



Minutes, IDEA GA, 10th December, Vormingsentrum, Malle, Antwerp, Belgium

Meeting begins: 9.15am

Members introduce themselves (in counter-clockwise order).

12 votes present: ACCD (Serbia, Zorica Razis), ADK (Czech Rep, Katerina Svajcova), ARDOR (Romania, Karoly Beres), CKD (BiH, Nadina Balagic), Debate Association (Turkey, Olgu Gokalp), Debate Center (Latvia, Mihails Halitovs), DiCS (Azerbaijan, Seymour Huseynov), EDS (Estonia, Sigrid Solnik – joined later, as noted), FOKAL (Haiti, Jean-Gerard Anis), IEDC (Lithuania, Alma Juozaitiene), NCC (Belarus, Alena Stefanovich), SDA (Slovakia, Miroslav Nemcok), YEF (Macedonia, Marjan Zabrchanec and Brankica Georgievska)

Other participants present: IDEA NL Board members Andrej Schulcz, Noel Selegzi, Virginija Paksiene, Maja Nenadovic, Logan Balavijendran, Lazar Pop Ivanov, IDEA NL Executive Director Yvonne Heselmans, and IDEA Central Executive Director Bradley Gallop – joined later, Forum Director Veronika Vlckova and Coordinator Anne Valkering – both joined later.

Apologies: German Debating Society, board member Ton Sonneveldt

Introduction

Purpose of GA: Extraordinary, to deal with changes to the statutes. But given members are present, there will also be updates on the state of IDEA, the Youth Forum, reports on the progress of the IDEA Working Groups.

Some changes to the schedule to accommodate presenters (Marcin)

Report on the Youth Forum 2012 (Marcin)

Report on Youth Forum Working Group (Logan)

Report on changes to the statutes (Yvonne)

Youth Forum 2012 (Marcin Zaleski, IDEA UK)

Announce that he was appointed to Forum Director by IDEA NL board.

He is still staff of IDEA UK; IDEA NL is not paying for his salary.

- Forum dates: 2nd - 15th of July 2012, Leon, Mexico.
- Host: Universidad Americana Mexico.... (must verify spelling)



- Forum held in province of Guanajuato, north of Mexico City.
- Discount of 15% secured from Air Mexico (from Barcelona, Madrid, Paris)
- Weather: 27 degrees. Sun has been promised.
- Most likely Forum hotel : Real de Minas Poliforum
- Registration for Forum : no higher than 650 Euros
- Participant numbers : Maximum 340 (260 debaters/coaches, 40 organizers, 20 Spanish track, 20 guests)

Theme of the forum: Securing Liberty

Sub themes

- Torture
- Ethnic Profiling
- Detention
- Surveillance and Privacy

Topics will be announced second half of January 2012 – 3 topics.

Selection of Trainers: February 2012

Registration Opens: February/March

Logan is talking about the Youth Forum working group discussion.

Most of the things we will talk about will not be valid for this year's Forum, but mostly for subsequent forums.

Briefly going through each section:

1. **Duties of the Forum director**, Curriculum director & committee, chief adjudicator.

In the future, open call for all these positions. This year, we did have an open call for the Forum Director, but candidate backed out at a late stage and we had to appoint Marcin to take over.

2. **Selection of Trainers**



This is where most of participants interact with the forum, we must get this right. People remember bad trainers and good trainers. We want to get the best trainers, old and young, representative of the Forum, etc. (We get some 90 applications for 20 positions.) We need a rigorous selection process for the trainers. We are working on ranking, scoring, and getting objective criteria for selection. We are discussing what kind of quotas we should implement, in terms of gender distribution, returning trainers versus new ones, geographical representation. We want representation from six main regions of participants at the forum. Finally, we want to promote Junior and Assistant Trainers, we want to give them more responsibility, etc. (Most experienced coaches were promoted into Lab Assistants.)

3. Educational Tracks at the Forum (MTT, CJT, BPT, IND tracks)

Maybe the MTT track needs to be rebranded, focus on the purpose of the track rather than reflecting its composition. What are the goals, themes of this track? CJT track, there was a good balance and teaching, passing on knowledge going on. Finally with the BP track, there was confusion in the past. It is only for undergraduate students, cap of 32. We also want to integrate the BP track into the forum, to debate theme related to Forum's theme.

4. Language Issues

It varies, who comes to the Forum in the given year. We need to have an experienced ESL/EFL trainer. Their job in the past was (if necessary), to run an additional track for students who needed special language attention, or go from lab to lab and assist those who need assistance. We want this person to help with the curriculum, to sensitize other trainers to the ESL/EFL issues. We do not think it is a good idea to separate or segregate kids from the group, due to level of English. Related to this discussion, we wondered whether to give special awards for ESL/EFL categories. It is difficult to draw that line, and if we cannot create those objective standards, things become arbitrary. More often than not, it is the least ESL person that wins these awards, etc. which may create more animosity. Also, by doing so, we fix the correlation between language knowledge and debate ability/skill.

5. General Venue and Technology Standards

All rooms' fresh air, cleanliness + how many separate rooms are required to run a Forum administratively. Technology quality is also important: there should be Wi-Fi, high speed internet present and available to all. How many computers should we require the Forum hosts to provide? We decided to ask to provide 10-15 computers, as many participants are expected to have their own computers.

Yvonne: Does anyone have reservations about the location, Mexico? Do you all intend to attend?



CKD: We need help with approaching donors; it is expensive to send a team.

Logan: Can IDEA assist you with providing information to the donors?

CKD: Yes, info package on the forum would be great.

Marcin: We can invest attention into the Forum website, and provide a letter of support.

CKD: Sending government officials to a website is a waste of time; they will not seek the information out themselves. Letter of support is better.

Logan: Background analytics on the forum? What the curriculum has been like?

Virginija: Perhaps an idebate-magazine that mentions Bosnia? Perhaps this could help?

Logan: We keep this conversation going, and we discuss it further. We can have some download section for the sponsors, with info on the Forum.

Yvonne: We should share best practices and fundraising ideas with each other via email.

Logan: We want you, the members, to be part of this discussion and the working group on improving the Forum.

Andrej gives overview and background for next discussion on membership

Andrej: I understand that there was some confusion when we were supposed to start today, apologies for that. The second thing is that I would like to direct your attention to the appendices in your package. We have here two colored documents that Yvonne will be referring to, narrative and financial report, and plans for 2012 of IDEA NL. We also have a document overview of Logan working group, on membership and voting, affiliation to IDEA NL. Last document is a rather long summary of responses to a questionnaire on IDEA members that was circulated during the summer. Most of you filled it out. I encourage you to read it and exchange information.

Andrej discusses the IDEA structure and briefs members of where the network is; IDEA NL, UK, US – IDEA Central, IDEA Mexico, IDEA South East Europe, IDEA China, IDEA Central Asia etc.

Coffee Break: 10.40 to 11am

Andrej clarifies current membership status and review the list for the benefit of the GA, and informs the GA that there's been a request from an organization called Logos from Montenegro that claimed to have tried to apply but have been not been engaged. No membership request has



been received from them, there is no record of application or participation in IDEA general assembly, there is no record of them ever paying membership dues. Their current status is of Not Member.

Andrej updates the GA as well on the current board composition (Andrej, Logan, Lazar, Noel, Ton, Jasmin, Maja, Jasmin) **Yvonne briefs members on the state of IDEA**

- Detailed accounts attached in handouts, but in brief debts after accounts have been reconciled stand at 7600 Euros, operational budget for the next year guaranteed up to 50% at the least.
- Staffing brief for 2011 and 2012.
- 2012 – Funding for staffing helped by projects with Scope and Rabbobank. Biggest change is Veronika not part of the 2012 staff.
- A consultant controller was engaged to sort out the finances. Finances were kept in a comprehensive and transparent manner, but the overall structure of the book-keeping system needed a revamp in order to make IDEA budgeting more project-driven. The value of this work is also shareable within the entire network.
- Fundraising overview for 2011 and 2012
- **Pending fundraising for 2012**
 - Running Fire, Debate festivals in the Neighborhood, Dutch Lottery
 - EU operational grant Europe for Citizens
 - JP Morgan
- **Running projects**
 - Idebate Zeeland, with Scoop
 - Debate in the Neighborhood Antwerp, with KRAS
 - Debate training with youth workers in Antwerp, with Proving of Antwerp
 - Welcome in Fraz, with youth work Rotterdam, Amsterdam, Sneek and Zeeland



- Youth Forum 2011/2012 in Mexico
- **New Projects 2012**
 - Debate@Europe, with EU subsidy Partners: IDEA members in Estonia, Romania, Macedonia, Lithuania, Slovakia, IDEA UK, and IDEA NL. Status confirmed, cost share from OSF institutional funds
 - > YEF asks about specifics of involvement. Partners can develop own plans, the more partners the better, so all IDEA members are encouraged to be part of the program. Yvonne and Marcin will be developing the work plan.
 - > CKD asks how partners were contacted. A request for partnership was sent out to everyone asking for involvement.
 - University Debates: Debates at universities. Partner's universities/debate clubs in Porto, Dublin, Ljubljana, Utrecht, Berlin and Paris. Not yet confirmed.
 - > OSF is interested to push debates among the university debate community.
 - Debate in the Neighborhood (in Europe)
 - Idebate in Regions
 - Youth in Action 4.1 EU/Africa, deadline May 2012
 - Cordaid : debate trainings for Communities of Change, pending
 - Plan: debate competition at schools

Yvonne concludes with a summary, Andrej thanks her.



Discussion on Statutes of IDEA (by Bradley Gallop)

Bradley goes through the list of changes, most of them minor (PPT presentation and list of changes attached with the minutes)

- Primary reason for editing the statutes is to change the financial year (previously listed as from 1st July to 31st June) to 1st January to 31st December. This is in order to give the GA time to approve the budgets, 6 months before the end of the financial year
- Yvonne raises a question on when the plan needs to be approved. Has to follow the budget. Increases the need for long-term budgets.
- Discussions on whether to change the amount of time notice given to the GA before changes are made the statutes (currently 2 months' notice). Slightly shorter period gives the board more flexibility. Consensus to change it to 6 weeks' notice.

Discussion on when the new Financial Year would come into effect. Yvonne says it's possible to do it 2012, but better if can do an audit for 2011 and present in April. The GA agrees Bradley and Yvonne should come to an agreement on the best approach

ACCD: Is it possible to have the GA meeting on line?

Noel: I believe that we need to have a face-to-face meeting at least once per year.

Andrej: Is it possible to have a meeting face – to –face but some of the members to participate via on line?

Bradley: the idea is to influence each other's opinions and votes, so if it is done in a way that everyone can participate at real time, plus you need a written record of what was agreed-upon in addition to the Skype conference

If some people are on spot, and other people join in via net, it is considered as a meeting

Andrej: we will explore this idea, and if possible implement it for the GA

Bradley: we will have to change the statute if we do want this to happen.

Logan: without any change to the Statute we can have a meeting in which some people can get involved via net but can't vote online so they will have to have a proxy.

Bradley: I suggest the following articles as changes to the current Statute:



4.1.6 A meeting of the General Assembly may be convened by the Board to take place by electronic or any other means, as such means currently exist or as they may exist in the future, including but not limited to by electronic mail, facsimile, and internet voting, provided that the following conditions are met:

- (a) Voting members are able to be in contemporaneous communication in “real time”;
- (b) Each voting member may be identified;
- (c) Each voting member may directly hear or read the contributions of other voting members during the proceedings of the meeting;
- (d) Each voting member may cast its vote in a verifiable way; and
- (e) Confidentiality and secrecy are assured where voting is by secret ballot.

4.1.10. Voting members may be allowed to cast their vote on certain items on the agenda of a meeting no more than thirty (30) days before such meeting, provided that all of the following conditions are met:

- (a) The agenda identifies each item on which voting members may cast their votes in advance of the meeting as well as the manner in which voting members may cast their vote;
- (b) The agenda items to be voted on in this manner do not require debate or deliberations among members, including but not limited to such items as approval of minutes of previous meetings and election of members of the Board of Directors or of other committees of Association.
- (c) Each voting member may be identified;
- (d) Votes may be cast only by electronic means, as these currently exist or as they may exist in the future, including but not limited to by electronic mail, facsimile, and internet voting;
- (e) Each voting member may cast its vote in a verifiable way;
- (f) Confidentiality and secrecy are assured where voting is by secret ballot; and
- (g) Votes cast by electronic means in accordance with this Article shall be added to



the votes cast during the meeting for purposes of Article 4.1.12 of these Statutes.

4.1.11 The General Assembly may validly deliberate only if one-half of the voting members of Association are present or represented. For the purposes of this provision, participation, either individually or through a proxy, in a meeting organised in accordance with Articles 4.1.6 or 4.1.10 of these Statutes shall be counted in the same way as presence or representation. Except as otherwise provided in these Statutes, no meeting of the General Assembly, other than one meeting the quorum requirements stated in this provision, shall be valid or binding unless it is unanimously approved by the all voting members.

It was that this change will be added on the voting list for the Statute changes.

ACCD – Moved the motion

EDS – Seconded

All GA members voted in favor of this proposal

Voting on the statutes will happen after the discussion on membership, in case there is any part of the membership discussion that could impact the statutes.

Discussion on Membership

Andrej provides context for the discussion. Numbers of formal members of IDEA (debate organizations) have been declining, while the number of general stakeholder (engaging the website, participating in events) has increased. It's a challenge to demonstrate what exactly the strength of IDEA is.

Goal now is to re-think what voting membership of IDEA means and what are possible ways to define the relationships of all stakeholders with IDEA (voting membership vs. non-voting affiliation).

Discussion (identify if changes need to be made to the statutes): What should be the rights and duties of members?

- rights are currently to govern IDEA



- rewards include a discount at the Youth Forum, possible special recognition on the website
- duties are to pay the dues and be present (possibly by proxy) at the GA
- Members have to be Network Organizations, registered entities that are more than debate clubs. Don't have to a single national organization.

DC (Latvia) raises that reporting is not done consistently, could survey members more regularly in order to quantify activities done by members.

DA (Turkey) asks if goal of the member organization can be fostering debate as an activity alone, or do they need to have broad goals of creating open societies. The GA decides who members are, they can decide this subjectively. Board makes recommendations on membership (after investigating applications) to the GA.

YEF – require (obligation) members to display IDEA logos on events that they run

CKD – required attending the forum to maintain membership? No, as long as represented through proxy at least. Noel also points out distinct role of voting members, which is to govern IDEA – best national debate organizations can remain so and maintain an affiliation, but being a member means you must take an active role in IDEA governance.

DC (Latvia) – should also require a minimum level of activity of members? Not just being an IDEA member for the sake of being an IDEA member.

Lazar: Presentation of the membership group discussion

We briefly went through the summary of the discussion we had in the working group on membership.

1. One or more IDEA members per country - It was basically a debate between having one national debate organization being the voting member for that country and having multiple organizations with that same privilege.
2. Becoming a member of IDEA - It was agreed among most of the participants that becoming a member of IDEA should be stricter, in terms of reviewing the applications for IDEA membership more thoroughly. Having clearly defined criteria's that the applicant has to meet was another idea that was accepted by most of the participants.
3. Should we create one or several classes of non-voting affiliation with IDEA for organizations, educational institutions and individuals? How should membership and classes of affiliation differ? - All of the members agreed that if IDEA wants a tiered membership it should pay attention to the following:



- A clear definition is needed for what a voting member, and what a non-voting member is.
- A clear definition of both types of memberships and the requirements the organizations have to comply with in order to receive the status of voting or non-voting membership
- Multi-level membership structure has several advantages and we certainly need clear definitions, but while working this out, let's also try to keep in mind, that a) someone later has to administer the system and b) it has to be motivating for potential newcomers to join IDEA and move up the membership structure to eventually become full members.
- What we have to balance is the need to have reliable voting members, who join as voting members want to help IDEA pursue its mission. We have to avoid organizations joining as voting members who see IDEA not as a mission driven association but rather as a means to pursue their organizations self-interest.
- When it comes to tiered membership, I think we can and should be more inclusive as we get more removed from having a governance role in IDEA.
- We need to sort out exactly what conditions should be for IDEA-NL voting membership, and then sort out different categories/level of non-voting membership and then what do we do with organizations that may want to use idebate.org but otherwise want nothing to do with IDEA.

Noel: In principle, IDEA_NL statutes don't mention national organizations,

Maja: I believe everyone agrees with this, but the reality is that some of the countries are presenting themselves as the only legitimate representative in IDEA, and the only legitimate debate entity in that country.

Logan: Clarification on this point can be published on the web-page, so that we don't have misunderstandings.

Bradley: Using the name of IDEA for the events, should be regulated and agreed upon between member organizations

Noel: The standards regulate the area of usage of the name and logo of the organization

Andrej: 4 things were suggested in the discussion we made previously:

- 1) Reporting on the activities from member-organizations
- 2) Members should be dedicated to fulfilling the values of open society
- 3) Publishing the IDEA logo
- 4) Minimum number of activities for every member organization



1.

Logan: Standardized form for reporting might be a good idea

DC (Latvia): All the organizations do have the list of activities they have made throughout the year, so it will be good if we share these ideas

Bradley: I am not sure that this needs to be regulated in the Statutes.

Noel: We do have internal regulations, so that might be a good place to put the reporting activity, because it is a lot easier to change the bylaws rather than change the Statutes.

Yvonne: We can send a simple format, for reporting and that is a good instrument

Bradley: we have other means of communication that we can use

Andrej: there is consensus that on voluntary basis, no matter what the mean of communication is that the organization members should write this report and share it with each other. There is a consensus as well that this changes should not be in the Statues.

2.

Bradley: I would like the idea that something should be added in the Statutes that will explicitly explain that the organizations promote debate, as well as all specific goals of the IDEA

Andrej: So the question is do we want to make it more explicit

Yvonne: I believe that we should make it more explicit if we all agree

Andrej: Any suggestions about the wording of the proposal

Yvonne: Contributing to democracy and human rights by promoting active citizenship throughout debate and discussion.

Bradley: the change should be in 3.1.3, point **b)** we add contributing to democracy and human rights by promoting active citizenship through debate and discussion.

So the question is should we put this in the Standards or in the Statutes

Noel: We should put this into the Standards, because we do focus promoting debate in places where we promoting HR and democracy might get us kicked out of the country.

Bradley: but isn't the difference between voting and non- voting members the level of contributing for open society goals and democracy.



Noel: that classification should be about participation in the governance of IDEA, and not related to the work those organizations are doing in their country.

Bradley: we are introducing this change by adding this in the Statues, but we should include these details in the bylaws that regulate the working of IDEA.

Everyone agrees with Bradley's last suggestion.

3.

Marjan (Macedonia): Should a confirmation be gained from IDEA, if we want to use the logo for a debate tournament

Noel: If something goes wrong on that event and IDEA's logo was used, IDEA might have consequences

Mihails (Latvia): is it possible to get the logo for IDEA member. So that we can use that specific logo when we are organizing these events

Manos: we can submit a template to the board, and if the board decides than organizations can use it.

Noel: There is a DVD with guidelines about the logo, its usage etc.

Andrej: The conclusion is that Manos will find/create the logo for IDEA members.

Noel: we need to recreate the Standards, update them, in some cases simplify them and then use them, because they regulate most of the issues that we are currently talking

Andrej: the suggestion is not to include this proposal in the Statute

4.

DC (Latvia) you can be a member organization, but you can be doing very little in your home country.

ADK (Czech Republic): but we do have the reports that we submit, so that should show the activities you are producing in your country.

DA (Turkey): what makes a voting member and the affiliate members is the willing to govern in IDEA, so if we stick to that we will not have this issue.

Logan: One way to evaluate is the capacity to run activities in your country



Andrej: Isn't it enough to have a line that says that they should run a debate organization

Logan points out that that is already in the Statutes

Bradley reads the current version of the Statutes

Everyone agrees that we shouldn't make any changes in the Statute

Andrej: Affiliation issue

We cannot resolve this issue today, but we can ask for comments, on the ideas that we have so far.

Lazar points out the proposal Brankica made to call them Strategic partners

Bradley: there is a difference if we use the wording strategic partners that imply a broader circle of institutions / organizations.

Noel: we need to collect data's on debate organizations, and it gets difficult if the wording is Strategic partners.

Bradley: because this is a job that requires coordination, perhaps it is better to have IDEA central as the entity responsible for partnership.

Noel: but we have to have in mind that IDEA-NL is the only membership association, and the logic is that IDEA-NL is the one that has experience in this

Logan: We should answer this question immediately; IDEA NL losing members that are in between

Noel: Groups/self-identified entities / individual users of the website – judges, coaches, etc. –

We need to sort all this questions before the next academic year starts, so that the users of the web-site can be given more explanations about the groups and entities.

We have to make sure that people know what they are included in, in terms of participation of events and tournaments, without IDEA to be

Manos: There will be badges and logos that will clearly distinguish IDEA – NL events with every other event. Every IDEA member will be invited to join a group, which will be specifically labeled as IDEA – members. The same thing is applicable to IDEA staff.



Andrej checks the organizations present on the GA, so that a 2/3 majority can be established based on the present members.

- 13 members were counted as present
- 9 votes are needed to make the changes in the Statutes.
- „public voting “ procedure was established

13 members voted for the Bradley’s proposed changes in the Statutes

All present at the GA agreed upon that we want the changes that Bradley suggested are in principle acceptable for the GA, and we leave it up to Bradley and other relevant stakeholders to amend the Statute.

Andrej: the next GA will take place on the last day of the YF.

I do understand that because of the location, some organizations can’t come. So the suggestion is to familiarize with the agenda before you choose a proxy. We will do our best to inform you about as many details as possible for the GA. You will have the information about who will run for a board member in time, as well as every other information that is vital for the regular GA.

In the board discussion we agreed that the working groups need to continue with their group.

The YF working group will continue working on giving suggestions for improving the forum.

The statutes working group will become the Standards working group, and continue working.

Membership working group, we can change it to Affiliation working group and should continue to work as well.

The board should propose a time-frame for the discussion, chairpersons of the groups and specifics about the content.

Andrej: Is there anything that you have done recently that is really important?

The organization plans for 2012?



Projects, organization of tournaments

Azerbaijan – Debate in civil society Public union

- Debate is not our only program.
- This year we had 2 national annual tournaments.
- For 2012 we have a state program, we are working in all 65 regions of the country
- For 2012 we plan to do 6 or 7 summer schools, 6 days long, and participation. One of them will be in the BP format, second one will be on Coaching and Judging debates and another one on organization and running debate clubs and the other courses are on different topics

Macedonia - Youth Educational Forum

- 6 beginners schools in Skopje, plus debate clubs in 13 other cities in Macedonia
- BP clubs in 5 cities in Skopje, verbal clusters, main focus of the clusters is BP debate
- The annual Macedonia Open tournament, 7 different countries participated, theme: liberty over safety
- New year's tournament at the end of 2011

2012

- March – national tournament for election of the team representing Macedonia on the Youth Forum

Other activities

- Street law program – program is being implemented since 2001
- Policy making program – researches and policy making, this year we were especially active on the issues regarding the adoption of law for youth, leading a coalition of NGOs that was promoting changes in the suggested law
 - Working on reforms in the system of student organization
- 2 media clubs in two cities in Macedonia

Belarus (New Communication Club)

- 2 open debate tournaments for children, with the Baltic states, Russia debating on the tournament
- In March we had a University debate championships
- Teaching how to include debate in the curriculum



- Create a new web- page for the organization
- In November we had a debate tournament
- University student debate tournament – in English
- Tournament in December, 2011

2012

- February, BP style tournament, cap for 32 teams participating, an invitation letter will be released to all the organizations
- Lithuania, making a debate camp for the Belarusian students
- Continuation of the activities of 2011
- Public debate, problems in Belarus, at least 6 public debates per year.

Bosnia and Herzegovina (CKD)

- Organizing youth forum 2009, with the support of 3 presidents, and 13 ministers of education, and other institutions
- European commission project, Provide a good reason for ex-Yu country to enter in EU, regional project, successful implementation of the project
- Support from the town of Sarajevo
- UNDP BiH, aids and debates in Bosnia
- Demo debate – students from Sarajevo University, BP format.
- Public debates on juvenile delinquency
- Support from national television/ public debates/ 1 moderator/ guests- from region or BiH/ debaters

Romania (ARDOR)

- Membership organization, working in 5-6 regions
- Working on line – we can cooperate for the debate@europe project, or it can serve as a method for us, and our work
- Competitive successes in KP and BP formats / outreach to hundreds of students around the country
- Cooperation with the Ministry of Education, institutionalizing debate
- We would like to implement something like the DIN project

Haiti (FOKAL)

- University debating program



- November – 60 University students, debate event
- The debate program is the only way students can develop their skills, schools aren't providing this possibility for them.
- We have to continue to invest in the debate programs in Haiti, in order to have more kids participating

Turkey (DA)

- Established at 2009
- Trainers trainings in 2009
- Entered in 20 high schools the first year
- 51 high school participated in the debate tournament
- 2 tracks, one for students, one for teachers
- March- regional high schools tournament
- National debating tournament is planned for the following year
- Public debates with other NGO-s are planned

Lithuania – Informal Education Debate Center

- 2 year project founded by the ESF, 250 000 euros, implemented with 11 schools
 - 2 conferences
 - 60 public debates
 - 2 day national debate tournaments
 - Publication for class teachers
 - 2500 lessons with integrated debate methodology in 20 schools
 - Project ends in a year
- Ministry of Education project

Latvia – Debate Center Latvia

- Karl popper debate format 60-70 teams
- Area of work: introducing debate in schools
- Projects, following the example of Lithuania

Czech Republic - ADK

- 17 years competitive debate league, English and Czech language
- We are Primarily with high schools students



- 5 national tournaments this year, finals hosted by the Parliament
- Working with Roma students

2012

- Heart of Europe, international tournament
- Let's talk with us – activities outside the competitive debates
- Debate across the curriculum project for the next three years, teaching debate, during classes in school
 - 3000 students
 - 500 teachers
 - More members for our organization
 - 350 members so far

Slovakia - Slovak Debate Association

- Slovak debate league, split Slovakia in 2 regions, tournament in every region, and finals
 - Problem: we can't motivate enough judges to come to this tournament
 - 40 teams participating on this tournament
- Platform where experts are debating on different motions

Future plans

- Project submitted for a University debate league project
 - Will establish 6 or 8 debate clubs in Slovakia and Czech Republic
- Elementary schools
 - Elementary school debate league
 - Slow process because teachers aren't interested in this project
- Get accreditation from the Slovak ministry of education
 - To teach teachers, how to implement debate methods to the education

Estonia – Estonian Debating Society

- Debating in the national curriculum, you can choose the subject debate in high school
 - Working a lot with teachers

Future plans

- Competitive tournaments
- We are working with the Russian community
- Public debates, at least once a month in the national newsletter. Politician vs. debater. Newsletters are willing to cooperate and are leading the process.



International

- Tallinn Open
 - Call will be launched next week

Noel: Global debate initiative goal is to expand to Universities, and you can encourage Universities to apply and to use you as trainers. We have to have the support from the Universities. The debate NGO-s can apply with concepts that are different than the regular proposals: trainings + tournaments that have proved to be not-sustainable.

Launch of the web – page should be in January, and on the web page you can get on line recognition for everything you are doing in your countries.

The data section is important so that foundations and contributors can see tangible results

Manos: we will publish the beta – version in January.

Every IDEA voting member will get a group on the web-page. Every options that you will have as an option will be explained in details from our-side. Every contact-person will get a user name and password in addition to the guidelines.

The success of the web-page depends on the organizations because in the end of the day, the content on the web page is filled (most of it) by the member organizations, in their groups.

Visibility: Idebate magazine

Latvia, Lithuania and Turkey – contact me if you want to be promoted in the Ideabate magazine.

The on line newsletter the big idea, is very punctual, it goes out every two weeks, that would be every second Friday.

Subscribing to the big idea is modified, everyone can subscribe himself, if you want to share the membership lists with us, and I will be more than happy to add them.

We launched the University debate rankings. The generated a lot of good discussions based on these rankings.

YEF: Macedonia is considering making a bid for the Forum in 2014.

Noel: These are some of the things you need to do if you are considering this option

- Location – 300 people



- Host- responsible for fundraising
- OSF – arranges 100.000\$ plus travel of the trainers