**Pre-Council**

Roll call – 12 countries present (out of 23) + Qatar (non voting status at the moment)

1) Minutes from Tallinn, Newcastle, Antalya

France: Did not receive the minutes

Jens (President): Tallinn – we have no minutes, there is an abbreviated version on-line

Unanimously adopted

2) ESL Status

Jens (President): there might be appeals due to the fact that before this competition, rules of ESL eligibility have changed at the Worlds level, it is the pre-Council which needs to be presented with the appeals, passing it over to Adriaan who will speak on the behalf of ESL committee

Adriaan (N & W E): rules have changed, in relation to previous EUDC, we have checked the info which participants filled in and we invited people for an interview. There were a lot of late arrivals, and a lot of ESL interviews- there were 47 in total and we still need to do 20 more. People who are turned down, if not happy with the decision can appeal to the Council, hope that they will not, and if do I hope that the Council will resolve the problems which will arise from this.

Sweden: How many have been turned down?

Adriaan (N & W E):3 at the moment. There were a lot of people who applied and were cleared before coming to the EUDC due to the last language committee work.

Jens (President): There are certain rules in the EUDC Constitution about ESL, but since EUDC Berlin the Council have decided to follow the rules of WUDC in regards to ESL eligibility. By these rules the final appeal instance is the language committee.

Adriaan (N & W E): Language committee will have a report at the end.

Jens (President): Just a note, to be an ESL team, both speakers need to be ESL, and if a team is consisted of an ESL speaker and a main break speaker, the ESL speaker appears at the ESL tab.

3) Country eligibility

Qatar: We need to find a good solution for the entire Arabic world, there are other regional debate circuits such as Iraq and Saudi Arabia is interested in starting a debate program.

Registrar: There are three conditions in accepting a country established at the Council in Zagreb and Cork. First is that the region is geographically close to Europe and/or in Europe, second is that the debate circuit is developed, and the third is that the country is not eligible to break at any other regional tournament.

Qatar: we are geographically considered as Europe at the Worlds level, in regards for our application to be recognised as a country at the EUDC, unfortunately I cannot make that claim at the moment, because out of 8 institutions in Qatar that are involved in debate, there is only one present, and I can’t make a decision for the entire circuit. I’ve send an e-mail to all, but they are all currently on vacation.

Our logic for attending Euros this year is that we are placed in Middle East region which is part of Europe at WUDC Council. Currently debating is at the naissance stage, Saudi Arabia is looking into the prospect of developing (currently one school); Qatar is the most developed in the region. I cannot commit for now, countries and schools in Qatar to be subscribed to this tournament, but I can say that we are looking towards West and cooperation with the countries and circuits situated there.

Jens (President): Should we move the discussion?

England: As I am aware of, Qatar has campuses of Northern American Universities and theoretically they are considered part of Northern American institution

Qatar: That is a contractual obligation; there has been a case where a Texas student and another from a campus in Qatar were debating together.

England: So theoretically studying in Qatar, you are actually studying in Canada?

Qatar: That depends from which campus you are applying from

Manos (Greece, SE & ME): There have already been cases of similar nature, which have been allowed to compete at Euros, University of New York in Prague and SSE Riga

England: Just asked

Adriaan (N & W E): There is a still a possibility to participate as Texas in North American competition.

Ireland: It is impressive that you are here this year. If you have a possibility to come next year and participate, than come next year in order to be recognised as an EUDC eligible country.

Registrar: I concur with Ireland. If you do not get consent by the time of the Council, please come back next year.

Jonathan Leader Maynard (DCA, Reform committee): It should be noted that in order not to have an overlaps with eligibility, there should be put restraints, on participants which have participated on other regional competitions as a breaking team

Jens (President): Who wants to move the motion, for Qatar to be voted in Schedule A of the EUDC Constitution?

**England moves**: Deferring Qatar to come next year to be inputted in the Schedule A of EUDC Constitution.

Serbia and Netherlands second it.

Vote: Unanimous

4) Eligibility of teams

Jonathan Leader Maynard (DCA, Reform committee): There were two n-1 wavers, Lund and Amsterdam University College, due to the fact that they are new institutions, and they were not aware that they need to send judges. I’ve read the entire Constitution and no where there is stated that this does not fall in the discretion of the organizing committee.

In regards to ULU, it has been discussed and an agreement has been reached that they will be a swing team, in regards to team Australia, we had extra places so they were placed as a swing team, we checked whether or not all the countries which wanted to be here are represented and they were.

England: ULU-aware of this, they are a separate university, because one of them had to drop out, they are not a fully eligible team, but they are allowed to compete as a team, if you have any questions in regards to London, be free to ask

Jonathan Leader Maynard (DCA, Reform committee): allow them to say swing London, and compete as a swing team, and not be eligible for break

Paul(team concerned) : having a team name swing can impede our standing in the tab, because it creates a prejudgment that a team is not eligible and should not be taken seriously, because our team name distinguish us from others

Ireland: We need to trust our judges, whether a team is called team England, team Australia or swing.

England: Team London

5) Discussion on proposals for constitutional change

Jens (President): There are no print-outs

Registrar: I submitted the proposal for introduction of the post of Secretary- its duties is to keep track of the delegates, count votes, minutes, and all of the submissions to the Council. This is a position that already exists at WUDC Council. It is needed due to the fact that a large number of countries are already participating, and it is hard to keep track.

Oskar Avery (Convenor EUDC 2009): also to check out the voting status

Jonathan Leader Maynard (DCA, Reform committee): This is an issue that plagued Euros and Worlds. There are two problems, whit the definition of an institution currently which due to the lack of clear rules result either in teams getting to the Competition and find out that they are not eligible or various organization misuse the current rules to send more teams. The proposal for eligibility is that we introduce an article in the constitution to state what an eligible institution is; with this we keep the current recognized institutions. This is in our opinion the best way to solve the situation.

The proposal has introduced requirements of enrolled students and that they peruse a degree, which did not exist in the previous years. In addition it has set out guidelines in order to cope with a variety of institutions which have arisen in the previous years. The introduction is made on the basis on clarification of the term academic body, participated at Euros in the last 4 years, the territorial aspect of a municipal area and looking into a fact what kind of funding did the institutions received.

Sweden: If they can apply from next year that may deter some debating societies from coming to the Euros.

Jonathan Leader Maynard (DCA, Reform committee): The rules do not affect representation, either the county representation at the Council, nor institutional, there still exist a cap of three teams per institution.

England: This was a very comprehensive elaboration, I was just wondering, what about potential duel membership, and persons enrolled in two institutions at once.

Jonathan Leader Maynard (DCA, Reform committee): We sorted that one, with the clause of brining the proof of attendance in an institution. We are also aware that there are controversial cases, and that we cannot clear all the issues. We do assume that an enrolled student has method of proving which institution he or she is enrolled in.

France: We have more than one campus, but there are two debating societies open. There is one academic body, a single university, but the societies are in a two separate degree awarding bodies, and are regarded as separate institutions, and have been present at Euros and other tournaments in this same form.

Jens (President): Specific countries have different institutional organization. For example Berlin Debating Union – this enabled debaters from all three institutions in Berlin to debate under one roof organization

Ireland: So in this regards we observe either an institution or municipal area.

Qatar: In Qatar we have double campuses. Meaning that if you are registered at one, you can apply to another- example you can formally transfer from Pittsburgh from Qatar. In that respect separation of institution, as a degree awarding body is dubious- there is one degree awarded within multiple campuses, i.e. one academic body.

Oskar Avery (Convenor EUDC 2009): I’m aware that Newcastle University has satellite campuses in Singapore and Malaysia. They are not realistically eligible to represent the debating society.

Jonathan Leader Maynard (DCA, Reform committee): Aim of the article is not to eliminate persons, we trust that there is a system of rules in place at the society level, if there is need, these societies need to come to the Council so it can interpret the rules, and may even in future redefine it, but for that it will be needed a discussion on Council level. In the meantime they can always state their claim under exceptions.

Qatar: There would be needed a change on the part of the academic body and institution, Qatar institutions would have to be regarded as one academic body and independent institution, because they are sole providers of debating on those campuses

**ESL Committee:** There is a slight inconsistent with the current ESL rules, the new proposal must have a direct link to the Worlds Constitution, there needs to be an exclusion of ESL which are educated in English speaking countries

6) Regional reform

Jens (President): Just to inform you, that after consideration we came to a conclusion that there is no sense in this, we already have projects of a continental league to boost debating in European, as well seeing new countries such as France thrive. What we need is to provide assistance to new countries, regional discourse, and aiding new countries with ideas and advice on how to start debating programs.

C&EE (Milan Vignjević): We already are cooperating, even outside of our region, for example Manos and I held workshops in Austria. I’m wondering do regions as they currently stand make sense. Can there be a determination of a person “who you can call” in order to get in touch from the region. Maybe we should have clearer guidelines what do regional representative does.

SE&ME (Manos): I don’t see a current need of changing the system. Also no one of the regional reps gave proposal on how to actually reform it. We need to work in what we have now, until a proposal comes.

N&WE: I as a rep am useless, I believe if you want to have a rep which is useful you need to have a smaller region. My region is from Portugal to Baltic’s; it is half of Europe and is not feasible to start any cooperation on such a large scale.

Germany: What is the current function of regional reps? Maybe we should change it, have more cooperation in their duties.

Registrar: currently regional reps have two functions. One is to spread and coordinate debate activities in their region, the other is to serve in the Council Committee as their region representative.

Netherlands: Maybe we should introduce a special function, the one which deals with encoring debate or merger all the reps in one position.

France: On a Euros level we believe there should be more done in spreading debate in France and Spain.

Registrar: We need to entrust this to a specific rep.

Oskar Avery (Convenor EUDC 2009) : Perhaps a new perspective in this is that we need to officially designate persons which know their geographical position and their debating circle in that geographical position to reach out to new debating societies.

Ireland: Perhaps delegate persons which will go and expand debating, and aid the new societies

Jens (President): If it is particularly useful, as long as it does not harm, it should be done.

7) Bids

Galway: Bid presentation

Germany: What are the expenses in Ireland, will alcohol be expensive or free, on socials? Will the campuses be large enough to accommodate everyone?

Galway: Short answer yes- the campus is large enough, and the university is giving us support

Netherlands: For a 6 day competition, what about the financial aspect? Who is funding the Euros? Do you have financial assurance?

Galway: the reg fee as stated, + 15 Euros for an extra day, the fee will not go higher

Netherlands: What is your financial security? The financial report states 25 000 Euros in expenses, where is the rest?

Galway: I’m sorry that is a misprint, we will provide the financial report without a misprint on the Council, with proper table and total expenditure. Once again sorry.

Qatar: There are limited international flights, because Galway is a small airport, what are the alternative routes?

Galway: You can fly to London, and then get cheep flights with Ryan Air, to Cork or Dublin for about 20 Euros, from there you can travel by coach or train to Galway. Cork is further away from Galway than Dublin.

Sweden: The expenditure table, just to be sure that we will get it in Council.

Galway: Yes, again sorry for the misprint

8) Other

Jens (President): We had a European meeting this year at the WUDC, we should make it every year, because it is a good venue on which we can agree on mutual interest and preserve the European interest

England: Can we have a Council discussion on the allocation of team above the cap?

Jens (President): I refer this discussion to English circuit, because there is not much of difference on one team or four teams.

**COUNCIL**

21 countries present, Montenegro and Switzerland not present

Lithuania, Hungary and Qatar present – have no voting status (Lithuania and Hungary are not representing universities from their country of origin, in a form of team or a judge)

1) Newcastle report

Convenor : I currently don’t have detailed financial report- I’ll be submitting it by e-mail, but I can answer your questions about the details, just that I don’t have a closed financial report at the moment.

Finance was tight- we feared of being in a loss, but we gained a profit which will be passed to Amsterdam, which was 2500 pounds. University did not chase us for money. Our extra money went to refunding the travel for volunteers, some of the reg fees have been refunded due to the fact that these were people who had problems with visas, and we felt it was our moral duty to refund these cost.

Lessons that we’ve learned- we passed on to Amsterdam, which was in regards to organizational issues, ESL issues etc. In addition just want to add that is good to see a lot of countries here and that debate have spread around. Also I am a very big supporter of the two year bidding cycle, and the Constitution should change and go in that direction, it is hard to do it now, with a large influx of debaters and financial issues that arise during organization.

Anne (Convenor Amsterdam): Where are the other 1500 Euros?

Convenor: We’ll sort it later

2) Amsterdam preliminary report

Convenor: Most of it went pretty well, what we predicted that would happen, happened.

a) Registration issues

There were 256 teams registered and 13 were on the waiting list, minutes after reg opened. We were shocked how many teams dropped out after prepayment, and for 17 teams we haven’t refunded the prepayment. Also they were surprised by this, although this was clearly stated. Ukrainian and a Russian team were on a waiting list, and they got in due to the nation clause. We also advertised through universities in Spain, Sweden and Denmark, so there is a possibility of them starting a debate program.

b) Hotel

There were problems with the hotel because they have not reserved our rooms, and we had to pay more. They cleared the rooms due o the World Cup. We had to go and sort out that with them. They overbooked 6 rooms, and we had to split 3 institutions, and we are sorry for that.

c) Food

We really done the best we could to get all the appropriate diet for every participant, although they changed it two days before the start of the competition. Everybody who had an allergy got an e-mail where we asked what sort of food they needed, there were some miscommunications with that, but in general people e-mailed us. In regards of kosher food we had a lot of content about what kind of specific meals we need to provide. In regards to the boat trip, we booked a caterer, and are currently resolving the issues. I hope you have all fun tomorrow.

d)Budget

- Budget passed around

We strongly support the two year bidding process, we had problems with the time allocated, all our funding came primarily from public and private sector (not company), if Galway needs advice in budgetary matters please feel free to contact us.

Ireland: Thank you very much for the report. I was just wondering what happened with an e-mail that was end around for participants to vote in order to get 3000 Euros which were promised to be spend on delegates. And secondly, this regards an equity issue, why were participants called by the Equity officer in front of the entire auditorium?

Jens (President): Equity report will come later, so the Equity officer will answer that question.

Anne (Convenor): Unfortunately we did not win that award, sorry.

England: Why there were no bottles of water provided? In other competition of similar size they were provided

Anne (Convenor): We gave you one bottle and you needed to refill it. We didn’t think that this would be a problem.

Croatia: How many teams and participants were in total?

Anne (Convenor): 184 judges, 191 teams.

Croatia: 70 teams cancelled? Out of 260?

Oskar Avery (Convenor EUDC 2009): In Newcastle more teams cancel, there were 80 team cancelation in total.

Anne (Convenor): We have a list of institutions which cancelled prepaid and after prepayment and we will be passing it on to the future host

d) Adjudication report

Leela (CA): Most of the things went well; there were good rounds and tab. There were situation where one team did not come in time; we managed that with swing teams and iron man teams. Currently don’t have anything to report more on the issue.

Russia: Is it possible to get the judges final rankings?

Leela (CA): There is not feedback from all the rounds, you can send me an e-mail and I can give feedback for every judge. We will not disclose it openly.

England: In Cork Open, round 8 motions were run two weeks prior to the championship, was the CA team aware of this, and are you concerned by this fact?

Leela (CA): There is always a risk on that; you need to trust your DCA’s. In addition you have to take into account that we have to think about the time limit and suitability of the motion.

Jonathan Leader Maynard (DCA): We also need to take a look on the impact on the tournament, there were only 16 teams attending Cork Open, it did not have a big impact, and was a slightly different motion. This motion was known to 2 to 3 teams, so that should be also taken into account.

Ireland: Nevertheless, some of the people debating at Cork Open were judges here; this situation impedes and compromises the right to be heard fairly. Some of those judges may have judged teams that they lost from in that round.

Leela (CA): We cannot predict, what will be the outcome, because we did not have an insight on who debated in those rounds at Cork.

Ireland: Did you have an alternative motion to this one, the one that you could have put if you had known that this one was already run at Cork?

Jonathan Leader Maynard (DCA): The impact wasn’t significant, if it turns out that some teams were affected we are sorry.

Ruth Faller: Just to congratulate you on a good job so far.

Ireland: In regards to the POI policy of taking two speaker points if you do not take POI.

Leela (CA): We recognize that policy in order to punish a team that does not take any POI. Although it is regrettable, any policy can be misunderstood by the judges, and it happens. We trust our chairs, if it happened we are regretful.

Sweden: Was application wrong?

Leela (CA): Yes

Qatar: It is a good rule, maybe it would be useful if a ballot would have an extra column for awarding points, like World Schools format does.

Leela (CA): We will take notice of that.

Ireland: On the issue of teams striking a judge, why there was no box provided for that?

Leela (CA): I was approached by e-mails. But what I have found out is that teams who wanted to strike judges did it on the basis of tactics, and was quite amusing. The intention for striking judges is not intended for that purpose, you must have a serious claim.

Jonathan Leader Maynard (DCA): I didn’t receive clashes; the clash box was not inputted in the column, my fault.

Ireland: If there are new teams, they would feel upset about that.

Finland: One team debated the same position 4 times, what went wrong and how to deal with that?

Jens (President, Tab): Sorry for that, the program was overstretched, 6 teams debated the same position 4 times, 15 teams 2 positions 3 times, 3 teams were 6 times on prop/opp

Leela (CA): This was an exceptionally well organized tournament, it was quick, well organized, I recommend Tournaman for all the tournaments, and because of all his work I thank Jens.

Adriaan (N & W E): What was the problem with the program?

Jens (President, Tab): Priorities and rules of WUDC concerning brackets, I’ll need to check the code, and it will be repaired.

Oisin: The standard one has a report, if you had checked it, than sorry

England: Did it include motion breakdown and fairness?

Leela (CA) : Yes

e) Equity report

Equity officer: I’m pleased to state that we have nine equity complaints so far, one was dismissed because it was not legitimate, 8 ended with an apology. It was mostly hackling – in 1st round debater didn’t know about this rule, and others were made on the 2nd day. Maybe future host can put information on website about hackling because it confuses some speakers. This has caused problems and should have been done earlier.

The communication with the CA team and organization was effective.

In regards of calling individuals that was regrettable, but we needed to act speedy because there were serious accusations and severity of the accusation. We tried to get them in lunch after round 6, and we had difficulties founding them. In addition the issues were dealt swiftly, and all appropriate measures and responses were taken.

Ireland: Thank you.

f) ESL report

We would like to thank the people on the ESL committee; we enacted rules made on WUDC Council this year, also saved the data from last year, which cleared a lot of people. There were 55 interviews, 185 applications, 6 of them lost ESL status, and there was 1 appeal. Most of then were educated in an English speaking institution, or coming where a primary language of instruction is English- we needed to decide what does that mean. There were 90 teams ESL with one mixed- in total 89.

The Israeli delegation criticized the rules, all the data will be added to the Tab on Tuesday.

Jens (President): We will have a discussion later on ESL criteria

3) Reports

a) ESL Committee report

We pushed the criteria for the ESL, and were supported by Asia, except two votes, now are a less f and gray area. It is clearer now; the issue was learning English through debating, to be put on ESL and EFL criteria. We don’t know how new criteria will work in practice.

Ireland: There is a language ambiguity – living and being enrolled in an institution. It should be stated enrolled in an institution in academic year.

Slovenia: Majority of debates are in English. Status of one’s speaking ability does not change in the top room. You cannot be ban from ESL and EFL status on the fact that you compete in English.

b) Region committee

Jens (President): I don’t see a suggestion on the table, 4 reps at this time make sense, and it’s up to the Council to keep them or dismiss them. There is a facebook discussion on this, if anyone wants to join.

Adriaan (N & W E): I will draft a proposal, with exact wording for the next year.

I believe it’s simple, VP development doesn’t work, change the current rule, make it a more responsible job, and VP’s have to have a greater role. I also believe that meeting for Scandinavia was very useful, in developing region and Finland and Sweden had a great idea on meeting in this way. Again I stress out that I’m feeling quite useless, last few days I was active in my role.

IONA: We have seen a lot of schools competition, we have the Mace, workshops, debate tournaments, we are also biding for Euros, we had Oxford Women’s which was overall perceived as a positive thing, and we had London Austral.

C&EE (Milan Vignjević): We have an awesome region, and we are bidding for Euros in 2 years, we had Belgrade Open, Kiev Open, cooperation between Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, Austria, we cooperate outside of our regions, namely Austria and Greece. Come and see us!

SE&ME (Manos): We have a fairly large region. In regards to Greece, we had some funding problems, you may have heard of it, Jens thank you for helping us out.

Next year we are going to have a better and slightly more crowded Athens Open. In regards to Turkey we had the best worlds ever, and we’ll be having a Koc summer tournament again this year. In regards to Israel there will be a Red Sea Open, Israeli debating league is now a sports institution, and has an institutional support and funding.

Jens (President): In regards to Middle East, Qatar is a positive sight, if there is any other development that would be good to hear. I know that Alfred Snaider held workshops in Iraq. Qatar can be a regional post for development of that region.

Registrar: As previously stated at the pre-Council ,a Secretary is needed, it is modelled on the WUDC, in addition want to state that we should repeat the meeting that we had as Europe in WUDC , again in Botswana.

Jens (President): I enjoined being at this post, also believe that we should have a meeting on Worlds level. In addition I’m sorry that I didn’t send a “join eudc mailing list e-mail”, also believe that we should have a secretary which keeps track of all delegates. I’ve set up a homepage, on which there are incomplete tabs for some tournaments, hope I will retrieve.

Adriaan (N & W E): Well done!

4) Bid

Galway: Presentation

Adriaan (N & W E): 9 rounds is a good plan, 4 rounds a day is too much, maybe you should do it 3, 3, 3.

Galway: We were thinking about that, we don’t know when the delegates are coming, if there will be problem, we will have to do 2, 4, 3, if not we will defiantly do 3, 3, 3.This will not cause any problem with the plan and the schedule.

England: I consider 9 rounds fair, because there will be 200 teams, 8 or 9 rounds is a fair balance. In order not to reflect on tab and team allocation, perhaps remove the element of randomness from 2nd round in the tab.

Oskar Avery (Convenor EUDC 2009): You have allocated funds for flying in judges, do you already have a list of whom will you be flying in? There is a lot of politics in it, not every good speaker is necessarily a good judge.

Galway: We are funding our CA to travel the tournaments; we recognize the need for a variety. To us is more important that teams get good judges.

England: You have 23 000 Euros allocated for funding 38 judges, can you elaborate?

Galway: We will have up to 38 judges, Irish judges will have their fee wavered, that will not affect the tab, if so it will be slightly.

Sweden: How much regional representation will you have in the judging pool?

Galway: We will concentrate on good judges. We do not prejudge and say that some judges from a certain region are bad; we are merely saying that we want good adjudicating pool.

Croatia: What is a “good judge criteria”?

Ruth (CA Galway): It is the judges we judged with or heard that they are good. In essence it is a question of trust in the adjudicating pool.

Ireland: What is the CA take on 4 teams per institution?

Galway: If there is a monetary need, and there will be space, and they can send additional judge, we will consider this option.

England: If you are going to allocate the 4th spot, could you please make the decision process transparent, on how these spots were allocated.

Galway: We have the current policy on 4 teams; we will try to avoid having teams outside of Europe. We will have firstly European interest and European teams at mind.

Oskar Avery (Convenor EUDC 2009): Are you still advertising the bid in the non-European circuits?

Galway: Our prerogative is to see the European circuit; we don’t have enough budgets to visit the circuits outside of Europe.

Hungary: what is your budget on 4 days/3 days/ 6 days?

Galway: You have it in the bid, that all depends on the cost for food.

Adriaan (N & W E): Perhaps the registration phases should start earlier

England: Any time earlier will make the English circuit not able to register because of the Worlds dates.

Sweden: What is your policy on new countries will be slots made available for them?

Galway: If they e-mail the convenor, we will reserve the spots.

Hungary: Is the 1st day arrival and 7th or 8th departure, then the briefing might be at 8 am.

Jens (President): This Q&A is pointless, I **move to vote**

Serbia and Slovenia second it

Vote: Unanimous – Galway wins the bid

5) Bid proposals for 2012

Belgrade: We will like to bid for Euros, contact us on [Belgrade.euros@gmail.com](mailto:Belgrade.euros@gmail.com)

We have already a hotel and sponsors; we believe it would be great for regional development. We will be flying more than 45 chairs. We will announce the CA and tab next year at Galway.

Jens (President): Let’s break for the night; see you tomorrow at 9 Am

**After Council**

Jens (President): We are dropping the Regions reform agenda.

1) Various

- Cosmetic changes of the Constitution

- Vote on Qatar

2) ESL

Jens (President): We should move this discussion to the committee.

Israel: The new ESL criteria cast a light on other difficulties; we feel that it should be moved to a committee or a subcommittee. This issue was raised in regards to a student who had lived up to the age of 8-9 in an English speaking country, and hasn’t spoken English for the Last 15 years. ESL should have discretion on deciding upon this, and not to use the rules so stringently.

Adriaan (ESL Committee): Being on ESL committee, we have talked about taking into consideration this aspect of past, especially studying and living abroad. We realized that there is a difference if you study in English for 5 years in Bremen, and 2, 5 years at Cambridge. The level of exposure is greater in an English speaking country. The rules are clear and are evident that your level of exposure in England is much greater because of the vocabulary and grammar which you can use. In addition, we have talked to people who specialized in grammar structures and we’ve been told that what you’ve learned by the age of / that grammar structure will always stick, no matter how long you don’t use the language. When it comes too bilingually you don’t have such a barrier. On education part, there is no such dilemma; where as this part is still a gray area.

When it comes to the being exposed to the language, Fletch, is the only one who can asses this, because he is the only studying this specific area which I have just outlined.

Jens (President): Go to the Committee with this, with an expert inside, it will be more qualified than we are now.

Slovenia: Make sure that the criteria are clear for next year, so that we don’t have these problems.

England: There should be taken into account the expert analysis, of the problem.

Adriaan (ESL Committee): Obviously there is a fact on grammar structures, we will talk to the people who are studying about this and know more.

Slovenia: This is a good idea, if we solve more cases this way, it will be beneficial for both the Council and participants.

Ukraine: Grammar patterns are of no influence if you do not have a vocabulary and fluency.

Netherlands: We should seek expert opinions.

Israel: We agree with formation of the committee and seeking people who have the expert knowledge.

Adriaan (ESL Committee): We should do this in order to avoid having the same problems over again, and the same discussions.

Jens (President): Article 24 is hollow and needs to include a reference on the Worlds

Netherlands moves motion: **To form an ESL subcommittee headed by Adrian and attract experts outside of the debate community**.

Seconded by Slovenia and Ukraine

Motion passed unanimously

Motion passed by England: **To insert Qatar in Annex A of participating countries**.

Seconded by Russia and Ukraine

Motion passed unanimously.

Regions- will be dealt next year.

**3) Secretary**

**Article 8**

(1) The Registrar to the Council shall be appointed by the Council, and such appointment shall give due consideration to the necessity of preserving continuity in the membership of the Council;

(2) The Registrar may appoint a proxy to act on his behalf;

Adding

(3) The Council shall appoint a Secretary of the Committee or a designate in his/her absence.

Also where appropriate adding the Secretary in the Constitution. The Current articles: Article 5 , Article 7 paragraph 4 after word Convenors in a phrase „The Vice Presidents, Registrar and Conveners shall not have a vote on any substantive motion placed before the council“, Article 19 add f) The Secretary of the Committee.

Slovenia moves to vote

Seconded by England and Russia

Motion passed unanimously.

4) Austria passes a motion to be added in **the Annex A of countries under N&W E**

Seconded by Netherlands and Germany

Motion passed unanimously

5) Eligibility

Austria: we did’t have a club on previous Europeans

Jens (President): This is in ratification section, fundamental concern are universities, and other recognized bodies.

Netherlands: We should take into consideration institutions that were present in 2006 till 2010, with this we include the ones represented at these Euros, and past Worlds.

Adriaan (N & W E): Adding 2010 would be clearer, on institution eligibility.

We should add in 22 (6) In cases where individual has dual membership of eligible debating institution, it shall be up to the president (or equivalent) or country delegate to the council to devise and explain the rules within their country for ensuring individual eligibility of the institution that person is competing for at that tournament.

After some discussion this article is added, with an addition based on the proposal of Qatar to insert or otherwise contiguous area “and not municipal

And that the participating years would be 2006-2010.

Germany moves the motion. Russia and Netherlands seconded it, Motion passed unanimously

Now it reads and should be inputted in the Constitution as follows:

Preamble.C

“institution” means any academic body or other debating organisation authorised to send teams to participate at the Championships under Article 22 of this Constitution

“academic body” means any university, college or other institution of further education awarding degrees or other qualifications as recognized by the laws of the country in which the aforesaid are situated;

Article 22

1. Competitors must be enrolled students and must be attending classes or pursuing research at doctoral or pre-doctoral level in the academic body which they or their institution represents on the last day of term preceding the competition and must be recognised full members of their institution.
2. All competitors should bring proof of their institutional membership to the Championships and must produce such proof of membership if requested by the Organisation Committee of the current Championships or by the Council.
3. An institution may send competitors to the Championships under any of the following conditions:
   1. It sent competitors, who appeared alongside its name in the final tabulated results, to any European Universities Debating Championships from 2006-2010 (see Schedule B).
   2. It is the sole organisation within an academic body through which debating is structured, and it’s membership are not eligible to compete for any other institution already recognised as eligible by the Constitution, and it is ratified by a meeting of Pre-Council at the current Championship (see Schedule B).
   3. It has been recognised as eligible by a majority vote of the Council under Article 22.3 at a meeting of the Council subsequent to Newcastle EUDC 2009 and at least two weeks prior to the current Championship (see Schedule B).
4. Institutions that do not meet the eligibility conditions laid out by Article 22.3.1, 22.3.2 or 22.3.3 may be recognised as eligible by a majority vote of the Council on the basis that they are:
   1. Organisations that are the sole providers of debating within an academic body, such as society, union and other debate organization

or

* 1. Organisations within otherwise contiguous area which are the sole providers of debating opportunities to members of academic bodies within that area.

1. It is expected that all eligible institutions shall have fixed membership rules that define what students or academic bodies constitute that institution, and that these rules should be relatively unchanging over time. Institutions which Council deems are not sending competitors in good faith, shall be censured by a majority vote of Council, and may have their eligibility suspended for a finite period or permanently by a 2/3 majority vote of council. Such suspension should be recorded in Schedule B of the constitution, together with the date (if any) on which eligibility shall be restored. Permanent suspension of eligibility may be overturned by a 2/3 majority vote of council.
2. In cases where individual has dual membership of eligible debating institution, it shall be up to the president (or equivalent) or country delegate to the council to devise and explain the rules within their country for ensuring individual eligibility of the institution that person is competing for at that tournament
3. An institution cannot be eligible if it is not based in a country deemed eligible under Article 24. This requirement overrides Articles 22.3 and 22.4.

Article 23

Insert:

“Composite teams may not be eligible for any ‘break’ at the Championships, unless by a specific ruling of the Council.”

6) WUDC

Jens (President): The current situation is that Europe needs to stand together, because there is a strong feeling about Europe losing its power on the Worlds stage. The next two Worlds will be held far away from Europe and a lot of European countries will lose their voting power.

Registrar: We need to work together. This is something that happened recently, that Europe has a single voice, and now is needed more.

Netherlands: There are different ideas what the Worlds should look like than what is the Europe’s shared view.

England: We must act with one voice, be Europe as a whole, there are different ideas what debating is, and how should it be structured on a Worlds level.

Jens (President): There is a great ESL/EFL divide; it has been made a political question. There is an outlook that European teams should not be EFL teams. Personally I don’t see how European teams can be EFL, I do subscribe to opinion that Asian teams have more language barriers than European.

Slovenia: If we won’t to have a political break, than we shouldn’t call it EFL and ESL, than we should call it Asian and European break. If we are going to have language breaks than we need to recognize the fact of the language, and not regional placement of a speaker.

Russia: Clearer rules must be done in this respect. There are still problems with criteria.

Netherlands: This needs to be discussed on the world’s level, it shouldn’t be a political break, and it should be a language break.

Adriaan (N & W E): We need stricter decisions, and clearer rules on these two categories.

Ireland: We should discuss this among our own home contingent, and discuss whether an EFL and ESL category should be made a political break.

Russia: This is strongly political. What is the point of having Worlds if we are going to have regional breaks? We have regional tournaments already. We are currently attending one.

Slovenia: This should be put on the agenda, the ESL and EFL, and Europe should have a unified voice on this,

Jens (President): This should be made a formal statement. On the other hand I’m not a right person to push it, because I am perceived as a controversial person in regards to this question. On other hand, I’m trying to put a motion out to introduce ESL quarterfinals in the WUDC Constitution.

Ruth (CA Galway): Bid for Worlds!

Croatia: We will bid for Worlds

7) Vote on Council executive

Jens- president

Branka- registrar

Rob- secretary

Regional reps- they need to be picked by the region