall.

Denmark (Emil): 2 teams in Denmark. We have some agreements with school classes to play quidditch in the next academic year.



**New point:**

Minutes will be using NGB names instead of the names of representatives, due to increased likelihood of similar names of representatives.

**4. Secondary Player Policy [input from NGBs with pre-existing regulations; address concerns]**

Felix: There has been some debating during voting on the policy. However, we didn't reach consensus on the policy (8 in favour out of 16 voting members, not a majority). We will now speak a little about some of the concerns that were raised, and talk about pre existing secondary player policies some NGBs already have.

Poland (Kinga): I voted abstain, because we don't have secondary team policies. Can I change my vote?

Felix: No. We'll have a look into concerns that were raised, and then have a revote.

Belgium (Laurens): Belgium voted no, because of a couple of issues. The policy seems to be missing clubs with several teams. I believe this is only relevant for UK, Belgium and Germany. There's some issues with the B-teams, because they are only there for development. Also, you can be a secondary player (as per the policy) if you're raising a new team, for one year. The policy doesn't specify what a new team is well enough.

Spain (Héctor): We really appreciate the work behind the proposal. However, we voted against because our internal policy helps us better in this situation. All of our tournaments are qualifiers, so secondary players will never be able to play for their second team.

Norway (Jørgen): In reply to Laurens about B-Teams, there's no reason to have a "first team"; would it be problematic to say that you cannot have primary/secondary team be from the same club?

Belgium (Laurens): This would be the opposite of what we are doing. We have a complicated membership structure, who allows for B-players to play for the A-team in any tournament except for our national tournament (only allowed for EQC if the B-team does not qualify). The A-players can not play for B in any competition. If the B-team player wants to be part of another secondary team (in another team), they can't play for the A-team in their club. Jørgen's suggestion would make it hard for clubs to develop their players, because clubs couldn't try B-players out on the A-team in some tournaments.

Netherlands (Chula): I know Belgium has this system, so I was considering adding clubs into this policy, as a side-policy, and say that if you're a B-player you're excluded from the secondary team system. So if you play for a B-team, you can't have a secondary team in another club, because you already sort of have 2 teams through the A- and B-team system. Would this be problematic for Belgium and UK?

Felix: Suggest that if you're a B-team player, you can both play for the A-team and for a secondary team in another club.

Belgium (Laurens): Currently there are 3 B-players on Antwerp who are excluded from the A-team because they have a secondary team from another club.

Netherlands (Chula): Suggest that if you're a B-team player you can choose between either having just an external secondary team, or just have the option to switch between the A- and B-team. Players shouldn't be able to be connected to three teams [A-team, B-team, secondary team in another club].

Felix: Suggest that clubs are not part of the primary/secondary proposal. Players should be allowed to move freely in their club [especially upwards]. NGBs can make harder restrictions if they don't want to allow this, so the EC policy is a framework.

Belgium (Laurens): I feel the framework would be okay, but would like to make it strict, so some NGBs don't allow players to play for 3 or 4 teams.

Felix: We should add some regulations on allowing moving upwards, but not downwards? Not all clubs have an A-team and a B-team, but equally strong teams.

UK (Mel): We are making this very complicated. Could we keep it simple?

Netherlands (Chula): Could we approve this policy by vote now, and add stuff to it later?

Belgium (Laurens): If this would pass, we would need to remove big parts of the BQF membership policies, so I would like to not approve this policy before we fix things.

Netherlands (Chula): I could make a new suggestion with input from UK, Belgium and other interested parties by next week. Would that be fine?

Chula will make a new proposal based on the concerns. Delegates should talk to her if they want to have some input.

## **5. Approving Score Notation Policy [Felix]**

Felix: We've already made this system public and approved the use of this system, so we just need a stamp of approval on the policy itself as we haven't technically approved it yet. See this document for the policy:

[https://docs.google.com/document/d/1PuoUvc3hMol4OjcXWmV-CLDmJ\\_tsEbuObm8d14wdaR8/edit](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1PuoUvc3hMol4OjcXWmV-CLDmJ_tsEbuObm8d14wdaR8/edit)

[Felix reads the policy for the Committee.]

Norway (Jørgen): Motion to vote of the score notation system policy.

Germany (Nina): Seconded.

Score notation system policy is approved 9/9.

## **6. IQA Proposal**

Felix: After talking with the IQA Board of Trustees, and after discussing it in the European Committee, we have made a proposal to the IQA on how to formalise our relation to the IQA.

Netherlands (Chula): Motion to move in camera.

Spain (Héctor): Seconded.

Discussion moved in camera.

**Meeting ends at 23:15**

Next meeting on July 16th, 21:00 CEST.

## European Quidditch Congress Meeting

Date: 13 August, 2017

Location: Skype voice

Meeting time: 21:00 CEST

In attendance: Felix Linsmeier, Chula Bruggeling (QNL), Nina Heise (DQB), Maja Bartnik (PLQ), Héctor Cabrera (AQE), David Mohamed (FQF), John André Seem (NRF), David Jonsson (SvQE), Michael Puntschuh (SQV), Ana Mercado (AQC), Andrea Miglietta (AIQ), Laurens Grinwis (BQF), Stefan Scheurer (QIRE, joins 21.41) Lena (QAT, joins 22.18), Michael (, joins 23.48)

Observers: Victor Pálmason (QSI), Marc Alcalá-Ramos (Administrative Assistant)

Absent: Turkey, UK, Slovakia

Chair: Felix Linsmeier

Acting Secretary: Chula Bruggeling

### Agenda

1. Introduction
2. Roll call
3. Approving new members
4. Formalised committee structure: input [Felix]
5. Secondary Player Policy: Club teams [Laurens, Chula]
6. IQA Proposal [suggested in camera]
7. Tackling score keeping issues [suggested in camera for outline, then open discussion]
8. IQA Fees [Héctor]
9. EQC: Team count deadlines and spot algorithm [Jørgen], Team submission deadlines [Stevo]

### 3. Approving new members

Felix: This only applies to new staff hires as well as new NGBs joining the committee, not new representatives (changing boards).

New: Iceland (Victor), Marc as Administrative Assistant.

Let's start with approving Iceland.

Héctor: **Motion to approve Iceland as a new member of the EC**

Laurens: Second

In favour: QNL, AIQ, NRF, DQB, FQF, AQE, PLQ, SvQF, SQV, AQC, BQF (11)

**Outcome: unanimously in favour**

Chula: **Motion to approve Marc as the new Administrative Assistant of the EC**

Andrea: Second

In favour: QNL, AIQ, FQF, PLQ, NRF, AQC, AQE, SvQF, SQV, DQB, BQF (11)

**Outcome: unanimously in favour**

Victor: Hi all, I'm Victor from Iceland, and I'm excited to join this committee.

Marc: Hello everyone, I'm from Barcelona, it's a pleasure to join the European committee.

Felix: Looking forward to working with you all.

#### **4. Formalised Committee Structure**

Felix: I've been working on this on and off for a while now. Some of this will be familiar already, as we have been using some parts of this already. In terms of best practice though, we'll formalise it now.

The Administrative Assistant isn't mentioned in the document. We might add a note to specify the Chair and committee may add extra members, without having to change this document every time we add new positions to the secretariat.

Observers are of interest to us for potentially inviting TDs of tournaments such as EQC, EG or WC, staff from the IQA on to a meeting, etc.

This document can still use quite a bit of extension. I wanted to introduce it as an informative point at this moment, and we can improve on it over the coming weeks. This is sort of a progress report at the moment.

Laurens: Not really about what's currently in the document, but did we ever approve who can join into the European committee and which countries and so on?

Chula: Yes, you can find that here: [link](#)

Laurens: Then I think it would be useful to merge that document into the one Felix presented.

Hector: Would it be interesting to specify what kind of majority we need when we vote?

Felix: I've purposefully not included it at the moment because I wanted to discuss it. We might want to decide which votes need a simple majority (51%+) and which need a higher majority. This would be a relatively defining decision.

#### **21.41 Stefan Scheurer (QIRE) joins.**

Chula: Could we discuss this further on Facebook and vote on it next time.

Felix: Yes, definitely.

Felix: What else would people think should be included?

Chula: Could we maybe add sort of the purpose of the committee?

Felix: Good point. This would tie in and would have to be adapted according to our own terms of responsibility which already exist, which are approved by the IQA Congress, so a lot of it would be copy/pasting from over there.

Maya: Shouldn't there be something about quorum and majority in the voting part?

Felix: Yes, so that's related to what Hector asked a bit earlier.

Michael: Maybe on voting and discussion who is moderating the discussion and gives the right to speak. Specifying that the chair has that right.

Felix: Probably a good idea. We can maybe specify that with the committee roles.

Felix: So in general, how do people feel about this document?

Chula: I think it's a good start, but people probably just need a bit of time to think about it.

Felix: Fair point. I'll put it on our Facebook group, and we can discuss it, together with the points about quorum and majorities.

Maya: I think it's a really good idea to finish the topic now, and then over the coming weeks we can all think about what should be there and compare this to documents from NGBs themselves. Would this be published?

Felix: Ultimately, yes, but that would still be a way off.

Maya: In that case I think it would be a good idea to check with professionals how this should look.

Felix: Do you think the level of writing that this is put in now is too complicated?

Maya: No, absolutely not. The shorter it is, the quicker to read for other people.

Felix: When we've figured out how to treat our own committee structure and also related to our later topic with the IQA relationship to Quidditch Europe, it might be a good idea to give out an organogram which clearly says which is the IQA Congress, the other organs of the IQA, where Quidditch Europe fits, etc.

Maya: I agree.

## **5. Secondary Player Policy: Club Teams**

Chula: We've discussed the primary and secondary membership for a while. It currently doesn't mention the club/team structure that some countries have, where a club consists of multiple teams (such as Antwerp A and B, Oxford Chimeras and Quidlings, etc). We are currently figuring out a way to incorporate said structure within our primary and secondary team membership.

Laurens: So what I remember from the previous discussion was that it mostly defined when a person can have a secondary membership, and their relation to participation in EQC. We all seemed to relatively agree with that. I think this new document should be on top of the other document, with some extra explanations.

David: I have a question. In France we're discussing about making multiple team in a club for some teams, but we have acted that only a club can qualify to EQC. So for example Titan A and Titan B would win a spot for EQC, Titan would get one spot, and send one team. In the current document, you have to declare your team. But for us, if Titan would get the spot, Titan B players would be able to play for Titan A if that's the team that plays.

Laurens: I don't see a reason why a second team from a club shouldn't be able to participate in EQC. If that team is a separate team and qualifies to EQC through getting a silver medal at your nations. It seems unfair to the players in the second team that they can't go to EQC because their first team already qualified.

David: I'm not saying it's fair to Team B. But if both qualify, if you have injuries within the first team, you couldn't make transfers.

Laurens: In Belgium, there's currently policies about having to play with your primary team. If both A and B would qualify, and you're a B player, you cannot play for team A. If you would also have a C team, both teams could technically take players from C team.

David: Interest in creating A and B is that all players can get experience. If you tell that two teams will be able to qualify, to prevent A players to be injured.

Felix: What would theoretically happen if let's say Titans A and Titans B would get a spot for EQC?

David: Only Titans A would go to EQC. The next team ranked would get the spot instead of Titans B.

Felix: That seems like a decision that would fall under general European rule and more specifically NGB rules. You're always free to impose harsher rules on your own NGB. If FQF chooses to enforce these stricter rules, they would be free to do so.

Chula:

John: In Norway we're probably going to be doing the same thing if we would get two spots, but I don't think that should be a European policy. That should be up to individual NGBs.

David: I understand we shouldn't change European policy, I just want to make sure new policies wouldn't.

If both Titans teams would qualify, that would be unfair to all the other teams. That's why we made our move to talk about clubs instead of teams.

Felix: How would you think this currently penalises France for deciding this?

David: This policy talks about having a secondary team or being part of a club. But if I'm part of Titan B but want to be secondary member of another team outside of the Titans club.

Laurens: That's exactly why we are discussing this. We don't want to have stronger players play for other teams to help them out during tournaments. If you want to help out at trainings and the like, you don't have to be a member, you can still do that. We don't want to have a strong player who's perhaps the strongest player of B also play for Titans A during EQC, but also be able to play for for example Lille in a regional tournament so Lille can win a tournament.

Stefan: Laurens said the purpose of this amendment to prevent strong players to small teams, but I thought the purpose was that we create an incentive to players to start new teams. I'm confused what the purpose is.

Laurens: The purpose of the amendment is to have a better flow of players within a club with multiple teams. The original membership policy was proposed to have an incentive that players can start new teams but also make sure we don't keep using stronger players from other teams to strengthen the teams at competitions like EQC. It's both in the original one, the amendment is to help easier flow of players within teams within a club. Such that promising B players can also play for A sometimes, and see them as within the club instead of full separate teams.

Felix: So if the addendum would go in the other policy, you would still have both purposes fulfilled.

David: Just to be sure we are clear, if I register as only Titans, not A or B, they are in a team and they can be secondary member in another team?

Chula: That's something that's currently not compatible with European policies. You need to be registered with a team, not simply a club.

David: But they play together, and train together. Why should they be divided as teams for registration?

Chula: But not all clubs work like that. Some clubs have 'proper' separate teams, with separate trainings and the like.

## **22.18 Lena Mandahus (QAT) joins.**

David: But that's the purpose of a club. Recruit for the club, not a team.

Laurens: We are not penalising anyone. Everyone can still have multiple teams. A player inside a club just shouldn't get the right to play for 3 teams, because then

David: So if I want to be .. with the addendum, either we have to tell people from Titan B that they can't play for French Cup because that's an EQC qualifier or if they go

Chula: The EQC qualifier is besides the point. We want to give players the chance to play for two teams. Either that's inside a club (Titans A and Titans B), or with two different teams (Titans B and Lille). A club player just shouldn't have a third team (Titans A, Titans B, and Lille).

Felix: I'm gonna stop the discussion right there and move to some other points. This is definitely something that has a bit of discussion. It should be clear what the ultimate outcome for this policy should be. We decided from the get go that we wanted to have as Chula said the option to have two teams, we just want to standardise the way that is implemented. We should probably in discussion from now on take the step back and what the intention was, rather than which individual teams it might affect and how they might like or not like that.

Nina: I was wondering whether or not we need the third point about use of lower hierarchy, because for example in germany we don't necessarily have a hierarchy system within a club.

Laurens: I feel you always have a certain hierarchy within a club. I understand in some clubs teams might be almost equal though, where the winner of a game would be dependent on the day. But I still feel there should be some kind of hierarchy. If you have two equal teams, and you take seven of the best players in each team and seven of the worst in each team, one team qualifies for EQC, and you don't have a hierarchy, you could take your best players from both teams and send them off to EQC.

Chula: Maybe if you don't implement a hierarchy, you don't get the free flow?

Felix: If you're not using a hierarchy, don't you subvert the intention of the policy in the first place? For example the A team can use x amount of team B, under this lower hierarchy rule team b players despite them already having a secondary team?

Chula: Ah, no. If you're a team B player that gets that easier option to go to team A, you lose your right to a secondary team. You either have a secondary team, or the ability to move upwards within your club easily.

David: First, about the first chapter. Is it mandatory to set a number of player that can move? If you give up the right to get a secondary team and only join a club, you should have the right to move from A to B freely.

Laurens: Antwerp A and Antwerp B. B missed out on EQC. You could move all your good players from B to A if there's no max.

Let's say A does qualify and B doesn't. But for some reason the club decides we're gonna send B under the name A.

The first policy, it's specified you can play for a secondary team or not if you are having a developing function in that team.

Chula: There's also a maximum amount specified for secondary team.

Andrea: How do we make sure that policy is being followed? We'd need a sheet with all European players?

Chula: NGBs would make sure their NGB and players are following the policy.

Andrea: So is someone tracking NGBs are actually doing that? And not abusing their trust?

Chula: Currently we're working on trust only. There's also issues around privacy laws regarding sharing all of the information from everyone to everyone to check this.

Felix: Is there in the original document a provision about the total amount of players that a team can get from both secondary and club teams?



Chula: Not currently, because the original document didn't take into account the movement within a club at all.

David: A question about timing. Since the season has already started, if we vote this in, does it apply to the current season, or to the next season.

Chula:

Felix: We can do it for the current season on a voluntary basis. Any NGB that's willing to adopt it and change their current policy will be able to do so. If you've already started your season and your policy for the season has already be set, we'll not require an NGB to change their current policy for this season. For the next season, we'll all follow it.

Laurens: What are people's general thoughts?

David: I'd current not agree with the addendum.

John: It doesn't really affect NRF.

Héctor: Suits what AQE has.

## **6. IQA Proposal**

Chula: Motion to move in camera

David: Second

## **7. Tackling Scorekeeping issues**

Chula: Motion to move in camera

Nina: Second

## **8. IQA Membership Fees**

Chula: Motion to move in camera

John: Second

## **23.48, *Michael Skácha joins***

## **9. EQC: Team Count Deadlines and Spot Algorithm, Team Submission Deadlines**

Felix: Our last topic is EQC. We currently don't have an update about scouting, we are still waiting one one last venue. We have someone who's not on an NGB board but willing to scout this location for us. I know him quite well and I can testify he's qualified to do this, so we'll hopefully have some results early next week.

However, we can talk about deadlines.

Chula: For the team count deadline, it was problematic when the team count was done inside the new season.

Maya: Don't really like it.

Laurens: The end of last season, defined by IQA seems odd to me, because it isn't very reflective on the new season. Like Belgium is not doing very great with the amount of teams at this moment. If we go by June 30, it will have more than what we will have at the moment.

Chula: Last year we had issues because people were still in the middle of sign up processes while we were collecting data, so that caused some issues.

David: The later you put the date for giving the number of teams, the later you will know the number of spots given for EQC. As our EQC qualifier is in November, the earlier we know, the better we can make the tournament structure to reflect that number of EQC spots. It has an effect on how you organise your tournament structure for your qualifier.

Chula: Can we give a later date, but say that some NGBs who have problems with that (because that's in the middle of their signup period) can use the number from the end of last season?

Felix:

Laurens: You don't necessarily need to know how many spots you're getting. You know the max is 6, so you just need to make sure to properly define your top 6.

Michael: Maybe the best way, if we make the deadline at the end of September, for NGBs that know how many teams they get, and for those that have it longer, they'll add later [??]

John: I would disagree with Laurens. At least in Norway, it will determine if we have a qualifier or not, because we're gonna get either one or two teams, and we only have two teams that are interested in the first place.

Chula: I think we just need to decide on a deadline and be done with it.

Maya: Could we simply take July 30? That would work for everyone, right?

Stefan: When do we have to announce which teams will go to EQC? So we know when to hold our qualifier?

Chula: Historically, late January/early February.

Chula: Would anyone have a problem with July 31, otherwise I'd like to motion to that.

Nina: We're also using last season's EQC results for some of the calculations. So you can also argue we're already using some outdated data. I don't think the team issue at a certain date is.

Héctor: Spain would have a problem with July 31.

Chula: **Motion to use June 30 for the purpose of EQC team numbers**

David: Second

In favour: FQF, DQB, QNL, SvQF, PLQ, AQE, QIRE, NRF, QAT, (9)

Abstain: SQV, CAF, AIQ, AQC (4)

Against: BQF (1)

**Outcome: Passes, 9:4:1**

?: When do we base developing vs emerging in relation to which spots an NGB gets for EQC by the way?

Chula: Last year we said based on what you were during the time of deciding on those numbers. Sweden and Czech Republic both were emerging at the time but were Developing later on, they were still considered emerging for EQC spot purposes.

Chula: Is it the European Committee or the EQC tournament committee that decides on the date by which the NGBs need to tell which teams got their spot?

Felix: I'm not sure. There's nothing stopping us from setting one as the European Committee I think?

Chula: Picking a somewhat arbitrary date, which is close to what we used in the past, would

Maya: We haven't quite got our schedule figured out yet. I wouldn't be able to properly vote until in two weeks.

Felix: It's a fairly quick vote. We're not in a huge rush, we can wait until next meeting.

Chula: How do we send in our number of teams for the EQC calculations by the way?

Felix: Spreadsheet with all the registered teams by team name, (and a total number) [quidditch europe@gmail.com](mailto:quidditch europe@gmail.com). Please send them in before August 31.

Chula: Motion to adjourn the meeting.

David: Second

End of meeting 00.57

## **European Quidditch Congress Meeting**

Date: 3rd September 2017

Location: Skype voice

Meeting time: 21:00 CEST

In attendance: Laurens Grinwis Plaat Stultjes (BQF), Maja Bartnik (PLQ), David Mohamed (FQF), Matt Bateman (QUK), Michael Škácha (ČAF), David Jonsson (SvQF), Lena Mandahus (QAT), Michael Puntschuh (SQV), Stevo Scheurer (QIRE), Chula Bruggeling (QNL), Victor Palmasson (QSI), Can Kaytaz (QD, 21.30), Andrea (AQE, 21.30), Andrea Miglietta (AIQ, 21.30), Nina Heisse (DQB)

Absent: Catalonia, Norway, Slovakia, Denmark, Slovenia.

Chair: Felix Linsmeier

Secretary: Bex McLaughlin

### **Agenda**

- 1. Introduction**
- 2. Roll call**
- 3. Approving new members**
- 4. IQA proposal [Felix]**
- 5. EQC Spot Algorithm**
  - a. Lowering the per NGB on maximum to 1/8th of the available spots**
  - b. General algorithm discussion**
- 6. EQC Participating teams submission deadline [Laurens]**
- 7. EQC Bids discussion in preparation of vote [suggested in camera]**
- 8. Letter addressing IQA Fees [Chula]**
- 9. Meeting schedule next season**

## Minutes

### 3. Approving new members

Felix: We'd like to approve Bex McLaughlin as the new Secretary.

Lena: Motion to approve Bex McLaughlin as the new Secretary.

Maya: Seconded

### **Vote: Approve Bex McLaughlin as Secretary of the European Committee**

In favour: QUK, QNL, FQF, QAT, CAF, SvQF, PLQ, BQF, QUIRE, SQV (10)

Against: - (0)

Abstain: - (0)

**Outcome: unanimously in favour.**

### ***Can Kaytaz (QD) joins 21.30***

### 4. IQA Proposal

Chula: motion to move into camera

Lena: seconded

### 5. EQC Spot Algorithm

Felix: First point lowering the NGB team maximum to one eighth ( $\frac{1}{8}$ ) of the available spot.

Laurens: Sorry I was distracted, I don't know what we're talking about.

Felix: The next topic is the algorithm for EQC, and  $\frac{1}{8}$  of the available if you'd like to say a few words?

Laurens: I don't recall... I can't remember proposing this.

Bex: Sorry, that was submitted by Jorgen (NRF)

Chula: It sort of depends what everyone is doing, but I imagine no one will reach the max.

Matt: How many for EQC?

Chula: 32

Matt: How many countries will attend?

Chula: 17 for sure, and then whatever emerging areas.

Matt: So the largest would be UK and Germany? Is this something we need to double down and decide now? Or can we look at expected numbers and make a decision later? Weigh up who is emerging etc? There's still time for EQC spots.

Felix: You are correct but we want to get the algorithm sorted ASAP. So we are discussing today but we may have the vote via Facebook later and some NGBs may have more interest than others. In general I'd like to have the discussion this meeting so we can hear the input. Obviously there are some for and against points. I do recall one on whether the EQC should favour competition or development.

If you want competitive EQC then no spots should go to team numbers, but all spots on performance, or one for teams and then based on performance. However, EQC does have a development role. Partly based on team number and performance next year.

Preliminary before the cap, as it were, to outline as it works as i was also asked by Maya, the past few years has been the top 8 places 1-8 of the last EQC gave their NGB a spot automatically, then 9-16 gave a half spot, performance spots as it were.

Then, what we do is, and this is what the team list is for, team based spots - essentially the bigger the NGB the more spots they should get in theory. We take all the teams in Europe and divide them up, and then some remaining spots are given according to the ratio, and then obviously reserved an amount (last year was 3, year before was 2 or 3) for emerging areas. Even though some teams may not have had Development Status they'd still have a chance to attend the EQC. If an NGB didn't get a spot they are automatically given one. All developing and full members are allowed to send a team.

Are there any questions?

Chula:

[https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1X1KmY-2RSosHSZhdR5Ajt95kg1\\_PKFGxk3-7forzMF0/edit?usp=sharing](https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1X1KmY-2RSosHSZhdR5Ajt95kg1_PKFGxk3-7forzMF0/edit?usp=sharing)

The UK lost some performance points, and because we get so many new countries (Ireland etc) they don't make 1 but we round up - so I don't think it matters if we cap because we are already lowering those numbers already.

Matt: But it still begs the question whether or not we should be pure competitive

Chula: But whether it should be  $\frac{1}{2}$  or  $\frac{1}{3}$  it will organically sort itself out. We can open the field for that competition vs opening again

Matt: Not sure.

Chula: But the  $\frac{1}{3}$  issue doesn't matter.

Matt: But many NGBs have to compete to get a spot to attend and some get one without that.

Chula: That's a new speaking point.

Felix: motion to make Chula chair of the meeting

Passes unanimously.

Bex: Is there any way we could slot these low level teams into EQC in a division II?

Chula: It has been discussed, but not for any time soon.

Chula: We are discussing the algorithm so we can discuss whether new NGBs get an automatic spot.

## **5b. General Algorithm Discussion**

Chula: We are at a point where developing not emerging areas should get a chance to come to EQC because they are full members of the European committee and are treated the same as full members (I think we have that written down as part of the QE policies somewhere)

Matt: Which part?

Chula: Somewhere that they are guaranteed at least one spot... however it's tucked away somewhere in the definition of Europe part.

"To get a spot they must be a member of the European committee"

<https://docs.google.com/document/d/1yj6XyHWJR0EaZWu76XRxiV7uz2NP-w320o9a5gx7Xo8/edit>

It's the last section.

Emerging areas can observe but cannot vote.

Matt: Who is emerging right now?

Chula: Iceland, Denmark, Slovenia those are the ones in the committee. Outside is Serbia, Finland, Romania, 6 or 7. This coming season it's already quite late it makes sense to have that one spot and have other discussions like which emerging areas are coming etc.

Classifications are defined by the IQA.

Matt: EQC is so competitive that spots shouldn't be taken away. Should QE make time for another tournament? We can't just bring in emerging areas to fill out the EQC

Bex: I'd rather see the top team of any one country vs one country's 6th best.

Matt: Fair point.

Felix: There has previously been discussion on this kind of thing, personally I feel like the purely performance based discussion can only be properly be led in terms of having a second division. Or: potentially in the future it may be feasible to have a champion's tournament of just country 1sts and then a second, larger EQC

Chula: If you know your team amount please make amends.

<https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1Jdmuv2soCzu-vLf3LwE1nHeA99Ix4uNAE1DTTqEO5OQ/edit?usp=sharing>

Top 8 is 1 point, 9-16 is worth 0.5.

The formula is your teams divided by the total teams.

### ***Working out the formula.***

### ***Moving the formula to Facebook.***

Chula: we see so many countries getting an automatic spot we'll have to drop something.

Matt: can we move to 40 teams?

Bex: no, that's not viable we don't have the volunteer numbers currently.

Laurens: also we can up to 40 one year, and then may not find a location the next year we need to make sure we can do it.

Can: a 40 team EQC can only be hosted in the UK where we know they have the space and refs etc.

Bex: can we set more regulation about which of these EAs attend? With points or something?

Chula: yes that's been discussed. Motion to table this discussion and move it to Facebook. Hopefully we will vote next meeting.

## **6. EQC Participating Teams Submission Deadline**

Chula: Laurens can you start that?

Laurens: not in detail, but in the previous meeting we were wondering when we would need to submit our teams, but more and more NGBs are moving their qualifying event before December. We should probably set a deadline.

Chula: does it matter? Does it matter that we're done and the committee can know later?

Laurens: it matters so they know when their qualification needs to be done

Stevo: You said end of January last time, so we're gone for January 27th for our qualification. So we'd like to keep it in February.

Felix: moving it forward might be better for finances. Moving it forward gives the committee more time.

Bex: I think it should be one rule for everyone.

David: what about saying you have to pay the fee one month after your qualification event?

Stevo: What about the NGB has to pay if the qualification is before that date?

Laurens: something about ireland

Chula: explanation of Quidditch Ireland.

Bex: that's not relevant.

Stevo: I'll explain later to you, Bex.

Chula: if we tell teams that helps the committee to pay earlier would you do it?

*General discussion in the comments that people would do that.*

Chula: I imagine some would, the Dutch team probably would

Bex: the Dutch teams are really nice though!!!

Chula: if Jan 28th is the latest time to tell teams that are attending... if we give them one week to respond so say.. February 4th is the latest time to confirm your attendance, would Feb 11th be okay for a payment deadline? Bear in mind last year we held the event in March and asked for payments in Feb, this year will be better as the event will be in April.

So Jan 28th is the latest day to submit their teams? Is that fine?

*Discussion in the comments that weekends don't make sense for bank transfers.*

Chula: so an 31st then?

Matt: are we voting?

Chula: motion to vote whether the team submission deadline will be january 28 or january 31

Matt: Second

Vote: Should the team submission deadlines from NGBs to EQC be January 28 or January 31?

January 28: - (0)

January 31: ? (?)

Abstain: ? (?)

Outcome: January 31

## **7. EQC bids**

Chula: motion to go in camera

David FQF: seconded

## **8. Letter Addressing IQA Fees**

Chula: motion to get out of camera

Maya: seconded

Lena: seconded

## **9. Meeting Schedule This Season**

Chula: now i would like to sort out the calendar for the rest of the season. As there seems to be some confusion over when we are meeting.



Felix: So just as an informative point, we're going to adopt a three week schedule again starting from the next meeting again, which we will put onto the Calendar as well (it's currently inaccurate because of the move due to Ghentlemen.

Chula: if we move to three-weekly then we become in sync with Quidditch Europe's calendar again.

Felix: Does anyone have any pressing concerns that we can't address in 4 weeks?

Chula: next meeting on **October 1st**.

Maya: we will talk about different apps to use on Facebook.

*General call to start using Slack. And discord.*

Chula: motion to adjourn.

Matt: seconded.

## **European Quidditch Congress Meeting**

Date: 1st October 2017

Location: Skype Voices

Meeting time: 21:00 CEST

In attendance: Matt Bateman - QUK, Maja Bartnik - PLQ, Hector Cabrera - AQE, Chula Bruggeling - QNL, Laurens Grinwis Plaat Stultjes - BQF, David Jonsson - SvQF, Nicklas Müller - DQB, Victor Palmasson - QSI, John Andre Seem - NRF, Francesco Pacciani - AIQ, Claudi Leuch SQV, Lena Mandahus - QAT (late).

Absent: Catalonia, Ireland, Iceland.

Chair: Felix Linsmeier

Secretary: Bex McLaughlin

### **Agenda:**

1. Introduction
2. Roll Call
3. EQC 2018 TD applications update
4. International transfer policy clarification [Laurens GPS]
5. The situation of amendments to the IQA Rulebook around European NGBs [Hector Dust]
6. Two-Tier EQC for 2019 [Introduced by Stevo S., worked on with Felix and Andrea]
7. EQC 2018 spot algorithm
8. Establishment of permanent branding for EQC and QE [introduced by Marc AR.]  
[https://lookaside.fbsbx.com/file/QE\\_logo\\_compilation.pdf?token=AWxli0zyUXFi\\_g3Z6yjMzPnwaTNFnldwkT7RCVblwkOpzPjyKQxQdul34TnkfRk9EQdjeSxdEJ8\\_5oqxRdD9zhFirkrb\\_QmVRvneZ04wmQeprcUDByi4yT\\_z5heIE-z18iV5THB7Cj9uNmWafZZ9R8o](https://lookaside.fbsbx.com/file/QE_logo_compilation.pdf?token=AWxli0zyUXFi_g3Z6yjMzPnwaTNFnldwkT7RCVblwkOpzPjyKQxQdul34TnkfRk9EQdjeSxdEJ8_5oqxRdD9zhFirkrb_QmVRvneZ04wmQeprcUDByi4yT_z5heIE-z18iV5THB7Cj9uNmWafZZ9R8o)
9. AOB

### **3. TD Applications**

Deadline ends just after the meeting, however we will interview them anyway. We have four applications right now we will see if any more happen tonight. So far we have applications from: Utku Boratac, Madalena Marchiori, Tobias Potzsch, and Twan Elting. If no-one else applies we have those four. Interviews are open so let yourself know if you want to take part.

Laurens: I'd like to be a part of the process, I have been involved since 2015 in EQC. I won't be applying for anything this season.

Bex: I will also be there to document.

Felix: we'll sort times and dates and get the interviews rolling this week. We will set the deadlines for 15th October or the rest of the committee. We have decided the TD by then so if someone isn't selected and still wants to be involved they can in the general committee.

Any questions?

Matt: what sort of experience do we want to bring in? Experienced only?

Felix: Ideally experience with international tournaments, doesn't have to be quidditch but in general is fine. Quidditch experience certainly, but yeah for TD especially we are looking for people who have done that sort of thing before TD, ATD etc. We would not take someone who has just been logistic assistant for small tournament somewhere.

Matt: Cool, thanks.

Felix: we will see who else applies and we will obviously want a mix of people. I personally know of some people who will apply but that is

Bex: is german required?

Felix: we prefer a high level of local knowledge, so if TD speaks German ideal. Logistics and hospitality needs to speak German - anyone who needs to be speaking to official places.

Good level of English is required generally. Further questions?

Okay no more questions let's move on.

### **4. International transfer policy**

Laurens: good evening, so this was brought up this week in the european committee FB group, currently belgium has received a message from a foreign NGB whether they could be potentially playing in both EQCs qualifiers mostly because the player would move countries between the qualifiers. But they also said they would be travelling back to the original country in february. In the policy moving country is a legit reason to move, we in Belgium it was weird you are allowed to play in both.

Matt: It's never been an issue for us.

Felix: please can you make a note in chat if you want to talk.

Matt: so since we don't share borders, but a player can qualify in the southern team and then compete with a northern team or foreign team. I struggle to see how common it that you'd want to change. I am not sure we need a whole policy. Isn't that just case by case? We could manage that on an NGB level without a whole European Policy for it.

Laurens: I don't think it needs to be a whole policy just an addition to the one we have already. Not even for this season since we already have a policy in place that we want to use. It can be easily done by just saying "A player cannot play in two EQC qualifiers unless dot dot dot" and then check with the player. It is looking like belgium is going to say you cannot play in the Belgian Quidditch Cup because they have already played an EQC qualifier in another country, but can play in the Belgian League.

Felix: we didn't say we would not not the policy we said we would not get involved in secondary teams.

Chula: If I am going on Erasmus in say, Sweden their competitive event might be their qualifier it's not fair to say you cannot play quidditch in this country because you studied in a place that had a different schedule. We say you should be allowed to play in any team even if you were not there for the EQC qualifier, it seems unfair to punish that player simply because of the ranking of the team they they happened to transfer to. I say it should not be a european policy, if belgium wants to do that it is their policy and not one for europe.

Bex: it should be about where you are permanently moving back to, going back for Christmas doesn't count.

Felix: I am wondering currently if there is even a clash. I am posting the links. For internal and external transfer. Which reasons why a transfer might be allowed. Only the within NGBs have the reasons specified (city, graduation, harassment etc) it's not in the transfers between NGBs. That is totally fair. However, it hinges on point two in the transfers between NGBs point. I wonder if that then covers Laurens' point or not. Can you clarify if that clashes or not?

Laurens: I feel the player is bending the rules to switch the teams, and I think it would help the team qualify for major events and it is a different situation.

Bex: then make the rule that you can move once, like it is internally in QUK.

Chula: are we saying this player wants to move from country to another and then back again.

Laurens: Yes, from  $A \rightarrow B \rightarrow A$ , i.e. back again. Moving back and forth isn't reasonable.

Felix: to add to that - our regulation gives the NGB the room to stop teams swapping etc, it's within your right as you have your own policy. How would you at all change this policy?

Laurens: to be involved in a major event you have to be associated with a certain team already before an event taking place. If we agree that players should only get one move then we could make it a Euro policy and make it easy.

Bex: how do you police it anyway? Make a database?

Felix: it's hard to realise in actual terms the current form is that the NGB receiving the player so in this case Laurens can say no.

David Mohamed: don't you think it's unfair for NGB "B" to make that team better with a player not from there?

Felix: this sounds like the policy anyway, about switching teams to help other teams win.

Niklas: I don't agree that there should be one transfer and I agree it should be case by case.

Laurens: what I mostly afraid of that on a case by case, but it is allowed there but not here - why is that? It's an annoying thing ... and It would be easier if I could say "well europe tells us it is this"

Bex: passing the buck then?

Laurens: what's annoying is you could also have a team that could say we will take you and another NGB might not let them move. There needs to be some line it I think the rules are too loose right now, this is how I interrupt it.

Matt: I think it sounds like hiding behind an easy policy, if it is a regular problem then when we should do something.

David [in chat]: maybe moving players should provide proof that he is forced to move.

Felix: I think it becomes hard to

Matt: you're talking about players playing at EQC or qualifying? If an NGB allows a really good player to "dick over" other teams in their NGB by carrying an average team to EQC then that's their problem. This is an NGB level.

Chula: we're not a top level sport we are not having players deciding that someone wants to move somewhere to qualify for EQC. If i were an amazing player (which I am not) and I was going on exchange, I think if that player's level is so much higher shouldn't negatively affect their ability to play, they didn't transfer to mess up with qualification just to get some advantage in quidditch. If a really great player is moving for legit reasons then they should be allowed to play. Like Bex says if they are only moving back for a month that's different, so long as they are travelling for work, study, school - the fact it might disadvantage someone else isn't their problem.

Maja: agree with Chula.

Bex: It's nobody's business why people are are moving I didn't move because I wanted to play for TQC, and not the Eagles, I moved because I hated my job and wanted to go home. Speaking as one of the people who has actually moved mid-season.

David: So... If I decide to move each month to a different country I can play every EQC qualifier than I am in?

Felix: No, if NGBs have policies in place.

Felix: There's no real case of people "abusing" I wouldn't choose that rule, and NGBs have full right to allow the transfer. Personally I don't see the need to amend the policy.

Laurens: I just wanted someone to clarify the rule.

Chula: NGBs have the right to set their own policies. For example one of our teams is close to the border and players live on both sides.

[Lena joined at 22:13]

Felix: as it stands there seems to be mostly agreement that everything is fine so long as NGBs have their regs and can refuse people if they need to. Whether there needs to be new rules regarding membership and where people live then that's up to the NGB.

## **5. The situation of amendments to the IQA Rulebook around European NGBs**

Felix: Hector?

Hector: I bring questions about the IQA rulebook thanks to Laurens we learned the IQA. But I would like to know a couple of things:

First - what's the official process regarding getting these amendments approved?

Second - what do you think of these amendments?

Matt: Hello, QUK shifted to the IQA rulebook with amendments for the upcoming season. Our Gameplay director Steve Cockram put our amendments to Pauline Raes. things like extra brooms, metal cleats, non-mandatory mouth guards etc it wasn't a big formal thing just a conversation with Pauline. If you are going to do it, get your suggestions tight as you can then just email Pauline. So long as they are not game breaking i.e. not off pitch seeking! QUK has a backcourt rule now. It's not that big a deal. Just ask and at no point did they say we can't do this. It was reasonable. Feel free to use our template as needed.

Chula: the most common amendments are about mouth guards and metal cleats which differs between events too. MOstly these equipment related things are what people make

amendments for is what people want. Like, “hey most of our pitches are shorter” than even that can be worked around. As for how we choose them is similar to the UK, if someone wants to make a change it can usually be sorted.

Laurens: what I think about Matt’s common, Pauline is also part of BQF and was responsible for writing up the amendments and publishing, she sent us a private message saying that BQF would be punished by the IQA for not speaking with the IQA directly. And we were like, “Hello!? What is happening here?” She worked with Lena Naughts.

Matt: I can see her point a bit... if she wasn’t aware - it’s bureaucratic and annoying but just a simple “Hey this is what we’re doing” would have been better.

Chula: yeah I am confused, since we all made amendments last year, since when does the IQA hand out complaints, I know we talked about amendments ... shouldn’t the IQA tell us?

Maya: I am getting confused so we want to change the gender rule on the roster in Poland, as currently it is 12:9 and we want to change to 14:7...

Chula: it never got moved to 12

Matt: until IQA makes the announcement it’s still 14. Just assume it’s still 14/7.

Bex: they have missed the boat... surely? The season has started.

Matt: World Cup.

Bex: yeah, fair.

Felix: better to just check with them, if you’re calling it IQA then make it known to them that you are making changes. We can check if they have a punishment rule in place. Or whether it is a just nice to do thing.

Chula: so I think this has to do with the whole rule book team, to make it easier to make changes for the NGB.

Matt: if we are changing their rules we should let them know, they have changed a lot since last year.

Maya: I think there should not be any changes made about safety. I.e. mouthguards.

Felix: Obviously approval didn’t need to be a thing.

Matt: just assume if you’re making a change you need to ask the IQA.

Hector: thanks that’s covered all my points.

## **6. Two-Tier EQC for 2019**

We will move this back, in case Stevo arrives.

## **7. EQC 2018 spot algorithm**

Felix: So this is as it stands with the current algorithm [shared in chat] this is mostly playing around with the numbers and isn’t definitive yet. Chula, Laurens and I have been playing around and it may still change with caps. There’s currently a number of 34 spots being needed with emerging areas. If emerging areas are taken out then the numbers are completely different.

Potentially reducing EA spots. What do you propose?

If we are capping spots which is still undecided we can make minimal changes by reducing the number of spots given out.

This works with a cap of 4 spots per country.

[Chula leaves 21:46 - citing illness]

Felix: basically do you want to:

1. Make a cap
2. What to do with emerging areas?

Jon-andre: How many are actually in the position to apply for emerging areas?

Felix: the rules have been if you are emerging area you get a spot directly. EAs currently are:

Iceland, Slovenia, Denmark. How do people feel about the algorithm generally? Keeping in mind that if we didn't cap spots and remove some of the EAs spots we need a different system.

John-A: Capping EAs seems like a good idea since we're capping regular teams.

Matt: There are teams who work very hard to qualify and high level areas should not have spots taken away to make room for EAs. They don't learn anything from the experience.

Felix: I make the argument against that it's pointless to have EAs to come to EQC. We do see teams who go to international tournaments have continual growth, we see Slovenia not do as well as they didn't go.

Matt: I see what you're saying, but is EQC for growth or is it competitive? We cannot be both. EQC should be the best team, EG can allow everyone. Pushing for two-tier in the future would be a lot better.

Felix: Sort of the argument we have been saying for the last three years. The algorithm is for both.

Matt: You can't do both.

Bex: However Dublin was an EA and they left with the same win record as the Tornadoes from QUK.

Claudia: I think when EAs have had spots so far and they should have some next year and we should change the whole thing.

Matt: agreed.

Viktor: As an emerging area we should have a second tier EQC, and you can earn your place amongst the better teams.

Matt: If I have my way I'd keep it at 6, and cut some EAs and developing regions but we can't so that's that for now.

Felix: If you have any suggestions let me know. Currently it would be cut EAs and cap at 4. Potentially give the option at 6

Felix: A 40 team EQC currently is not possible. If anyone has any further comments, or wants to move to a vote about capping the NGBs at 4 or capping the EAs.

Felix: We are voting on capping the number of spots awarded to an NGB at 4 spots.

In favour:

AIQ, NRF, SvQF, SQV, PLQ, AQE, QAT, DQB

Against:

QUK, FQF, BQF

Result: passes. The EQC algorithm will be such that spots awarded to each NGB will be **capped** at 4 places per NGB.

Felix: we will be giving out one EQC 2018 spot for emerging areas. But spots will be calculated as if we're working with three spots for EAs.

In favour:  
DQB, SQV, NRF, BQF

Against: -

Abstain:  
QUK, FQF, PLQ, QAT, AQE, SvQF, AIQ

Laurens: Vote is already useless, too many abstains.

Felix: Why are you abstaining? You don't have enough information? Don't care on the issue?

Matt: I am not in favour of EAs being there at all, so I just let everyone else vote. No idea why everyone else abstained.

Andrea: Can we have more information.

Felix: What exactly is your question?

Andrea: I don't remember the difference between the calculation because I only spoke to one emerging area so how it calculates.

Felix: So essentially what we are doing is we are giving out performance spots, then team numbers, and then the EAs are automatically counted amongst that, so for example the UK gets a certain number etc. So EAs are given some spots which impacts the ratio. If you didn't have that and used ... So if you have 0 EA spots and calculated spots based on that we would have 39 needed spots. That's the reason I explained earlier. If you changed the number it changes the ratio.

The first vote was on capping it at 4, then the second was whether we are one spot to EAs or not.

David: What about if we take out the EAs and give it to the next competitive NGB.

Matt: We are making this was too complicated. Can you just erasure the EAs spots, and remove the cap.

[Some adjustments to the spreadsheet, hard to make minutes for.]

Matt: I move to vote for no EAs at EQC.

David: Seconded.

Felix: The vote would be to remove emerging areas from the next EQC and give all the spots according to which teams are next on the list.

Matt: Can you make it so that people know which NGBs those are so everyone knows what they are voting for.

Niklas: Basically should an EA get the spot, or Italy?

Matt: Basically, yes.

Felix:

Maja: I don't think I understand. We currently have 3 emerging areas



Felix: "Give out zero spots to EAs, with the one spot previously given to EAs going to an NGB instead; under the current system this would go to Italy." This would mean no EA would be able to apply for EQC.

David: There used to be three EA spots though... or is that related to the NGB in some way?

Felix: Yes it is, we are "pretending" those EA spots exist because otherwise all other countries would get a lot more spots based on ratio. But we wouldn't be giving out any meaning that the one goes to the "next country" on the list (i.e. Italy).

Vote:

In Favour:

QUK, AIQ, FQF,

Against:

QAT, SvQF, AQE, PLQ, SQV

Abstain:

NRF, DQB, BQF

Maja: motion to vote for 1 spot for emerging area.

In favour:

PLQ, QAT, AQE, SVQF, DQB, NRF,

Against:

QUK, FQF, AIQ,

Abstain:

FQF, BQF (citing cannot make an informed decision).

Vote passes: one spot given out to Emerging Areas.

Felix: Motion to table the further points of the agenda, such as the branding and the two-tire EQC for 2019 then if someone wants to motion to close...

[move to camera]

[Matt leaves 23:19]

[Laurens leaves 23:21]

Maya: motion out of camera

Lena: second

David: where do we stand on snitch certification currently?

Felix: currently on ice.

Lena: motion to close

David: seconded

## **European Quidditch Congress Meeting**

Date: 29th October 2017

Location: Skype

Meeting time: 2100 CET

In attendance: Chula Bruggeling QNL, Stefan Scheurer QIRE, Lena Madahus QAT, Hector Cabrera AQE, Viktor Palmason QSI, Michael Puntschuh SQV, John Andre Seem NRF, Maja Bartnik PLQ, Niklas Muller DQB, Ana Mercado AQC, Tereza Bystronova CAF, Matt Bateman QUK, David Jonsson SvQF

Absent: -

Chair: Felix Linsmeier

Secretary: Bex McLaughlin

### **Agenda:**

- 1. Introduction**
- 2. Roll call**
- 3. EQC staffing updates [Felix]**
  - a. Friends of European Quidditch Association**
- 4. Establishment of permanent EQC branding [Marc A]**
- 5. Two-tier EQC [Stevo]**
- 6. AOB**

## 1. Introduction

Felix: we do have quorum with 12 people. 12 voting members. Felix: head's up to anyone who didn't get an email from the IQA about World Cup. All member NGBs were meant to receive an email regarding where the WC is going to be. For today we have few points. Remember new points add a + a new comment add ii in the chat.

## 2. Roll Call

See in attendance at the top of the minutes.

## 3. EQC staffing updates

Felix: About EQC I have first chats with TD Tobias we have worked through the preliminaries, and volunteers, we are not talking through "staff" because that's a term we cannot use. The committee has been selected, I have yet to confirm with them, but last next week we will have the first meeting. Tobias, Chula, and I decided this, if anyone would like to know anything about this do feel free to ask. We picked the people we think who would work best, we have added some "Assistant" roles i.e. a Gameplay Assistant, a Volunteer Responsible. We hired another person to help with logistics and some fundraising stuff so we are spreading the work between people without separating the work out to a point of being useless. For instance in the past a separate snitch and ref position didn't work. So we have moved towards assistants insteads to help. This is me saying the EQC committee will be ready to work next week. Do you [the European Congress] have any questions you wish to ask? *No questions were asked.* Point two: weirdly this point doesn't work in English... but Tobias and I are keen for a proper set up in legal terms this year a clear corporate organisers of the EQC as well as a bank account etc. Tobias has an extensive record in this area for German championship and handball and hockey events and he recommended we find a supporting or "frenf" that would be an association that is officially tasked with the organisation as well as handling the money for the EQC so EQC would be a corporate entity. Have a bank account etc. Which would help with sponsorship and the seriousness of the event, and hand out donation receipts and this slip is the big requirement for German companies for tax purposes. The consequences would be ... I am trying to work out if the associations would be NGBs or individuals. If it has to be individuals then I would look for the German members of the committee as possible, and as many members of the European Committee ... if we can have the NGBs as members which depends on German law about Skype meetings etc then we can have that kind of meeting quite soon. Another consequence would be that we not be able to put the money we currently have in our PayPal into this association, however we still be able to buy equipment and transfer to the "frenf" - and would clear up our situation with the IQA. A mini update I have not been able to get in touch with the trustees but from talking with Marco IQA secretary they are confused about the proposal and I offered them two meetings but so far we have not heard anything, however the IQA thinks that EQC should be IQA organised which doesn't make sense to us to obviously, as the EQC has always come from the NGBs. Doing it this way is better as a separate entity as well as supporting european Quidditch. I also in discussion with Mel Piper today set that this would definitely be controversial in the eyes of the IQA. We would have a much stronger case for our

proposal of where the IQA vs QE committee.

Chula: I am confused... and I am not the only one. Is there anything we can read about it? This is a lot, and it's legal stuff and that's a bit... mmm...

Felix: I am going to paraphrase. In the case of my former school, for example the school only had X amount of money for teaching purposes, and then there was a separate association which was called "friends of my school" and they funded trips and various projects because the school wasn't allowed to spend money on that stuff. In our case the relationship between the IQA and the QE this would circumvent our problems with the IQA for this EQC. Which then would not be "us" redefining the relationship but us defining legal terms for EQC.

Matt: Hello, the way you're explaining is confusing... but it's a company of some sorts and they are responsible for EQC. Is that as it needs to be. It's a good concept, I have been talking with Mel about this, we like this. As for voting, the NGBs are at different levels - QUK is not a legal entity.

Felix: that's an issue

Matt: let's assume every NGB isn't going to be an entity, it's a great idea let's not even think about the IQA yet, let's just focus on making EQC the best it can be and not worry about them.

Niklas: DQB was founded on a Skype call. And it's registered as an association in Frankfurt.

Felix: we want an entity that organises EQC that individuals

Chula: would we as the European committee be useless?

Felix: we can work that later.

Bex: would there be a fee?

Felix: there would a notary fee in order for the founding docs to be confirmed. Low hundreds and work out to be part of the EQC budget. This came up as a discussion with Tobias and I will write it up properly over the next few days. On the whole, Tobias is very versed in this area. This would sort us out in several terms, I think it is well worth doing.

#### **4. Permanent EQC branding**

Marc points out that every major quid event has had a different logo what has have discussed is we have one logo for all the EQCs or a style guide for organising committees (eg. with certain fonts, color scheme etc).

Felix: do we want a new logo every time? Is that a bit stale?

Bex: a style guide is a waste of time, as we'd still need a designer

Matt: let's make something cool and then pull a style guide from that instead

Michael: I think a style guide is a good idea because a fixed logo for QE long term, and a style guide would let everyone make the EQC personal while having consistency.

Stevo: I agree with Bex. If we have a same logo we lose money on merch. Like FIFA it has the same idea I think it would be nice, but having consistency is not my main point.

Lena: has the QE logo been discussed and then separate EQC ones?

Felix: The QE one has always been "let's wait until the IQA and QE relationship with them and decide"

Felix: our letterhead has the IQA colours as well as a map with all the countries within QE

Chula: I like that the logos change, I think a style guide is a bit much maybe. I don't care for consistency, but in terms of texts "EUROPEAN QUIDDITCH CUP, YEAR, LOCATION" is the minimum. So then a very basic style guide.

John Andre: Where would this fit with a two tier EQC? Would they use the same logo?

Felix: with two tier logos we could adapt accordingly.

Bex: has it been a problem so far?

Felix: no, and many of the points are valid. There's merit in the basic style guide idea. It certainly doesn't hurt to set up the guidelines.

Stevo: I feel we're creating a problem that doesn't exist, no one has ever complained about this.

Chula: yeah I mean, just say we have to have the name in the logo. I don't think it has to be a big deal. A couple of lines.

Bex: it's a bit patronising to explain that a logo needs these basic elements.

Felix: I can write this up later. If people don't like it we can go back to the drawing board.

Bex: it would be more beneficial to just have a designer on the books.

Felix: we don't know what would become of this... which makes it more straightforward. Any other comments?

## **5. Two Tier EQC system**

- a. Do we want a two-tier EQC? In what form? A Div 2 like USQ Cup 2013 or a separate event altogether?

- i. Matt: Yes please. 2 tiers. Our argument for a second EQC so that more competitive teams can attend the first tier of EQC, two different events. We won't be able to decide tonight, EG / WC results should impact who goes where, I don't like that dev nations and emerging areas get certain amounts. I'd like two 32 team tournaments. Smaller NGBs can send smaller numbers of teams, perhaps Tier Two has 16 teams or something. It's about getting younger NGBs to have the pitch time.

Stevo: a few other options... we have floating around, two consecutive events at the same times, or a separate championship of all the national champions, or a bigger one event, I think Southampton is one of the few events I have seen for that.

Making one event a lot bigger will be a mess (please don't). One of QE's main points was that we were made because the old IQA wasn't looking at everyone, so I think it's important to hold that thought in mind... however it does become trickier when we are expanding. It's wise to go with a 32 upper and 16 team lower for the first to see how that goes. I think two EQCs are a good idea if there is a buy in from the community important because it won't happen without.

John Andre: I think from NRF is that we are generally for a split for an A and B and there's more interest for teams wishing to travel abroad.

Felix: if we get the community to be involved, that gives a mandate to get the community involved, "You want this you have to volunteer for it"

Stevo: to accept the spot in the upper and lower EQCs your NGB has to guarantee a certain number of volunteers.

Chula: we need to make it clear to people that all NGBs should send volunteers to both. We are a wide range of countries with a wide range of needs and financial strains, requirements

Maja: we always tell teams they need to provide volunteers, and give them the minimum numbers. I think on the point of the EQC.

Stevo: say the UK gets seven slots in EQC A and then the UK would not have any teams in EQC B.

Niklas: I think the requirement is very important. It would be harder without the requirement.

Matt: QUK would certainly send refs. Even if we had to help that a little bit. Even if funding goes to the event, then QE may have to contribute.

Bex: however, funding this isn't black and white... I have never really been funded for anything.

Felix: perhaps some sort of finance swap, so if X country contributes an amount that helps someone from Y country.

Chula: if people are on board about making this happen and making a proposal to make this happen, and then make the logistics detailed later on.

**MOTION: vote on whether we want an official proposal about a two tier system for EQC?**

**In favour: NRF, QIRE, FQF, AQC, CAF, DQC, SQV, AQE, QNL, QAT, FQF, QUK, AQC**

**Opposed: none opposed.**

**Action: an official proposal**

b. Why can't we have a much bigger EQC? Chula: venues, volunteers, "It's a mess."

c. How many teams do we want at A and B and together? Chula: 32 main EQC, 16 B EQC.

Stevo:

Chula: a lot of these issues are hard to decide for the future because NGBs grow, and team numbers grow etc. It might be downgrading some of the A teams into B etc.

Bex: I think we need to establish what the point of the EQC B is. Like do you want the teams that came fourth in say British regionals, who would overpower any of these new NGBs that are supposed to be competing at EQC B.

Chula: to get more teams in there someone needs to move around, if we are growing B someone needs to move.

Felix: higher

Stevo: we need to figure out who goes where, so that EQC B doesn't become

a “junk” tournament that people don’t want to go to.

Lena: we could after the first EQC B adjust accordingly and move teams.

Bex: Slim down EQC A because we don’t have 32 elite teams. And also allow ONLY full member states to compete at EQC A as a motivating factor to become official.

Chula: we are looking to develop a mock-up of what this event could look like. There’s a lot of variables right now. We have a large community who have a lot of skills and we may need some external help, Stevo has done a lot. We have addressed a lot of the problem areas that may come up. But we may need to find some people.

Stevo: making full members eligible doesn’t help the problem. We need to get people interested in EQC B.

Bex: perhaps we don’t have to have EQC every year, perhaps we could have a Western Europe and Eastern Europe Cup.

Michael: it’s important in the developing NGBs that we are included in the all Europe events.

Stevo: two points - 1. That to answer Bex’s point, why don’t we just support smaller events like Golden Nut, there’s a huge difference between saying “we are going to the EUROPEAN event” compared with going to some non-glamorous event. 2, maybe we should have a task force to discuss this.

- d. How do we decide how many teams each country gets to send?
- e. How do we decide which teams / countries go to which?

Felix: if anyone is interested in assisting Stevo and Chula then speak with them about it. What do we know? What do we need? Look into the potential to get people from outside the community who know what they are talking about, and how to get these ideas out into the community.

Next meeting in three weeks.



## **European Quidditch Congress Meeting**

Date: 19th November 2017

Location: Skype

Meeting time: 2100 CET

In attendance: Felix Linsmeier (Chair), Chula Bruggeling (QNL, Acting Secretary), Maja Bartnik (PLQ), Niklas Muller (DQB), Michael Puntschuh (SQV), John Andre Seem (NRF), Melanie Piper (QUK), Michael Skacha (Czech Republic), Ana Mercado (AQC, Catalonia), Lena Mandahus (Austria, QAT, arrives at 21.10)

Absent: Belgium, Catalonia, Denmark, Italy, Ireland, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Turkey

Chair: Felix Linsmeier

Acting Secretary: Chula Bruggeling

### **Agenda:**

- 1. Introduction**
- 2. Roll call**
- 3. IQA Mini-Update**
- 4. EQC Updates**
- 5. Two-tier EQC Proposal [Chula, Niklas]**
- 6. AOB**

### **IQA Mini-Update**

Felix: There's gonna be updates from now on from the IQA. They're sending out information as they have it. The first so-called NGB Digest, which supposedly will come out every two weeks, came out today. So that's the new update format.

Chula: There's also a facebook version of this first one in the Congress group. If you didn't get it by email, comment there and they'll get your info fixed.

### **EQC Updates**

Felix: Committee is set up.

Currently working on the logo, which will be out in the next two or three weeks I think, depending on efficiency. This because at the same time we're trying to get a marketing portfolio out, so we can actually approach some potential sponsors this time around, for which this portfolio would be very valuable. So we need a logo very early on.

The budget is set to be worked on around the end of this month. Our internal deadline for individual budget requests is end of this month, after which I can compile a proper budget. So we hope to have a working budget around mid-December.

Behind the scenes people are already working on things related to their positions - talking with the municipality, logistics, etc.

No big announcements or updates, just a mini-update of how we're doing.

If anyone needs any updates on any point, feel free to contact me or Tobias (TD).

I'll be posting individual emails of the committee members in the group soon as well.

Lena: Is there gonna be a stay and play policy or can people stay where they like?

Felix: We are deciding on that still. We are trying to set some things up. It's not likely that there'll be complete stay and play. As soon as we have that information we'll push it your way. We are currently looking into the capacity for floor spaces and working with some schools to see if they can give us some space. (German tournaments are very famous for their gym hall space.) That would firstly go to volunteers, if there's enough room players afterwards, but we're still in talks and don't know yet.

In summary: not yet clear, answer will come soon.

### **Two-tier EQC Proposal**

Felix: Chula or Niklas?

Chula: This is what our Sub-committee has been working on. Last meeting, we discussed having a two-tier system (EQCa and EQCb for convenience at this time). Niklas did some math and created a draft for a system how to potentially distribute spots between those tournaments. Each NGB should have at least one team in either EQCa or EQCb; the bigger and higher-level NGBs would have spots at EQCa and some at EQCb, and the smaller NGBs mostly at EQCb. There would also be some level of relegation between the a and b. There would overall be a higher level of play (while also reducing the number of countries present a lot, which should also be said). After some discussion, we also came to the conclusion that both tournament should have different objectives. We did say that it may be better to have a 16-team EQCb as a transition, and then increase the number of teams to 32 teams further down the line. Niklas will explain to you how the algorithm would work.

Niklas: Chula already explained a lot of the design points. We wanted to have a performance-only system for EQCa; we're assigning points across both EQCa and EQCb. We also added NGB tournaments to the point criteria, such as WC or EG, so those

achievements should also be rewarded. The lowest 8 teams of EQCa would get no points, and this would increase going up the ranking. There are 4 teams losing their spot, and 4 teams going up. The points basically mean the same as before (e.g. performance pts + team pts). For this system, we essentially ignore the team points for EQCa, and look how many teams the algorithm gives out; numbers are adjusted depending on whether it gives out less or more than 32 teams.

For EQCb, we would ONLY use team count points. We will have emerging area spots (which would be taken away from the total number before the calculation). Team points are awarded by number of teams, which gives out rounded numbers. We then consider the EQCa spots of those NGBs, and as such, detract that number from the number they *would* get for EQCb (which ensures that the better NGBs that are more present at EQCa will have less of a presence at EQCb).

Lena: It sounds really good, NGBs are rewarded for their teams' performance and the other teams will still have a chance at playing competitively (at EQCb).

Niklas: We also have some alternatives, but we wanted to present it later, just so you get a feel of the algorithm. Also, not every NGB would get EQCb spots, if they did really well but the subtraction would not give them EQCb spots.

Mel: I like the system as well, also how the focus is different across both tournaments.

Chula: Essentially, we keep revisiting these questions every year, so having two events, with different focuses, we could solve both problems. It IS very hard to get the extremes between accessibility and competitiveness into one algorithm, which is why there are two separate ones at the moment. There was a proposal to alter the algorithm to favour some of the smaller NGBs, which is done through some math.

Felix: Would the bigger NGBs still get that high a number at EQCb with the subtraction?

Niklas: Yes, because e.g. Germany and UK are so massive and would get an incredibly high number of spots (1/5th of all the available spots).

Chula: For the experience of European Quidditch as a whole, it is better to get some extra teams to smaller NGBs rather than a lot more to the bigger NGBs (which is a development argument).

Niklas: We already discussed this in the subcommittee, so developed some altered algorithms. The idea that was liked most among the subcommittee was giving base points (as was done for EQCa previously) for EQCb. This would still give some base spots to the bigger NGBs but a rather big difference to smaller NGBs.

Chula: Furthermore, as NGBs grow, this also starts to even out.

Maja: I really like this idea, and I think it's one of the best ideas so far, but I'm still kinda worried about what you have- I don't think anyone said it before, on the pros and cons: potentially negative for image of EQCb. We don't want teams to feel like they're being sent to a 'kindergarten EQC'. I fear that it might feel more like a friendly tournament than a real EQC.

Mel: So just to counteract that, we now have two tiers in UK. In the same way, Dev Cup is sort of EQCb, with BQC is more EQCa. Dev Cup team don't see it as a friends tournament, they see it as a jumping off point for working towards BQC. They can learn much more by having a tournament like Dev Cup, and then go through to BQC. I know it's different, with clubs vs NGBs and all, but teams are definitely taking it seriously.

There was a tiny team going to Dev Cup last year, learned so much through going to that tournament because they could play against and with teams on similar level, and can no go to BQC.

Felix: I would agree with that. Just because I don't necessarily it as a negative, because you will still get really competitive teams at EQCb. Essentially what you're looking at in the bigger NGBs are teams that just about didn't make the cutoff for EQCa, so those people are very keen on doing quite well at the lower tier. And on the other hand I can sensibly also see the teams from the smaller less competitive NGBs being a lot more motivated because they now have a genuine good chance of getting to the top, which I don't think can reasonably be expected if they go to EQCa.

Niklas: I would want to add that if you think it's a kindergarten EQC and it's too easy, you should easily become first in EQCb. And then you would have a guaranteed spot in EQCa next year.

Lena: Yeah, if you end up in EQCb and think you shouldn't be there, then just play really well and prove you should go to EQCa next year.

Felix: As a side question, I presume you give those relegation/promotion points to NGBs, not teams, right?

Niklas: Yeah.

Maja: Niklas, on this spot allocation for 2019, is there.. On June, this year, we had 7 teams, right now we had 9. There are two new teams that are currently developing. I think we might have another team by next June. So Poland might be a lot bigger next year. If we grow, would we get more spots?

Niklas: The question is how many teams other NGBs have. In general, if you have more teams, you get more spots. If you look in the table for example, if you look at Spain, they currently have 17 teams, and they would get 4 spots in EQCb.

Chula: You do need to take into account other NGBs. If you grow by a few teams, but everyone else by a huge lot of teams, you won't really get more spots.

Maja: I just want to be sure, so EQCa is based only on performance spot, and EQCb is based only on how big NGBs are?

Niklas: Yes.

Maja: Okay, just wanted to be sure of that.

Chula: So from the subcommittee side: If people seem to like this idea, do you want us to start working on a public announce. Also because it's now in the minutes, we don't want people to find out through the minutes and maybe get the wrong idea because they miss some info.

Lena: yes please.

Maja: Especially because this is such a big deal.

Felix: Since there doesn't seem to be anyone very opposed to it, it might be good to get an opinion more general.

Felix: What questions remain?

Chula: Two things. The first, timing. [explain]

Maja: Most of the EQCb NGBs are from the east side of Europe, and February/March isn't the best time in Eastern Europe, because you'd have to deal with snow and the like.

Basically, for Poland, we have a big tournament in March, so it wouldn't be nice for us, but we'll agree for whatever is worked out. But I think if we want it on the east side, because that's where most teams are, it would be too cold at that point.

Felix: Potentially it would be an option to push EQCa slightly more towards May, so mid-april to mid-May, and then have EQCb be mid-March to mid-April. On the other hand I don't necessarily agree that EQCb needs to be before, because I don't think there's much overlap. Chula: You also want to take into account volunteers. Playing and/or volunteering at EQCa, EQCb, and EG/WC meaning traveling in April, May, \*and\* June.. that's hard on people and people's money.

David Jonsson joins, 21.57

Lena: Similar to what Felix said, if we did EQCb towards the end of March, and EQCa towards the end of April, I think that could work.

Chula: How would the weather be in March for Eastern Europe?

Lena: I don't know if Austria counts, but I think March for us would be.. 0-10 degrees?

Maja: In Poland, early March is mostly -5 degrees and snow, but late March could work actually, that's around 5 degrees. I think late March and late April for EQCa and EQCb could work.

If we would like to have EQCb in Eastern Europe, then do late March or even early April could work really well.

Chula: So I've seen Polish tournaments be played inside. And I think Canada does it as well. Would those kind of venues be available in bigger options?

Maja: They're usually not too big. Maybe 2 or 3 pitches? So not big enough.

Felix: More general, what in your opinion (subcommittee) would be the next steps?

Chula: I think we're at the point where we should make a public announcement, let people know that we are working on this and see what the general reaction is to our proposals. After that, we need to decide if we want to go with 16 the first year as a transition state, or go directly to 2x 32. We should also look at how to make sure there's enough volunteers for EQCb, and don't risk volunteers only being able to go for one event and all going to EQCa and overlooking EQCb. We've had some discussion about that last time, we should continue that discussion.

Niklas: Also, if we go for a 16 team tournament first, we should probably go with either 5 or 0 base points instead of 10 as we are thinking about for a 32 team one.

Michael Punschuh: Maybe we could also shortly talk about the issue of branding. Because "EQCa" and "EQCb" is good for discussing internally at the moment, but we should get some more.. elegant names for when we start talking about it publicly.

Felix: I could see it being called Division I and Division II? But I think that's a good question to have. Should they both be called European Quidditch Cup, or branded differently entirely? I do tend to side more with have them both be called European Quidditch Cup + something added.

Chula: Also in terms of publicity, having the words "European Quidditch Cup" in there is really good for publicly.

Maja: I would suggest not going with a and b, or Division I and Division II, to avoid having people think of the second as "worse". Maybe we could call it the European Quidditch Cup Qualifier?

Chula: Let's be honest, teams and NGBs know where they stand in international rankings. For example the Netherlands, we go to EQC and end up with Lower Bracket. I don't necessarily see that as different than simply saying up front that we're Lower Bracket and be

honest about that, by calling the event Division II. In terms of Qualifier, I think that's confusing for the NGB events that are called Qualifier.

Felix: I would mostly agree.

Maja: But in the current EQC you still have the power to fight for upper bracket and potentially go there. I have nothing against EQCb, but I think as a player on a team, you might feel a bit upset that you as a team, no matter how good you are, you're not going to EQCa because of the country you live in. I just want to make sure we think about branding.

Michael Puntschuh: I think what would be crucial is to make it clear that both events are still one EQC. That they're strongly connected to each other, and that it's basically one tournament that is simply played out over two places and two dates. While they're separate, they're still together one big tournament. In a way, you're still in one tournament, because that's also how the algorithm works.

Chula: You mean how they're connected because they influence each other?

Michael: Exactly.

Melanie: Should we make a poll on Facebook to get the opinion of NGBs not currently present?

Felix: yes, we will.

John: Should we go with EQCD (D for Development)? As the UK has BQC and Dev Cup?

Felix: I'm torn. While it's related to Development, not necessarily all the teams going are there on a developmental level, they might still be really good teams.

Chula: So I'll be honest and say I don't know a lot about other sports, but.. For soccer, don't their big European Championship or whatever tournaments not have multiple 'events' on multiple dates and countries? Is there something we can copy from there?

Felix: The thing with that is that it's more fixture style. They're working towards an ultimate final, which you wouldn't have in this.

Chula: Ah, so they split the group stage and bracket stage of EQC.

Felix: Sort of, yeah. They have their first stages over different cities and different dates, and then they come together to the one championship. Which wouldn't really work for our format. But maybe outside of football there is something that could vaguely fit? If anyone knows about something, or finds something in the near future, please let us know.

Chula: Maybe we should ask Richard if he knows something. Worth an ask at least.

Felix: So, it's probably not necessarily a bad thing to call it Division I and Division II. It gives teams the opportunity to play which otherwise wouldn't have gone, and then it would also level the playing field within each tournament. And I think the point that Chula made is important, about being up front about the level difference. We're coming up with a solution to a problem a lot of people have been vocal about lately. I don't necessarily think it has to be viewed negatively.

Lena: I agree. Just because some people might not love the name doesn't change the fact that the one tournament has the higher more competitive teams. I think people are probably way more upset about the caps than about the potential names. I think they would be happy we figured something out, regardless of what it's called.

Melanie: People may also have good names.

Chula: If we're doing a public announcement anyway, we might as well say we welcome name suggestions.

Felix: Any really urgent further questions to the authors of this proposal?

Chula: Motion: Accept the current proposal as a proposal to be brought forward through a public announcement to the European community.

Melanie/John: Second

In favour: QUK, SQV, QAT, NRF, PLQ, DQB, QNL, AQC (unanimous)

Chula: Can we delay the publication of the minutes a little bit then?

Felix: Yes.

Felix: Thank you very much to those who worked on this, it's a great proposal and thought out very well. Thank you from everyone, I think.

## **AOB**

Chula: Motion to go in camera.

Second.

Chula: Motion to move back out of camera.

Lena: Second

Felix: Do we have any other business?

Chula: Motion to end the meeting.

Lena: Second

Meetings ends, 22.45

Next meeting: December 10