

IV INTERNATIONAL STRATEGY MEETING MINUTES



BRNO, CZECH REPUBLIC
7th - 11th February 2024



General Legal Partners of ELSA



Main Partners of ELSA



General Education Partners of ELSA



Human Rights Partner of ELSA



Corporate Partner of ELSA



Technical Supporters



Technical Supporter of John H. Jackson Moot Court Competition



Platinum Sponsor of John H. Jackson Moot Court Competition

VAN BAELE & BELLIS

elsa

The European Law Students' Association

FOREWORD

Dear Network,

I am delighted to present you with the Official Minutes of the IV International Strategy Meeting of ELSA, which took place in Brno, Czech Republic between the 7th and 11th of February 2024.

Reaffirming the values of Continuity, Fellowship and Diversity, the IV ISM was a testament to the strive for continuous improvement of our Association, present across our Network. Through discussions focused on Financial Accessibility, International Internal Meetings and the Future of ELSA, we were able to flesh out key findings which will lead the future direction of our actions ahead of the upcoming International Council Meeting in Thessaloniki, and beyond.

With gratitude toward our Organising Committee from ELSA Brno, we look forward to reuniting with you once again soon.

ELSAfully Yours,



Yordan Kyurkchiyski
Secretary General
International Board of ELSA 2023/2024

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FOREWORD	1
TABLE OF CONTENTS	2
GROUP 1 WORKSHOP MINUTES	4
Thursday, 8th February 2024.....	4
United we Stand, Divided we Pay	4
Standards High, Pockets Empty?	9
ELSA Math.....	13
Friday, 9th February 2024.....	19
How to Train Your Officer.....	19
For the Plot!.....	22
5 Days of Autumn, 7 Days of Spring	27
Saturday, 10th February 2024.....	32
More Energy, More Passion, More People.....	32
(Knowledge) Sharing is Caring	36
Houston, we have a Plan!	40
GROUP 2 WORKSHOP MINUTES	45
Thursday, 8th February 2024.....	45
ELSA Math.....	45
United we Stand, Divided we Pay	50
Standards High, Pockets Empty?	57
Friday, 9th February 2024.....	63
5 Days of Autumn, 7 Days of Spring	63
How to Train Your Officer.....	68
For the Plot!.....	71
Saturday, 10th February 2024.....	76
Houston, we have a Plan!	76
More Energy, More Passion, More People.....	80
(Knowledge) Sharing is Caring	85
GROUP 3 WORKSHOP MINUTES	91
Thursday, 8th February 2024.....	91
Standards High, Pockets Empty?	91
ELSA Math.....	94
United we Stand, Divided we Pay	98
Friday, 9th February 2024.....	103

For the Plot!.....	103
5 Days of Autumn, 7 Days of Spring	107
How to Train Your Officer.....	111
Saturday, 10th February 2024.....	116
(Knowledge) Sharing is Caring	116
Houston, we have a Plan!	120
More Energy, More Passion, More People.....	124
COMMON SESSIONS WORKSHOP MINUTES.....	129
Wednesday, 7th February 2024	129
Opening Workshop (Joint).....	129
Thursday, 8th February 2024.....	137
Daily Debrief (Joint).....	137
Friday, 9th February 2024.....	142
Daily Debrief (Joint).....	142
Sunday, 11th February 2024	147
Final Debrief & Closing (Joint)	147

GROUP 1 WORKSHOP MINUTES

Thursday, 8th February 2024

10:00 – 12:00

United we Stand, Divided we Pay

Participants' list:

Bjarki Fjalar Guðjónsson (BFG)	International Board
Xanthi Agoraki (XA)	International Board
Mie Tveit (Chair)	ELSA Norway
Eva Šimková (Vice Chair)	ELSA Czech Republic
Eila Karlsson (Secretary)	ELSA Sweden
Gabriel Marti (Secretary)	ELSA Switzerland
Philipp Strasser	ELSA Austria
Ibrahim Diallo	ELSA Belgium
Chiara Nikšić	ELSA Croatia
Patricija Čeović	ELSA Croatia
Johanne Rasmussen	ELSA Denmark
Benita Steger	ELSA International
Iina Rynnänen	ELSA International
Laura Merisaari	ELSA Finland
Ana Koiava	ELSA Georgia
Louis Flindt	ELSA Germany
Luca Cecere	ELSA Germany
Bence Bodnár	ELSA Hungary
Eszter. Bánstik	ELSA Hungary
Maksymilian Baumgart	ELSA Poland
Mira Woelfert	ELSA Switzerland
Mike van der Schors	ELSA the Netherlands
Alice Bigot	ELSA the Netherlands

Chair opens the workshop at 10:05.

Chair: I will now pass the floor to ELSA International.

BFG: Please mark your attendance.

BFG presents the workshop.

BFG: I would now like to open the floor to discuss three prompt questions. The first one is: Does the division between favoured and non-favoured countries represent the financial imbalance present in our network?

ELSA Denmark: Originally, how many countries would be in this section?

BFG: Since the system was established, they have been gradually added.

XA: In recent years, more specifically in the past years, there has been a request from ELSA Turkey to be moved to the non-favoured countries due to the unstable economy. They have, therefore been granted the non favoured status by IB 22/23 and IB 23/24.

EIT: When was the 20 000 dollars established?

XA: Far long in the past.

BFG: Any input if this represents the differences between the countries?

ELSA International Team: Can you show the questions again?

BFG: Do you broadly agree that it represents the difference between the countries? Thumbs up or down.

A mixed response from the group.

BFG: On to the second question, but keep the first one in mind.

ELSA Croatia: If we are making it lower, the question remains, if we raise the minimum we have to keep in mind that the difference between the non-favoured countries remains.

Chair: I would like to remind everyone to state their name and ELSA Group.

ELSA Denmark: To the first question. I do not think it represents the imbalances. Denmark has a good general economy, but students generally do not, and we pay for everything on our own.

XA: To add a clarification in general and something we should keep in mind when discussing these topics: on one hand, we have the organising groups affected by fees, but on the other hand, we have the participants. Income for groups and expenses for participants.

ELSA Germany: Regarding question number one, it would be helpful to have more data. If we had more data to see the imbalance between favoured and non-favoured countries, it would help.

Chair: Does anyone else have something to add?

No one wants to add anything to the discussion.

BFG: Then we move on to the third question.

ELSA Germany: If we rely on statistical data and then have a representative group on who can pay, the minimum, and everyone else, it would be helpful.

BFG: One idea could be to layer the system, not only two divided groups, and not to have a strict division.

ELSA Croatia: It would probably be the fairest if there every year could be an estimate on what country could pay what. I do feel like if there are more categories more irritation could be when small changes in financial status could affect each step a lot. A scale only gives a small number of countries the ability to be favoured. Just having two groups leaves less room for protesting from the groups.

BFG: We can move on, thanks for the input and commentary.

BFG: Why do you think the division exists?

ELSA Austria: Financial accessibility, equal chances to participate in international events.

Chair: Anyone else?

ELSA Germany: I think we have summed it up with financial accessibility.

XA: I would say there are other potential answers.

ELSA International Team: I wanted to ask if there is anything in the archive coming up about why we introduced this system. It was first in the S&C minutes from ICM Prague in 96.

XA: No.

ELSA Denmark: The purpose of diversity, have more nationalities and countries in the network.

Chair: Anyone else?

BFG continues the presentation.

XA takes over and continues the presentation.

XA: Why do you think people might be choosing more people from non-favoured countries than people from favoured countries?

ELSA Switzerland: A lot to do with financing the events, not a problem in Switzerland because we have to find sponsors, the fees are not enough anyway.

ELSA International Team: I agree with ELSA Switzerland. In the end, more money is better for the national group, but it doesn't matter what country they come from if it's a favoured or non-favoured one.

ELSA Denmark: Participants that add all the extra fees are more likely to be from non-favoured countries, so it has nothing to do with the country but with what they will pay.

ELSA Germany: The number of applicants could also affect it. If we have more applicants from non-favoured countries, this should be considered as well.

ELSA Croatia: I know when applying SELS and WELS, it does not say what this means, and I don't think the average participants know what it means. At least 30 percent marked it wrong, which affected the statistics. Maybe making this automatic would help to lessen the amount of people marking wrong.

ELSA Georgia: I also agree that it is mostly a financial thing for groups, but I also agree that if you have extra fees, it will be more for non-favoured countries. I also agree with the problem that participants don't know whether their country is favoured or non-favoured. It should be based on motivation letters, not on country.

ELSA International Team: One reason could also be applying for a visa, I think for heads of participation it can affect that you have to help them have the security of actually legally being in the country.

ELSA Germany: I align with what the EIT said.

Chair: Anyone else?

XA continues the presentation about the reasons they found for the imbalance.

ELSA Denmark: When you apply for hosting an IIM, you are aware of the financial situation, for S&C events it's very difficult to know the cost and how to fund it.

XA: Basically, a compromise between accessibility and having a more secure budget, we have to find a good balance. When organising an event, you consider all the financial implications of it and draft a budget. I can't understand how it is different to organise an IIM or a S&C event.

ELSA Belgium: I agree with Denmark. It is very different to organising an IIM. When it comes to law schools, a board can just hand it over to the next board without the same preparation. I think the events are very different and they should not really be compared.

ELSA Austria agrees.

ELSA International Team: You don't know when organising an S&C event who is going to apply, so it is harder to calculate the incomes.

Chair: Just taking your comment, ELSA Germany, and then we will continue with the group work.

ELSA Germany: I don't think there is a difference in organising. I don't think the money is a reason for giving up on diversity and it should be thought about in the planning stage.

XA: Cutting the discussions about finances at the moment, because we wanted to introduce some issues for the whole discussion we will have.

XA continues the presentation and explains the task to the participants.

ELSA International Team: About the second question, does that also cover how to discover if there is a breach?

XA: If you can talk about it, feel free.

Group work.

Chair: We will proceed with the presentation from the group work.

Group A: What are the differences between an IIM budget and an ELS budget? The main difference between the two types of events: is guaranteed participation, uncertainty of expected presence vs reality + guaranteed spots for non-favoured countries, and many more people are involved for the IIM than for the SELS. Application is not decided based upon who is and who is from a favoured / non-favoured country

Group B: Will setting a quota for favored countries in ELS really compromise quality? A quota isn't able to address the quality of the application itself, you may need to accept bad applications. Other mechanisms could be that the OC needs to publish the criteria they're basing their selection on and enforce objective criteria.

Group C: What other measures can we take to prevent and tackle discriminatory practices in our events? Some of the ideas we just opened up to have it discussed and it does not represent our opinion. One is to anonymize the national group in the application of the S&C events - the decision then is more based on the motivation letter/ELSA CV. OC could have to sign an NDA (non-discrimination agreement) Another option is a “walk of shame” on the plenary or have as a consequence to pay money.

ELSA Belgium: Question to group C. To anonymize the form, do you only want to anonymize the national group or also the gender, etc, of the participant?

ELSA International Team: Just talking about anonymizing the national group. We can of course do so for other criteria, but we just discussed national groups.

XA continues the presentation.

XA: We would like to do another round of group work and do a SWOT from the previous presentation.

Chair: We will continue with the presentation from each group.

Group A: Strengths for anonymization: More transparency & equality: anonymization through a selection committee responsible for anonymization of the applications might ensure more transparency. However, if we want diversity, this might not be the best way to achieve it, if all the best motivation letters come from the same group, you will not have a diverse group of applicants. It is very important to have guidance from the IB on what diversity is. Overregulation is a threat.

Group B: Informing the Council about Groups breaching diversity. Strengths could be quite effective. Weaknesses: it takes time off the plenaries. Opportunities, and financial sanctions by the Council. Threads, relationship with IB, influences on motivation hosting.

ELSA Belgium: We were divided on the idea of a “walk of shame”. Maybe restraining them from organizing a law school in the future or giving out a fee might not be good since it can punish a future board, not the same people organizing. They should still have the opportunity.

Group C: It could spread ELSA in non-member countries and offer relief to the OC, do not have to decide and have something to follow and not be the one responsible for the decision. It could lead to quality problems and the OC having to decline applications based on quotas. The term "diversity" can have different kinds of perspectives, how to decide what should be included and what should not? At ISM Prague, there was an attempt to define diversity, but the final list will likely not cover everything. This raises the question of whether having a clarified definition of diversity and such lists truly align with our values.

BFG: Thank you everyone for the conversation. Does someone have a reflection about this workshop?

ELSA International Team: In general it is a good thing that we discuss this topic. It is good that we are aware of the subject, even if it doesn't mean an immediate change. Thank you for presenting the topic.

XA: thank you very much for participating. I know that this is a very important topic for many of you, especially if you are organizing a Law School. We will keep everything in mind.

Chair closes the workshop at 12:00.

13:00 – 15:00

Standards High, Pockets Empty?

Participants' list:

Yordan Kyurkchyski (YK)	International Board
Nadia Dourida (ND)	International Board
Mie Tveit (Chair)	ELSA Norway
Eva Šimková (Vice Chair)	ELSA Czech Republic
Eila Karlsson (Secretary)	ELSA Sweden
Gabriel Marti (Secretary)	ELSA Switzerland
Philipp Strasser	ELSA Austria
Ibrahim Diallo	ELSA Belgium
Chiara Nikšić	ELSA Croatia
Patricija Čeović	ELSA Croatia
Johanne Rasmussen	ELSA Denmark
Benita Steger	ELSA International
Ina Rynnänen	ELSA International
Laura Merisaari	ELSA Finland
Ana Koiava	ELSA Georgia
Louis Flindt	ELSA Germany
Luca Cecere	ELSA Germany
Bence Bodnár	ELSA Hungary
Eszter. Bánstik	ELSA Hungary
Maksymilian Baumgart	ELSA Poland
Mira Woelfert	ELSA Switzerland
Mike van der Schors	ELSA the Netherlands
Alice Bigot	ELSA the Netherlands

Chair opens the workshop at 13:05.

Chair passes the floor to ELSA International.

YK and ND present the workshop.

ND: We have two questions for the discussion: Are the quality standards as presented attainable in your country/city? What are some main factors/elements that in your opinion drive costs up?

Chair: I would like to remind you to mark the attendance list. A question to ELSA Belgium: is Arthur still in this group?

ELSA Belgium: No, he has been allocated to another group because someone was sick.

ELSA Germany: The standards presented would be attainable in most larger cities in Germany, the issue is the expectations of the participants.

ELSA International Team: I support this argument, we do have to keep in mind that we are still a student association when it comes to our expectations.

ELSA Belgium: We should definitely go for mixing the options of having accommodations and workshops in different places to not make it too expensive for the OC.

ELSA Finland: We discussed it a lot because the usual idea is that Nordic countries cannot organise. But in Finland, we analyzed that we could reach the minimal standards, but certainly not the current expected standards. We would have to plan it a long time before to meet the standard and make it affordable.

ELSA Georgia: Regarding the quality standards, I don't think we have too high standards. In my experience, even when we only have three people in one room during law schools, people complain. It is really hard to find accommodation. Each year the price for the accommodation gets higher every year for the law schools.

ELSA The Netherlands: I second what ELSA Finland said. We would need so much external financial support with the current expected standards, which is undoable.

ELSA Austria: In theory, it would be possible. Accommodation is dependent on where it is held, a touristy area would not be possible in Austria for example. Going for five-star hotels would not be possible but meeting the quality standards would be possible if we planned it years in advance.

ELSA Poland: Regarding our strategic goals, we need to lower our expectations because it is part of our strategic goals. People have to pay for themselves, which reduces the possibility of going for some.

Chair: Any other comments or input?

YK: What do you think is the main driver of this level-up of the standards?

ELSA The Netherlands: It is what Nadia mentioned. Within national groups, we need to think about how to lower the costs from the start with our NCMs in order to translate that into the international level.

ELSA Austria: The accommodation is driving the costs up. No matter how high the quality will be, there will always be people who won't like it. Accessibility is therefore more important, we have to save costs and make it financially accessible for everyone.

ELSA International Team: I agree with Austria that the accommodation drives it up. It is not a vacation to go to an international meeting. During the Nordic Officers' Meetings, we sleep in hostels with up to 14 people in one room, and no one complains, so it is about the expectations.

ELSA Hungary: I agree that the cost is driven up by accommodation. But if we precisely define what we want, we don't need to have five stars, because in some countries, there are good standards in less ranked hotels. Also, if it is precisely defined, we can lower the prices but make sure that those standards are still respected.

ELSA Denmark: For us, it would technically be possible but the transportation would be hard and a huge expense. The food can be lowered by cooking by ourselves but who would volunteer for that? In Denmark we don't have a huge network so we don't have enough people to help lower the cost.

ELSA Switzerland: Jumping on what ELSA Hungary said. In Switzerland, we could never afford a 5-star hotel. Quality standards could be fulfilled, but not the expectations.

ELSA International Team: I want to offer a different perspective. The solution if no one can organise it is that the IB has to organise it which isn't a good solution.

Chair closes the floor and moves to group work. She passes the floor to ELSA International.

YK presents the tasks for the group work.

Chair: We will start presenting the results from the group work.

Group 1, ELSA Germany: We think the quality standards are easily attainable and not too high. We think the expectation of five-star hotels would need to be lowered. Switching to having workshops at universities could lower the cost. Another option could be to decide to only participate in the program and have the option to not stay at the accommodation.

Group 2, ELSA International Team: We also talked about different kinds of accommodations. We talked about going outside the cities, being in the middle of nowhere, like a farm ICM. We also thought about limiting the people attending the ICM. We discussed but weren't in favour of having it online, workshops online for example.

Group 3, ELSA Finland: Taking a remote location is an option. Organising the meeting together, a few national groups could help with sponsors. When we lower the standards, it can also mean the socials, for example, having the parties at the hotel is an option. We could also lower the expectations for the gala since it is very expensive.

ELSA Belgium: Does the OC pay a cost when they organise sightseeing?

YK: The sightseeing isn't completely free for the OC, but sightseeing, merch, etc, can balance out the cost for the organising country.

ELSA Denmark: The OC could ask the IB to lower the standards, kind of a free card to organise it.

ELSA International Team: What does everyone think about an ICM without the gala, sightseeing, etc?

Chair: We will leave that question to the next point on the agenda, the SWOT part. In the meantime, I think we have an ELSA Spirit in the room.

ND summarises the points made and explains the next task.

Group work.

Chair: We will now present the results from the group work.

Group 1, ELSA Germany: We discussed multiple national groups organising the IIM. Strength is more resources, both HR and monetary, it can also strengthen the network. Weakness is the loss of prestige for the groups hosting, our current regulations not allowing it, and the national groups having to comply with their individual countries' regulations, GDPR can also be an issue. Opportunity is the branding possibilities for partners, for example, branding it as a Nordic ICM. Threats are for example choosing where to host it, one group needs to be more in charge if it is hosted in that country.

Group 2, ELSA International Team: We started discussing the no-accommodation option. An opportunity is that the ICM can focus more on its purpose and not the accommodation however, we would not have the same exchange over meals and such.

Group 2, ELSA Austria: Regarding the half/half model, it could be possible but in Austria, we would still have to pay even if we held it at the University, and we would also have to pay for transportation. So we are not sure it would be a good solution.

Group 3, ELSA Finland: We kind of combined accommodation tiers and no accommodation. Strengths: cheaper for organisation and for participants. Weakness: not meeting the people in the same way, you wouldn't connect in the same way. Opportunity: not much to organise. Threats: peer pressure, people would choose not their personal best solution, but one of their friends. The difficulty of organisation, how would people meet, where, how would we eat, who would organise the eating times.

Chair: We can go to the next point of the agenda, I pass the floor to the ELSA International.

YK continues the presentation.

YK: How far are we willing to go as a Network in amending our Quality Standards in order to make our events more financially viable?

ELSA Belgium: I was thinking that maybe just keeping the important things in the hotel, the rest can be done somewhere else, but my group didn't agree, because in Austria for example they would have to pay extra, which is not the case in Belgium.

ELSA Germany: Speaking from what we have heard so far, no one is suggesting to amend the quality standards. We just need to be more aware of the expectations of the participants and lower them. We also need to make sure that the expectations of the OC are realistic.

ELSA Austria: I would not lower the quality standards, which are quite reasonable. We should highlight their existence and make clear that they are fine and that we could just follow them.

ELSA International Team: When we talk about quality standards, it is not only a question of how to amend them but also how we treat the OC for doing something so great. It needs to start with us.

ELSA Germany: At some point, we have to make an example to show how it is perfectly fine to have lower expectations. We should cut the competition that creates higher expectations, which will cut the costs.

ELSA Czech Republic: Creating a proper handbook is important, being more transparent with the budget could help motivate other countries to organize.

ELSA Switzerland: My point is going in the same direction as yours, we could say what we are expecting and write it in a handbook. We can say what we need in the handbook so it is clear.

ELSA Germany: We are currently overshooting the quality standards. I don't think we should overregulate but maybe we should set some standards for what a meeting should be so we don't have to have the conversation again.

YK: Do you have any ideas about how to educate the network?

ELSA Germany: Something we have in Germany is a hosting drive where we collect data from our hosts and give access to upcoming hosts so they have all the data. The OC also needs to present the budget for an upcoming NCM.

ELSA Denmark: I think it's a very great idea what ELSA Germany just said. We can collect the data and ideas in a shared drive. As there are ELS coaches, we could have IIM coaches. Ask the opinions of the network on the organisation of IIMs.

ELSA Belgium: I agree with Germany and Denmark. We have a regulation that the OC needs to send their budget to the IB, right? There was also an Open call on how to organize an event, but not a lot of people showed up, which is a shame since it is something we, as a network, have asked for.

YK: We recorded the session, so it is available if you want it. There was no obligation to present the budget of an ICM, which I think is a bit problematic, not only for transparency but also for educating the network on how much an ICM costs. Now, there is an obligation to submit a financial report, but this obligation is very difficult to enforce. We don't necessarily want to say in front of everyone that the OC didn't submit the report because it is already so difficult to organise it, we don't want to discourage the organisers.

ELSA Germany: In Germany, it is the second NCM after the NCM that they need to present the final budget. This could be an option so that they don't immediately have to finalise it but could have up to a year.

ELSA Belgium: We should still try to enforce the publication of financial reports. Without having strong information on the organisation, it is hard to know how to organise it. If we have the information, we will be able to better organise it, also when talking to sponsors, venues etc.

YK: For IIM, we have changes in the budget until it is realised to a large extent so I think it is good to follow up on it.

ELSA Czech Republic: I would take the quality standards and would put them in the email to call for organisers because most of the people just do what they experienced in previous IIMs.

ELSA International Team: We could not only collect hosts and former hosts but also in-person meetings where the actual hosts could tell us about organising the meeting.

Chair: I will give the word to ELSA International to say some final words.

YK wraps up and invites reflecting thoughts as a closing of the presentation.

ELSA Belgium: The quality standards should be kept, but we should lower our expectations. We have a great weekend during our NCMs with much lower standards. Financial transparency from the previous host is also important.

ELSA International Team: Something I wasn't expecting at the beginning of the workshops was the agreement that we are students, and we should lower the expectations, so I'm glad about the discussions and I want to see how it will keep going.

Chair closes the workshop at 15:01.

15:30 – 17:30

ELSA Math

Participants' list:

Adéla Chloupková (AC)	International Board
Mie Tveit (Chair)	ELSA Norway
Eva Šimková (Vice Chair)	ELSA Czech Republic
Eila Karlsson (Secretary)	ELSA Sweden

Gabriel Marti (Secretary)	ELSA Switzerland
Philipp Strasser	ELSA Austria
Ibrahim Diallo	ELSA Belgium
Chiara Nikšić	ELSA Croatia
Patricija Čević	ELSA Croatia
Johanne Rasmussen	ELSA Denmark
Benita Steger	ELSA International
Iina Rynänen	ELSA International
Laura Merisaari	ELSA Finland
Ana Koiava	ELSA Georgia
Louis Flindt	ELSA Germany
Luca Cecere	ELSA Germany
Bence Bodnár	ELSA Hungary
Eszter. Bánstik	ELSA Hungary
Maksymilian Baumgart	ELSA Poland
Mira Woelfert	ELSA Switzerland
Mike van der Schors	ELSA the Netherlands
Alice Bigot	ELSA the Netherlands

Chair opens the workshop at 15:38.

Chair passes the floor to ELSA International.

AC starts presenting the workshop.

Chair: Are there any questions?

ELSA Germany: Do you know why, for the ELSA Law Schools, there is a 17 per cent increase and 15 percent for IIM?

AC: I would say it depends on the amount of participants, for ICMs you will bring more participants, so the food is a group meal, which is cheaper.

AC presents the group work.

ELSA Belgium: Do we need to take into account the extra or only the obligatory fees?

AC: Just the obligatory fees, so how much would you pay for the stay?

AC: You will be divided into three groups for the group work.

AC explains the group work.

ELSA International Team: Question before starting: do you by any chance know the dates of the cycles? Or are the dates always the same?

ELSA Germany: Where should we write down the results?

AC explains by showing it on the screen.

Group work starts.

Group 1, ELSA Poland: The first question is the calculation properly set up? Should we also include something other than just inflation? We had an idea that when we are doing SELS it can have a holiday spirit and it is the holiday season, it can therefore be more expensive, not only because of inflation. Maybe we should also consult with local groups organising SELS and WELS, do they need more funding, etc. We also talked about what are the reasons for raising fees and our answer was to give a better experience for participants.

AC: Question about the first point: did you think about having different fees depending on national groups?

ELSA Belgium: It was more a reflection, we realize it might be too hard. Even putting a different system would mean an extra task.

ELSA Germany: Regarding GNI we would take European GNI and look at how it increased.

ELSA Croatia: In group three we talked about how the inflation is different in each country, however, if we calculated based on each country it could lead to the costs being vastly different between countries.

ELSA Poland: Inflation is the mean of everything, it impacts every sector.

ELSA Belgium: In my opinion, I think we should keep things as they are because it might not be worth it. People are looking for it to follow inflation and using GNI would mean the difference wouldn't be big.

ELSA Germany: Something like food, accommodation, and transportation index would be more precise.

Group 2, ELSA Germany: It makes sense, because logical, to see the inflation on the 1st of January. Our other question was, what do you think about making it two times per year? Doesn't make sense and does not affect the IIMs, so we think no. Our other question was: should IB have a chance to "predict" the new maximum fee for the next year and allow organisers to have different maximum fees before realising the update? On which basis will the IB predict? They could abuse it for their gain.

ELSA Belgium: When was the invoice sent for the current ISM?

ELSA Belgium: When we have an event like the ISM, why can't we adapt the fees for the new year? If we just wait a few more days, the fees could be changed.

ELSA Germany: Groups are planning the budget with the fees a long time before for hotel, food, etc.

AC: The reason why we are asking if we can have a different day is because it mainly affects the ISM. Why I don't go for the retrospective because if the application was open in January, it would not be possible to organise the event. It is therefore usually in November or December for logistics. As a participant, if I chose to participate and the fee would change after application and I couldn't pay the extra fee, what would we do in that situation? Should the OC give me the money back or wait for me to pay?

ELSA Germany: In addition to that, I am not sure that it is even legally possible to do that.

ELSA Belgium: I understand, it was just a possibility, you convinced me that it wasn't a good idea, but legally we could make ELSA's regulation fit it.

Group 3, ELSA Hungary: What we talked about was if a diverse system is needed. We think a diverse system is needed. An option is for ICM, ISM, fixed max fee, and SELS and WELS accounting for inflation (using the rate of individual countries). Accounting for economic differences between countries helps level the costs and bring possibilities closer to each other. Costs always change,

and calculation methods should adapt respectively. Maybe grouping similar countries and using a similar calculation method for economically similar countries, may calculate an inflation rate for that group.

AC: To make sure I understand, do you want to change it? Right now, SELS and WELS have the fixed maximum fees, and ICM's have the change on the 1st of January. So I think you have switched it.

ELSA Hungary: Yes, I accidentally switched them.

AC: Do you think about how many groups you would prefer?

ELSA Hungary: Similar to favoured and non-favoured, countries with similar economic situations should be grouped together.

ELSA Germany: Consistency of regulations is important, everything should be based on inflation.

Chair: Any other questions?

No other questions.

AC presents the group work, the questions remain the same but the group switches questions.

Group 1, ELSA Poland: Our question was, should there be a system for the calculation of the maximum fee? The calculation is good. Different calculations for different projects stand better to their character. No regional dividing.

AC: I am a bit confused with your answer, since it is different right now, would you like to have two different or change it?

ELSA Poland: I don't know.

ELSA Germany: We didn't take law schools into consideration.

Group 2, ELSA Germany: We agree with group one regarding the setting up of the calculation. We do not agree on seasonal prices. Should we also include something other than just inflation? Yes, considering inflation, especially regarding food, accommodation, and transportation, whether general inflation rates we will agree with Group 1. Seasonal prices would be inefficient, and too much effort might not be implemented by National and Local Groups; too long regulation, like 30 pages annex for every NG and at least two times per year different prices, so we disagree with Group 1 regarding that point.

AC: Would it be revised every second year? I am not sure I understood you correctly.

ELSA Germany: Using special inflation rates for food etc, instead of general inflation rates.

Group 3, ELSA Hungary: The questions were, does it make sense to have the recalculation on the 1st of January? What do you think about making it two times per year? It doesn't make sense to have it two times a year. Should it be on a different date (for example, the 1st of August)? Yes, it should be the 1st of August, that is when the IB term starts and the budget is made. The last question was, should IB have a chance to "predict" the new maximum fee for the next year and allow organisers to have different maximum fees before realising the update? They should not have a chance to predict, this could be abused.

AC: It depends on how you will take the question. We got the question, of how binding it will be if the prediction is wrong.

ELSA Hungary: They should not have the possibility to predict since things can change or it could be abused.

ELSA Germany: You agree that it should be on the 1st of January, but you also agreed on the 1st of August? Isn't that contradictory?

ELSA Hungary: It should be on the first of August.

ELSA Croatia: It could be the 1st of January for IIM and the 1st of August for SELS.

ELSA Germany: So you agree with us.

ELSA Croatia: Yes.

Group work.

Group 1, ELSA Poland: General Idea: split up the recalculation between IIMs and S&C events on different dates, like IIMs on the 1st of January and S&C events with or before the beginning of the term, for better budget planning.

AC: If we revised it twice, it would help the OC if it has been increased, otherwise it would just be informative for the network.

ELSA Poland: Okay, I believe you.

Group 2, ELSA Germany: We are for a dynamic one and have it decided on based on what project. For example, if there is or isn't any accommodation needed. The same calculation for every maximum fee in the decision book and different calculations for each project. There should be a unified system applied according to the projects, e.g. having inflation rates considered but regarding the project if no accommodation is needed.

AC: I would like to clarify the different calculations for the different projects: ICE → doesn't need to have the accommodation: would you then differentiate it from the S&C projects that require accommodation or how do you see it?

ELSA Germany: It is more like having different options, one for inflation rate for meals, one for accommodation, etc.

Group 3, ELSA Hungary: The consumer price index should be taken into account, the rest is agreed with the other group.

AC: Would it be excluding the study visits and ELSA Law Schools or have recalculations for ELSA Law Schools?

ELSA Hungary: We agreed that it should be used for all kinds of calculations. Every time that there is something related to expenses.

Chair: We will now move to the final point on the agenda, which is final reflections.

AC: Thank you, everyone, we will reflect everything with the IB in the following months. If you have any questions, tell me. Please fill out the form.

Chair closes the workshop at 17:26.

Friday, 9th February 2024

10:00 – 12:00

How to Train Your Officer

Participants' list:

Yordan Kyurkchyski (YK)	International Board
Xanthi Agoraki (XA)	International Board
Mie Tveit (Chair)	ELSA Norway
Eva Šimková (Vice Chair)	ELSA Czech Republic
Eila Karlsson (Secretary)	ELSA Sweden
Gabriel Marti (Secretary)	ELSA Switzerland
Philipp Strasser	ELSA Austria
Chiara Nikšić	ELSA Croatia
Patricija Čeović	ELSA Croatia
Johanne Rasmussen	ELSA Denmark
Benita Steger	ELSA International
Ina Rynnänen	ELSA International
Laura Merisaari	ELSA Finland
Ana Koiava	ELSA Georgia
Louis Flindt	ELSA Germany
Luca Cecere	ELSA Germany
Flavia Lehmann	ELSA Switzerland
Alice Bigot	ELSA the Netherlands
Daria Shylova	ELSA Ukraine

Vice Chair opens the workshop at 10:11.

Vice Chair passes the floor to ELSA International.

YK presents the workshop.

XA continues the presentation.

YK: We are now going to have an open discussion about issues that you have identified about the ITM. For example, from your perspective, what is the issue with the ITM, and what factors affected the low attendance?

ELSA Denmark: For us in ELSA Denmark, we didn't reach out to our local officers, and by the time we did, their schedules were set up. So, it's a lack of communication.

ELSA Germany: In general it is quite early in the term for local officers. It is easier for national officers to attend. It might not be as useful for local officers either.

ELSA Denmark: I also think you addressed the question of how much knowledge they have because I wasn't sure whether it was for me or the locals.

ELSA Switzerland: There are a lot of national groups that have their own training meetings. Sometimes there are specific things for each country that you need to train them in. It is also online which could affect the attendance negatively even if it makes it more inclusive.

ELSA Czech Republic: For us, it is hard to attend, because of the dates, this is during the fresher's day.

ELSA Finland: For us, it is too late in the term. September is always really packed at uni in Finland so we don't have the time. In general, we are also not that interested in the training. We believe that it should be earlier in the term.

ELSA Georgia: The problem with attendance is that it has an online format, despite the fact it is easier for everyone to attend, people have their lives, university for example, so they will try to do both. Also, by the time the ITM starts, the National Officer is supposed to have the knowledge.

ELSA International Team: I think the marketing is lacking, it comes so fast in the term, and it needs longer and better marketing in order to get people to sign up.

ELSA Ukraine: ITM is probably meant for National Officers, it is not advertised properly, and Local Officers should know of it.

ELSA Czech Republic: The topics are too general, we have the same topics during our NCMs a month later.

YK: One more note, keep that question in mind when we will be talking about the content of the ITM.

Vice Chair closes the discussion and passes the floor to YK.

YK continues the presentation.

XA: The idea for the group work is that you all should go through the topics and discuss them. The topics for discussion are why there is a lack of participation and how can you, as a National Board, force more participation. What should be the structure and the content of the workshops and trainings? The last topic is the structure and agenda of the ITM.

The workshop is divided into three groups and the group work starts.

Vice Chair asks groups to present question 1.

Group A, ELSA Finland: The ITM lacks focus and no one knows who it is meant for. The marketing starts too late and is not very good. The application form was really confusing on what workshops were meant for what people. It could be good to have some introduction videos for ELSA, especially for new local members before or during the ITM. The low attendance can be because some people only attend one workshop, so they could still get something out of it.

Group B, ELSA Germany: We were discussing a lot of topics. In conclusion, we think it should stay an online meeting, focusing only on national officers and sharing knowledge. They will then transfer it to the local officers. Also, having workshops on how to balance the interests of all our local groups, because we all come from one group with a different situation.

Group C, ELSA The Netherlands: We talked about marketing as well. Regarding the structure, instead of having one weekend that is really intense, it could be spread out over one week. You could pick training and workshops depending on your knowledge level. We thought this would work better to encourage participation if it's only a couple of hours at a time. It might be better to focus more on training over

workshops during the ITM. It is important to reflect on the aim and the targeted goal of the training in order for them to tackle goals.

ELSA Germany: I talked about the structure of the meeting, and I got confused about what question we were on.

Vice Chair: We will now mix up the questions between the groups.

Vice Chair asks groups to present question 2.

Group A, ELSA International Team: We should have a really short opening and get to know the IB as people and not only the areas. We could use retired EIT members to give workshops since they are so knowledgeable. The training should be more focused on the areas. It should be more for what each area needs and maybe indicate during the application what trainings are more beneficial for each area. The marketing should start with the previous board of ELSA International. A lot of the officers are really knowledgeable so the surface-level workshops are not beneficial for them. It would be better to deep dive.

Group B, ELSA Germany: I already presented the results for this question, so I will present the one for lack of participation. The dates and content should be communicated a long time before. Also, we should express who's expected to come to the ITM, national or local officers.

Group C, ELSA The Netherlands: I said most of it before.

Vice Chair asks groups to present question 3.

Group A, ELSA International Team: It should be shorter, only two days, Saturday and Sunday, otherwise it has already been said.

Group B, ELSA Germany: In conclusion, we think Friday starts at 14:00 Opening and have an area workshop on ELSA basics. Saturday started with Training on teaching knowledge and then moved to area workshops on knowledge transfer after that prepared Socials with Fun Games to make more people participate. Sunday starting with Training on balancing interests. Area workshops on knowledge transfer/closing and then move on to closing.

Group C, ELSA The Netherlands: Everything has already been said.

Vice Chair: I will close the discussion now and pass the floor to ELSA International.

YK: With regards to the application process, we heard some comments about the clarity of the application process. We discussed whether or not we should have an open application or not. For example, an alumni could register. We wanted to see what you think about this point.

ELSA Germany: I think it depends on whether you have local and national officers. If it is only national officers it is not a problem. If doing it like that by letting locals apply, you should inform the national groups what locals applied so they can coordinate.

ELSA International Team: With having only a form, I would fear that there would be much more anonymisation, which could hinder the number of participants. I would keep things as they are.

Vice Chair closes the discussion and passes the floor to ELSA International.

YK closes the presentation.

Vice Chair closes the workshop at 12:02.

13:00 – 15:00

For the Plot!

Participants' list:

Bjarki Fjalar Guðjónsson (BFG)	International Board
Nadia Dourida (ND)	International Board
Mie Tveit (Chair)	ELSA Norway
Eva Šimková (Vice Chair)	ELSA Czech Republic
Eila Karlsson (Secretary)	ELSA Sweden
Gabriel Marti (Secretary)	ELSA Switzerland
Philipp Strasser	ELSA Austria
Ibrahim Diallo	ELSA Belgium
Chiara Nikšić	ELSA Croatia
Johanne Rasmussen	ELSA Denmark
Benita Steger	ELSA International
Iina Rynnänen	ELSA International
Laura Merisaari	ELSA Finland
Ana Koiava	ELSA Georgia
Louis Flindt	ELSA Germany
Luca Cecere	ELSA Germany
Bence Bodnár	ELSA Hungary
Eszter. Bánstik	ELSA Hungary
Flavia Lehmann	ELSA Switzerland
Mike van der Schors	ELSA the Netherlands
Alice Bigot	ELSA the Netherlands
Daria Shylova	ELSA Ukraine

Chair opens the workshop at 13:03.

Chair passes the floor to ELSA International.

ELSA International starts presenting the workshop.

ND presents the group work.

Chair divides the workshop into three groups.

Group work begins.

Presentation of topic A.

Group 1, ELSA International Team: Regarding the purpose and the content of the ISM. We were not in favour of a proposal discussion during the ISM. There is a reason for it being about the strategy. The first year involves the implementation and what issues arose, the middle year what problems arose and the progress that has been made, and the third year writing the new one. We agreed that the ISM should also

cover discussions that came up during ICM, for example, the discussion regarding favoured and non-favoured countries. We think national boards should have the possibility to come up with input and suggest topics for the ISM. Additionally to the minutes, we would like to see a summary, like the daily debrief, that should be published, it would be beneficial for the officers not being able to attend.

Group 2, ELSA Germany: We can mostly agree on what was just said. Major changes that happened or should happen can be addressed, we can also talk about the progress of the Strategic Planning. National groups should also be involved in that. To improve, we thought the schedule could be more efficient and we could have more time to prepare the topics before the ISM.

Group 3, ELSA Ukraine: If there is a big proposal planned we should discuss that. More specific discussions are better than the abstract ones, it is also harder to evaluate the outcome. It also makes sense to have the workshops in areas the network thinks are important, and national boards should be able to give input. With fewer topics for discussion, the national groups can be better prepared and also prepare their networks for potential changes.

Chair opens the floor for discussion on this topic.

BFG: Question for group 3, with regard to your point on the discussion on each day, do you have any remark regarding what we are currently doing with the daily debrief?

ELSA Ukraine: It was in reference to this year's structure and that it is much better than before, that we have a daily debrief after to summarise the outcomes.

ELSA Norway: I also think the daily debriefs are very good in order to bring back the outcomes of the discussion to our network.

ND: Thank you for your feedback. I have a question, do you like the way we scheduled the reporting time and daily debrief?

ELSA International Team: I think the schedule is way too packed, I do like the reporting time and daily debrief but we didn't have enough time.

ELSA Germany: I see a problem regarding the structure, but I don't think there is a better way. It is better that the reporting time is before the daily debrief for the IB to be able to prepare it and the national groups to prepare their opinions.

ELSA Germany: We were also talking about the time of the debrief and it could be put the next day in the morning so that the IB has enough time to prepare it but also give us time for our reporting time and getting ready for the night.

ELSA Finland: I think it could be a good idea to have it the next day, but maybe we could also have less time for the reporting time. But if you move to the next day, then you will have sufficient time for reporting time.

ELSA Germany strongly disagrees with shortening the reporting time.

ELSA Switzerland: I think it is more the length of the workshops and the amount of workshops that is the issue.

Chair closes the discussion.

Presentation of topic B.

Group 1, ELSA International Team: We had aspects we thought were effective, thematic approach by days, daily debrief, very effective way to do it with the groupworks, we can have more specific and in-depth discussions. About recommended areas, we came to the conclusion that we don't think it is limiting, it increases engagement, and allows everyone to express their opinion.

Group 2, ELSA Germany: About the effectiveness we would like to know what you are planning to do with our input, this could be said at the beginning of the workshop. We like the mixed areas in the workshop but we don't think it should be randomised. Some topics are very specific and one area can give more input. About the only three guaranteed spots, we think it is enough however we think more information should be sent out before so we can discuss it with our board more. We would also have an overview of how the strategy is going so we know where we are and what we have to do going forward.

Group 3, ELSA Ukraine: Regarding the last ISM, they had the same discussions and the same outcomes, so maybe the efficiency could be improved. About the online ISMs, there were more people, it was then more effective, and more areas were present. Regarding ISMs in general, it is useful to discuss topics with the board in advance and to have the inputs of all areas. We also think that the problem of the ISM is that a lot of national groups are missing, especially because of the financial accessibility. Technically it is ok, because there are no binding decisions, but a lot of people and countries are not taking part in the discussions. The topics should be more connected to the SP itself.

Chair opens the floor for questions.

BFG: To group number three, when you mentioned that the topics should be more closely connected to the strategic plan itself. The three topics this year are all connected to the strategic plan, so I'm wondering if this is a general input or referring to the current ISM.

ELSA Finland: We were quite ok with the content, we just wanted it to be more clear. It is more of a general input.

ND: Question to group 2, Regarding the information that you would like to have beforehand. Can you elaborate a bit more on what information you would like? The ISM is a bit more abstract and not as specific as the ICM.

ELSA Germany: It is not about the way, but more about the working materials, they were very abstract and could lead to differing interpretations. You could have an Open call to clarify the topics and the discussions you want.

Chair closes the floor.

Presentation of topic C.

Group 1, ELSA International Team: About the duration and content of the ISM we had an agreement that it should be regarding future proposals for the ICM. We agreed that the five-day duration was too long. We could reduce it to four days or change the structure of the opening and the closing. Regarding the workshop structure, it should be connected to a specific strategic goal, we also like that the workshops have specific questions. We also really enjoy the fact that the workshops are two hours long, and we have enough time to discuss them without being too long.

Group 2, ELSA Germany: We can mostly agree with what was said. We think the expected outcome, maybe more in accordance with the strategic plan. Working group to prepare ISM. Also, we think that we could reduce it to three or four days, moving the opening and closing. What we disagree on is that the workshops were too long, and should be reduced a bit.

Group 3, ELSA Ukraine: The ICM proposals should be discussed during the ISM. We also discussed it being four days instead and moving the closing to earlier in the day or the day before. We also think the workshops should have three main topics instead of having different topics for each workshop. We also think it is beneficial to have group work first in the very first workshop to get the participants started.

ELSA International Team: I would like to ask group 2 to elaborate on the part of having shorter workshops. Time or format, should it be less presentation or less group work?

ELSA Germany: It was mostly about using time more efficiently in general. For example, presenting the topic more in-depth before. Some topics probably do not need as long of a presentation.

ND: First of all regarding the length, I understand your concerns. The first and last days are just opening and closing, so we cannot really have workshops. Regarding the three topics a day, I think it would be too much to discuss one topic during the whole day.

ELSA International Team: At some point, there could be some way of changing the structure of the opening and the closing.

BFG: First of all I would like to have a clarification from group 3. ICM's proposals being discussed at ISM, were they discussions on the network having inputs on the discussions chosen?

ELSA Ukraine: Yes we meant the groundwork. Regarding the topics, when the IB chooses the topics we wanted to open the possibility for direct input for the national groups.

ELSA International Team: We also discussed the involvement of the national groups, and we discussed the possibility of having an Open call to hear some different perspectives.

BFG: With regards to the daily debrief there is general content about it. I'm still a bit curious about the idea of moving the daily debrief to the morning after. The reason for having it on the same day is for the topic to still be fresh and moving; it could mean that people are not really reflecting on what is going on.

ELSA Germany: Having it the next day or the morning would also increase the possibility of national groups adding inputs during the debrief. Yesterday there was no comment, it could help to have a night in between.

BFG: From a time management perspective, we are just moving the day up for an hour it would not give them more time after the workshops.

ELSA Czech Republic: Let's be realistic and see how many people are missing out on the morning workshops.

ELSA International Team: I also think a lot of people were only physically, not mentally, present during the nighttime daily debrief.

ELSA International Team: There was a second question about the duration of the workshops, do you still have this question (to BFG)?

ND: Why do you believe workshops of two hours are too long? Is it long in the perspective of being tired? Group work is more chill. From what perspective do you think they are too long, and if yes what would be your input?

ELSA Finland: I think it's not about the length, but maybe it would be beneficial to have a small break during the workshop.

ELSA Germany: For me, it is more about the structure of the workshop. If there are some questions that can be answered by the whole workshop instead of having long group work could be more effective in some cases.

ND: Do you think you could answer in less than 20 minutes as deeply as you did?

ELSA International Team: About the two-hour workshop. I think two hours are not enough, when drafting the workshops you really don't want the participants to cut the discussion halfway. During the questions, I think some of them could have been answered quicker than 20 minutes, but we also changed our minds sometimes throughout the discussion and needed the time.

ELSA Germany: I think not only that but also it depends on what you plan to do with our inputs. If you want to discuss it, we could need more time.

ND: I agree, that replying to EIT, was our goal, so I am happy that you actually said it. Regarding the purpose, this workshop is more the evaluation of the structure of ISM. We don't want to have a proposition for ICM, but to have a better idea of the structure we want.

ELSA Denmark: The length of this workshop was good. The issue is that we have group work for 60 minutes, then we don't have enough time for the discussion.

ELSA Ukraine: It occurred to me that the same amount of time is allocated to every workshop, but it is not necessary, maybe we could change it a bit and have different time slots for different workshops.

BFG: Under the current structure with the rotating workshop, we would face the issue that it would make sense for all of them to have the same length.

ELSA International Team: I like the idea of having the same workshop duration, even though some topics require more time. Having the same length for each topic gives all of them the possibility to be discussed to the same length and degree.

Chair closes the floor to discussion and passes the floor to ELSA International.

BFG: What will you take with you from today's workshop? What will you take back to your national group?

ELSA International Team: Thank you very much for what you did for the ISM and that we have the actual time to discuss topics.

BFG: If you don't come up with something now I urge you to reflect on it later.

ELSA Belgium: How do you think it could be more efficient in time, which would also reduce the participation fee?

ND: First of all, the IB will give their stance during the daily debrief. Initially, our opinion was that five days was okay in length since we didn't think we could fit everything in four days. I see your point and also the financial point of view. I am not sure it would be possible to have such a concrete discussion since the schedule is already tight.

BFG: I completely agree with ND, shortening the ISM would condemn the quality of the discussions.

ELSA Finland: It could be an idea to move the closing to before the sightseeing so people can get an earlier flight to go home.

Chair closes the discussion.

ND: Thank you for attending the workshop, I hope you also enjoyed it.

Chair closes the workshop at 15:00.

15:30 – 17:30

5 Days of Autumn, 7 Days of Spring

Participants' list:

Adéla Chloupková (AC)	International Board
Mie Tveit (Chair)	ELSA Norway
Eva Šimková (Vice Chair)	ELSA Czech Republic
Eila Karlsson (Secretary)	ELSA Sweden
Gabriel Marti (Secretary)	ELSA Switzerland
Philipp Strasser	ELSA Austria
Ibrahim Diallo	ELSA Belgium
Chiara Nikšić	ELSA Croatia
Patricija Čeović	ELSA Croatia
Johanne Rasmussen	ELSA Denmark
Benita Steger	ELSA International
Iina Rynnänen	ELSA International
Laura Merisaari	ELSA Finland
Ana Koiava	ELSA Georgia
Louis Flindt	ELSA Germany
Luca Cecere	ELSA Germany
Bence Bodnár	ELSA Hungary
Eszter. Bánstik	ELSA Hungary
Flavia Lehmann	ELSA Switzerland
Mike van der Schors	ELSA the Netherlands
Alice Bigot	ELSA the Netherlands
Daria Shylova	ELSA Ukraine

Vice Chair opens the workshop at 15:34.

Vice Chair gives the floor to AC.

AC presents the workshop.

AC: Any questions or remarks regarding the summary of the evaluation sent out after the autumn ICM? Do you think there is enough time for discussion?

ELSA Belgium: I think the length of the autumn ICM is enough, especially considering the financial aspect. We are always pressured on time, and it annoys me that we don't have enough time during the plenaries to discuss and I would like to have more time to discuss before voting. Sometimes there are problems with the internet and secretaries, but it is important to make sure that we have enough time to discuss during the five days.

ELSA Germany: It is always hard to find enough time when you are studying, so two days more can make it even more difficult.

AC: One of the arguments for the five days is that everyone can't take the break to take the seven days off. We can, however, see that a lot of people take one or two extra nights, this could be due to flight issues or that you want to be able to visit the country when you are there. It is a reasonable point, but many people still stay the extra days.

ELSA Switzerland: Regarding the two previous points, if we add two days more, we won't have less work, we will have more work by adding more things. The people having two extra days is mostly for them to enjoy it as well.

ELSA Belgium: People stay mostly in my opinion because it is the weekend, and I agree with Switzerland.

ELSA International Team: I think going there and just being there for a short amount of time and not having enough time to speak with people and meet people to discuss the topics is frustrating. I think five days is not enough for this. To Georgia there was for example a very long trip for a lot of people so more time there would be better. From an EIT point of view, we had to break down area-wise what we were going to focus on during the ICM since we didn't have enough time. It is not only the amount of time in the workshops but also having the time for the topics that would like to be discussed.

ELSA Germany: I think we technically have enough time to discuss, but we just need to take that class. We could also do it online during calls. 5 days of focusing on topics that have to be discussed is not a problem.

AC: That point was raised in every group. I think it would be a great idea to have knowledge management calls before, but during the Open calls, I was mainly looking at the pictures, and not that many people put their cameras and people didn't engage and ask questions enough. It is a good idea, but it is up to you to make it possible by participating in the call, you need to actually listen and not only attend.

ELSA Belgium: Would it be different if the workshop is given in presence? You would maybe not have the same condition, but the same result. Some people are not interested in all the topics, and they won't give their opinions. I would agree with ELSA Germany's opinion.

ELSA Germany: If there is a general thought behind changing the system, behind the Open call, and if you communicate that if you want that knowledge, it will be given during the Open call and not the ICM, maybe more people will show up. In Germany, we have monthly calls, where if you don't show up, it will be harder for you to keep up with the information.

ELSA International Team: ICMs are also about exchanging, and that is a part that is not happening in online events.

AC: I want to react to ELSA Belgium. I would be in favor of having monthly calls, but you have to be honest if you feel the calls are useful or not. I have experienced all ICMs since 2019, and in the online ones, no one was speaking. Onsite people need to ventilate because of long days, so we have to take that into consideration.

ELSA Germany: It would also go well with our goal of accessibility to have an online format for that kind of knowledge transfer. A lot could have been done during preparation calls and the continuation of the discussion during the ICM. We tried it during our NCM this autumn, and it worked really well. I think the five days are enough.

ELSA Czech Republic: I think on the 1st day of ICM during the workshops no one wants to speak, especially when it is their 1st ICM, so 7 days gives more place for everyone to talk and to go in depth.

Vice Chair closes the discussion.

AC continues the presentation and introduces teamwork.

Group 2, ELSA International Team: We think five days is enough. The opening can be earlier, at 3 pm, this leaves more time for free time after the freshers workshop, etc, and before dinner and socials. We want to start the workshops earlier, at 9:30, and then workshop the whole day. We want to extend the reporting time. We broke up the mid-plenary into two days in order to get more time for the plenary and you get more time for preparing for the gala.

ELSA Belgium: I have two questions. Why start opening at 3 pm? Many countries arrive later. Starting at 9:30 is not a good idea, even at 10, everyone is half asleep, and especially if we need to share a bathroom for up to 6 people.

ELSA International Team: The problem is that people feel rushed, we want to give people more time. For HoD, it can feel like you don't even have time to eat during the first day. It is a personal choice if you stay out late.

AC: Thank you for the presentation. I have one concern about the mid-plenary being split. Paying for the plenary room is one of the biggest parts of the budget, so paying for 2 days may increase the expenses.

Group 1, ELSA International Team: Regarding the length and starting sooner the workshops, we discussed not changing it. We wanted to move the plenary, but we didn't.

Group 1, ELSA Belgium: We kept basically the same structure of Dubrovnik and Tbilisi.

ELSA International Team: We accidentally forgot the sponsor's fair.

ELSA Germany: We also discussed whether or not to split reporting time or dinner time, some groups have different needs for reporting time.

ELSA International Team: We discussed a lot, even if it looks like we just copied, especially for the mid-plenary.

Group 3, ELSA Switzerland: What we changed was to add a bonus time at the end of the workshop days but on the spot, the IB or the chairs could prolong it or add another workshop. We also changed the mid-plenary day to do it all in one go and start after lunch.

ELSA Switzerland: We also moved the gala to after the mid-plenary because maybe we don't need as much preparation time.

ELSA Switzerland: We also don't need the reporting time after the mid-plenary since all of the board is present.

AC: I have a question for everyone but especially group 3. Why is there a tendency to shorten the workshop allocation, even though I said there was not enough time for it?

ELSA Switzerland: We discussed that maybe some workshops can be shortened. There are some time slots for BEE to be longer meanwhile, AA for example can have a couple of shorter at the same time. We can make choices to be a bit more efficient.

ELSA International Team: I have a question for group 3, why is there so much time between lunch and dinner on the day of the mid-plenary?

ELSA Finland: You can bring snacks to the mid-plenary. We thought it would be easier to have lunch before so we don't have to recount the votes again.

ELSA Belgium: I would not shorten the workshops, if they are going faster, the chairs can just close them. We can see how it is going at every specific moment.

ELSA Norway: Regarding the lunch situation, you can't have 6 hours mid-plenary without a break so it doesn't matter if it is a coffee break or a lunch break doesn't matter.

ELSA Switzerland: Having a break in the beginning and redoing the administrative things after just one hour is a bit strange.

ELSA Norway: I agree with that, but we could move the lunch break later.

ELSA Czech Republic: We need some breaks in the workshops, we can't keep attention for four hours straight.

ELSA Switzerland: For the workshops, it is more the time slot for when they will be, but then it is up to each area to do their schedule, including breaks.

Vice Chair closes the floor.

AC introduces the second group work.

Group 1, ELSA Switzerland: We felt prepared for the ICM it was more depending if you were there as a national or a local officer. The national board usually discusses but the delegation is usually only debriefed. Some national boards ask their delegation for their opinions and some don't.

AC: What do you think about the IB's side preparation?

ELSA Switzerland: The preparation that was missing was more on the national groups' side to educate their network.

Group 1, ELSA Finland: There is a transition that shows you how the international network works, attending the ITM is good and important. If your national group has not attended the IIM's for years it is more difficult. Also talking during a plenary is scary.

Group 3, ELSA Germany: Regarding whether you feel prepared depends on the national group but generally yes. It is valuable to have joint calls and discussions of the stance of the national boards and have shared drives and documents. There is enough preparation from the IB, but we would like to have more Open calls about specific topics. Having an Open call for freshers workshop before could also be a good idea.

ELSA International Team: I just wanted to add that the idea was not to remove the freshers workshop in the ICM, but to give the place to express concerns or ask questions.

AC shares closing reflections.

AC: How are you feeling during the Open calls, and would you be participating in Open calls every month?

Generally a positive response from the group.

ELSA Czech Republic: Question to everyone regarding locals joining the ICM, do they have to go to the workshops?

ELSA Belgium: I told the locals that it's not mandatory for them to attend since we don't pay for them. However, I will check if they are involved. I will check to see who went.

ELSA International Team: When I was HoD of ELSA Finland, they generally had to go to workshops, but we could release them for some discussions.

ELSA Switzerland: If we don't have a national board member to attend, they need to go. We say that they need to go to the opening and closing plenary but if they want to skip the mid-plenary they can.

ELSA Germany: For our locals, it is mandatory to attend if they want to be part of the programme.

ELSA International Team: If the application is out for the next IIM, what does your local need to do in order for them to go?

ELSA Czech Republic: They have to write a motivation letter.

ELSA Germany: They need to send a motivational letter and their CV.

ELSA Finland: They have to provide an ELSA CV, motivational letter, and motivation to apply for the NB.

ELSA Switzerland: It's basically the same as ELSA Finland, but they also need to send their CV. The reason for them not having to attend the mid-plenary is that we don't pay for them at all.

ELSA Austria: Same for us, motivational letter, ELSA CV. We give points depending on how long they were officers, their position, etc.

ELSA Belgium: It's the same but I also ask them if they want to be part of the NB next year, which can sometimes give them priority.

ELSA Switzerland: If not every NB member can join, we are looking for someone who can join in that area.

ELSA Belgium: Do you cover the fees for local delegates?

Generally a negative response from the group.

Vice Chair closes the workshop at 17:30.

Saturday, 10th February 2024

10:00 – 12:00

More Energy, More Passion, More People

Participants' list:

Yordan Kyurkchyski (YK)	International Board
Benita Steger (BS)	ELSA International
Mie Tveit (Chair)	ELSA Norway
Eva Šimková (Vice Chair)	ELSA Czech Republic
Eila Karlsson (Secretary)	ELSA Sweden
Gabriel Marti (Secretary)	ELSA Switzerland
Philipp Strasser	ELSA Austria
Chiara Nikšić	ELSA Croatia
Johanne Rasmussen	ELSA Denmark
Iina Rynnänen	ELSA International
Laura Merisaari	ELSA Finland
Ana Koiava	ELSA Georgia
Louis Flindt	ELSA Germany
Luca Cecere	ELSA Germany
Maksymilian Baumgart	ELSA Poland
Mira Woelfert	ELSA Switzerland
Alice Bigot	ELSA the Netherlands
Daria Shylova	ELSA Ukraine

Chair opens the workshop at 10:07.

Chair passes the floor to ELSA International.

YK starts presenting the workshop.

BS continues the presentation.

BS: What do you think HR-wise is the biggest problem in the network for ELSA International?

ELSA Denmark: I think communication. What is the purpose? HR is a big thing, and it isn't communicated with the network that the purpose of HR is.

BS: What is your reason for not joining the EIT or ELSA International in general?

ELSA Switzerland: My reason is the lack of time, besides my studies. I would love to, but I don't have the time for that.

ELSA The Netherlands: I wanted to focus my time on my position, EIT is something big to be next to it.

ELSA Czech Republic: I see it the same way, I am currently holding two positions on my board, so I wouldn't have the time for it.

ELSA Norway: Same reason for me, I have filled in for S&C as well so it's not possible time-wise. It is also only my second year in ELSA so I thought it would be a big leap.

ELSA Finland: When I was in the EIT, I had a bad experience. If you hear bad things, you don't want to apply. I think the control and management of the EIT might be a problem. As for the IB, the process is really cruel.

YK: I don't want to delve into your experience, but from the perspective of someone who has been in the EIT, what do you think about the workload and the management of the team?

ELSA Finland: I was doing advocacy for two years, it was a cross-functional team so no one knew what we were doing and we didn't know what we were supposed to do, so I ended up doing nothing.

ELSA Denmark: We don't know what it is to be in the EIT. In my vision, it was something you do after being in a NB. As for the IB, in my University, we can't leave it.

BS: Thumbs up, thumbs down if you thought about applying.

Mixed response from the group.

BS explains the work team.

Chair makes the groups and starts the work team.

Chair asks the groups to present their work.

Question A:

Group 1, ELSA Germany: Regarding the structure of the strategy, you should present short texts for different structural points as suggestions for implementation. We discussed engagement being a key part of development, and working with reality as well as adding flexibility between development and engagement.

Group 2, ELSA Germany: It should be short and simple and concrete achievable goals with enough flexibility to adapt to the network needs and should be set up for 2.5 years (like mid-strategic planning), with separation into national/local and international goals.

Group 3, ELSA The Netherlands: The structure should be simple and concrete. There should be implementation suggestions, guidelines, and maybe a case study. If guidelines are suggested, they should be flexible and prescriptive, avoiding over-regulation – you cannot regulate everything.

Chair opens the floor for questions.

YK: Are we opting for the same style as the strategic plan or more like the OYOP, in your opinion what is short and simple?

ELSA Germany: More like the OYOP.

BS: Group 2 mentions a 2.5 or 3-year duration, what do you think about it? I would like to hear your comments.

ELSA Czech Republic: I think 3 years is enough, things change rapidly so more than 3 years is too much.

ELSA Denmark: I agree with ELSA Czech Republic, it is better when it comes to evaluation.

ELSA Germany: We were also talking about three years in group 2 but having it after 2.5 years would have the benefit of having two IBs working on it and also following the updates of the strategic plan.

YK: Making the strategy accessible for everyone, do you have particular features about that?

ELSA Germany: We have not talked about concrete features but presenting the main points making it accessible and easy to get.

ELSA Czech Republic: I agree but also educate the key areas on the matter.

ELSA Germany: I think something about accessibility as well is that even if SecGen is doing HR, it is part of all the areas.

BS: I want to ask if there is something we presented where you had the feeling of wanting more information so we can clarify it in the following workshops.

ELSA Denmark: Maybe explain a bit more the strategy and show the picture of the plan.

ELSA Germany: Release date to see the current problems.

BS: Talking about specific statistics, do you have something specific in mind that you would like to see?

ELSA Germany: What could help is having numbers on how many people we can attract how many people apply for the EIT how many are accepted etc.

Question B:

Group 1, ELSA Germany: Social problems could be fixed by social initiatives like regular team calls, even though there could be too many calls. During the application period, you should publish concrete goals to give being an EIT member a purpose. Being able to focus on what you like is a good selling point for the EIT. As for the process of the IB candidacies, implying a CoC to make people be nicer to IB candidates and promoting happier mindsets regarding new candidates could help have more IB candidates, through public speaking by the IB for example. We should also improve financial support for IB members.

Group 2, ELSA Germany: We discussed improving transparency about the position beforehand, e.g. expectations, work in the position, finances, and personal insights. It is also important to ensure transitions for the EIT. As for the IB, we thought about more grants for them. The network should also (allow us to) show and accept that we're humans and students.

Group 3, ELSA The Netherlands: Keeping one year term, but put it in between two board years, so you have continuity and more chances of having local and national applicants. Better marketing and continuity are also required. As for making IB more attractive, we discussed about areas of Open call, fixing the house, and the financial issues of the house. Finally, we also talked about more presence between ELSA & UNIs (eg. using CoE to have better recognition for NB members – easier to combine ELSA obligations with uni ones).

ELSA Poland: About making IB more attractive we need to always have this mindset. Every national board has its own vision for the IB. It takes a lot of effort to go to IB and it is hard to take a gap year.

BS: Regarding changing the year, we have discussed it quite extensively. Our term has been extended to August 31st to ensure transitions. Did you talk about specific dates when you discussed changing the year?

ELSA The Netherlands: It is hard to find a perfect moment. We mostly talked about having it around the international meetings but we thought having a survey in the network would be good.

YK: One quick note on what ELSA Germany mentioned about statistics, we will try to give the accessible ones today. I think there are approximately 120 EIT members, but a few years ago it was only 20. This is why we ask what number we should have and what the workload is. If there are too many people, you could lose the quality and the quality of management.

ELSA Switzerland: We talked about that in our group. Maybe there could be a survey at the end of the EIT's term to gather info on how they feel about their work and also social.

ELSA Germany: We weren't talking about numbers but about functional teams. We suggested it was better to have more cross-functional teams.

YK: I agree with this. The cross-functional teams were developed in 2020 but I don't think they worked in the best manner. This year they are cross-functional on paper but for the most part, they are allocated to a specific board member.

ELSA Czech Republic: I think we should do something like a summarisation of what the EIT members did when they left the EIT.

ELSA International Team: There are positions that are not full-time positions. Some don't take all of your time.

Question C:

Group 1, ELSA Germany: We discussed the implementation of a control group checking on the engagement of all EIT members, especially focusing on team structures. We had the idea of creating a questionnaire for EIT members at the end of their terms. The control group could transform into the working group making sure that the knowledge in the group reflects all five years of the strategy and not only the last. We also talked about a measurement by comparing the happiness factor in the EIT. Finally, we discussed the implementation of training for the team leaders so they are able to manage a team properly.

Group 2, ELSA Germany: We discussed having a control organism something similar to the auditor's report or all strategies, an obligated yearly HR Report based on statistics and questionnaires (using SotN), and having a working group to prepare ISM.

Group 3, ELSA The Netherlands: We thought about having a yearly HR report – mandatory part (6 months is too short, you can't do much then). About the Working Group: Strict regulation with concrete ideas, more transparency in the expected tasks, and keeping former IB member supervision of WG. For the achieved goals? Hand in hand with the concreteness of goals (SMART goals and make sure the Guidelines are respected by NG as well).

YK closes the presentation.

ELSA The Netherlands: I liked the workshop as a whole coming from a key area.

ELSA Switzerland: As a secretary, it was good to have a conclusion part on the sheet.

BS: Thank you for your participation. I know that when there is the label IM on it, it can be a bit daunting to provide a contribution, but thank you for your input. There are job descriptions on the website, if you are interested in joining the EIT, check the website and do it. It is a great experience. And if you have any questions, reach out to me.

YK: Thinking about the main outcomes of the workshop. What will you bring back to your national board?

ELSA Denmark: Nice workshop, thank you to everyone.

ELSA Czech Republic: I really liked the longer working groups, that we don't have time to do during the ICM's.

Chair closes the workshop at 11:57.

13:00 – 15:00

(Knowledge) Sharing is Caring

Participants' list:

Nadia Dourida (ND)	International Board
Xanthi Agoraki (XA)	International Board
Mie Tveit (Chair)	ELSA Norway
Eva Šimková (Vice Chair)	ELSA Czech Republic
Eila Karlsson (Secretary)	ELSA Sweden
Gabriel Marti (Secretary)	ELSA Switzerland
Philipp Strasser	ELSA Austria
Ibrahim Diallo	ELSA Belgium
Chiara Nikšić	ELSA Croatia
Patricija Čević	ELSA Croatia
Johanne Rasmussen	ELSA Denmark
Iina Rynänen	ELSA International
Laura Merisaari	ELSA Finland
Ana Koiava	ELSA Georgia
Louis Flindt	ELSA Germany
Luca Cecere	ELSA Germany
Bence Bodnár	ELSA Hungary
Eszter. Bánstik	ELSA Hungary
Maksymilian Baumgart	ELSA Poland
Flavia Lehmann	ELSA Switzerland
Mira Woelfert	ELSA Switzerland
Alice Bigot	ELSA the Netherlands
Daria Shylova	ELSA Ukraine

Chair opens the workshop at 13:04.

XA and ND start the presentation.

ND: We are going to have an open discussion about the officers portal. Are you happy about it?

ELSA Belgium: Do you mean on the officers portal?

ND: Yes.

XA: If you can think about any other material, you can include it in the group work.

ELSA Belgium: In my opinion, we are quite satisfied with the officers portal. We have our own officers portal in Belgium where we put all of our necessary information. We would like to know why you had the idea of this workshop because we are satisfied.

ELSA Germany: It is very useful to separate the areas, but it is also good to have a general part.

ELSA Poland: I am wondering what kind of unification we are talking about. I think the most important thing is the way that it speaks for itself and that people find what they need. Unification isn't the most important part.

XA: To react to ELSA Belgium, yes the officers portal is a library, but the reason we brought that here, is first that it is on the SP to have it updated and second to identify the areas where it can be improved. In the second part of the WS, we will also see how the portal is structured, as a website.

ELSA International Team: In my experience in S&C the handbooks are the most useful part. However, the outdated information in some of them can lead to problems.

ELSA Belgium: I think that most of the things are quite updated, we are all satisfied with the content of it.

Chair: I am closing the floor and we are now going to have group work.

XA continues the presentation.

Presentation of group work.

Group A, ELSA Belgium: We spoke about in BEE at least some things that need to be updated. Maybe making a differentiation for the board management. In general to have an archive file with everything that is needed.

Group A, ELSA Poland: For marketing, you can find handbooks, training, and templates. The most important thing is the template. I would love to have the templates for Adobe in Canva since it is cheaper. Some materials can't be used since it is outdated. The most important thing is that templates need to be updated for Canva users.

Group A, ELSA Switzerland: For the PD area, there are a lot of handbooks, some are outdated, I stress the need for an archive in the PD area.

XA: Thank you for your input! We want to gather your input on what you want each area to have. We appreciate you looking into the separate areas and wish for future groups to continue with a similar input style.

Group B, ELSA The Netherlands: Overall we thought it was very well structured for AA and we really appreciate the documents. Just to improve, we thought it could be better differentiated between HR, AA, and C. Also there is a lot of information, maybe a small presentation of what to find in the subheading (5-7 words) might help. We thought also about a Guidebook: 'know-how for newcomers' – link with ITM and introduction to the new term (very small handbook, simple English & ELSA terms) to help newcomers in the network and locals (ELSA terminology + ELSA facts + ELSA Officers' Portal – 'what's and why's') Regarding the C question, we couldn't talk too much, but maybe too much information.

ELSA Germany: Regarding the human rights section it is very small. I think the Human Rights Handbook is very good and the fact that you can see how it affects every area. Regarding the guidelines for the Council of Europe, it is from 2012 and it has to be replaced. The main things for the HRC are in the AA folder.

ELSA Switzerland: We pointed out the fact that the structure is a bit strange since some documents for Human rights are in different folders. We thought one option could be to put everything in the AA/C folder.

ELSA The Netherlands: In regards to the ELSA advocacy manual, we think it could be good to find it under the AA folder.

ND: The AA/C area in general is very messy, especially with the portal. It has been like that since 2012 when they uploaded the documents. I also received emails from things the people read from old documents.

Group C, ELSA Germany: I think most of the things have been said and apply to IM, FM, and S&C as well. IM has a shared drive for the officers so some documents are there and some are at the officers portal. In general, we think IM and FM are doing well in having beneficial documents.

XA: I think it is amazing that you discussed it, it is one of our final points to share with you.

Chair: Any comments?

ELSA Czech Republic: In the FM area there is a section about the webinars that are really confusing so I think they should be removed.

ELSA Belgium: When something is outdated, we should take it out or put it in archives, even if there is no new document.

ELSA International Team: For S&C there is a handbook that if you use it you will get sanctioned. The contact request is outdated. When I was S&C at the national level two of my local officers broke the rule since they thought the info in the handbook was updated.

ELSA Ukraine: I second what was said. This is a problem, especially because some NGOs train and inform their LGs with that information. I'm not a big fan of striking it, but more to keep it in a way we know it is outdated.

ELSA Denmark: I want to suggest links to for example ELSA wiki but I can never find it so it would be good to have practical information.

ELSA Czech Republic: Do you actually use ELSA Wiki?

Generally a negative response.

ND Presents the next group work.

Group A, ELSA Poland: Regarding unification, our solution was to arrange my projects. For example, you open the marketing folder and find the basic info and then folders for every project. The same should apply to all the sections

ELSA The Netherlands: Our conclusion was that we thought the structure could be better. Unification is not necessary when it comes to headings, each area has different projects, etc. But just having the same aspect could be good.

Group C, ELSA Germany: We agreed with what was mentioned. We also think every area should have the same general area in the same order. It should be generally consistent in order. For example, is it organized in alphabetical order, by priority, or another way, it should

ELSA Ukraine: Maybe for S&C and AA, to systemise we could list the different events in the order they appear in the DB.

XA: Basically by unification what we meant was that it would be more beneficial to find all the guidelines together, all the handbooks together. We have too many names and in the end, it gets confusing. When you look at the Officers Portal, we wanted to see if it would be more beneficial to have it by project or by use, etc.

Chair: Any comments?

No comments.

XA continues the presentation.

XA: Would having shared drives for all areas be beneficial? What are potential threats? We currently have it for IM and BEE.

ELSA Germany: We were discussing replacing the officers' portal with a shared drive accessible to everyone. This would avoid the problems of data protection. We don't think it's useful to have separate area drives.

ELSA Czech Republic: I agree with what you said and we do the same for our network.

ELSA Germany: We also do the same for our network and it works perfectly fine. Archived files are very useful as well. If it is badly managed it can lead to more confusion but if it is well managed it could lead to more knowledge.

ELSA Switzerland: I think a good thing about a shared drive, is the sharing of documents between national officers. But in that case, we would need a way of controlling, who's able to put which information.

XA: Are we talking about replacing the officers' portal? The most important thing is currently on the officers' portal. Should we have a workspace as well or are we removing the officers' portal?

ELSA International Team: I think it would be better to have one solution, because the more spaces you have, the more confusing it is to find the information.

ELSA Germany: On what Switzerland mentioned I think what documents would be on the Drive and having observing status for national board members could be easily managed. I also agree with only having one place for storage.

XA: That is mainly what we were discussing. If there are too many platforms, what to put where? Our idea could be to protect more parts of the officers' portal by password and use it as the main platform.

Chair: Any other comments or ideas?

Chair closes the floor for discussion and passes it to ELSA International.

ND: What do you realise after this workshop? I am guessing that you are using the Officers Portal but what are you taking with you back to your national group?

ELSA Belgium: When something is outdated we think there should be written or informal rules to put it away, and to be sure to have more updated documents. We think we should work more with shared drives.

XA: It is very important to get your feedback. The IM team has started an effort in order to write down where all the material is to know where the material is and what material is outdated. It is better to not have material that is so outdated that it actually makes it harder for us.

ND: I'm pretty similar to XA. The purpose of the WS was to find out if the structure and the documents suit you and my realisation is then how we should proceed with that.

Chair closes the workshop at 14:54.

15:30 – 17:30

Houston, we have a Plan!

Participants' list:

Bjarki Fjalar Guðjónsson (BFG)	International Board
Adéla Chloupková (AC)	International Board
Nathalie Labar (NL)	ELSA International
Mie Tveit (Chair)	ELSA Norway
Eva Šimková (Vice Chair)	ELSA Czech Republic
Eila Karlsson (Secretary)	ELSA Sweden
Gabriel Marti (Secretary)	ELSA Switzerland
Philipp Strasser	ELSA Austria
Ibrahim Diallo	ELSA Belgium
Johanne Rasmussen	ELSA Denmark
Iina Ryyänen	ELSA International
Laura Merisaari	ELSA Finland
Ana Koiava	ELSA Georgia
Louis Flindt	ELSA Germany
Luca Cecere	ELSA Germany
Maksymilian Baumgart	ELSA Poland
Flavia Lehmann	ELSA Switzerland
Mira Woelfert	ELSA Switzerland
Alice Bigot	ELSA the Netherlands
Daria Shylova	ELSA Ukraine

Vice chair opens the workshop at 15:33.

Vice Chair passes the floor to ELSA International.

BFG presents the workshop.

AC continues the presentation.

Vice Chair: Any questions?

No questions, Vice Chair passes the floor to BFG.

BFG passes the floor to NL.

NL continues the presentation.

Vice Chair opens the floor for discussion.

ELSA Denmark: Was the Open call only for the BEEs?

AC: Everyone could have joined, but we sent the email only to the BEE list, however saying that we would appreciate them discussing with their boards and that their board members were welcomed.

ELSA Germany: I think one thing that could lead to a lack of engagement is that it was discussed so early on in the term. Having it a bit later could have helped.

AC: I understand that it could have seemed a bit of a rush and even more if national officer for the first time. However, you already know that the deadline for the implementation was the autumn ICM, so we had to start as soon as possible. Do you think the structure should be different? Maybe for the spring ICM?

ELSA Belgium: The strategic goals are important for us in Belgium and we see it as important for what we can do. We do try to specify them for the Belgium network. Do you think they are important and try to implement them in your country?

Unanimous positive answer and mixed to positive answer.

ELSA Germany: To answer AC, it mostly depends on what the IB needs.

ELSA Denmark: A suggestion could have been that since a lot of the goals are for specific areas there could have been Open calls for the specific areas.

ELSA Switzerland: I agree with what was said. As president, you try to engage your boardies, but it is maybe easier when there are specific goals for specific areas to involve them that way.

ELSA Czech Republic: Regarding postponing it until after the autumn ICM. It would be positive to this since in my experience we were just trying to settle into our roles at that time and that's why I didn't engage.

NL: The final report was to be presented to the Autumn ICM. Do you think it is a great idea to keep it that way but to move the implementation handbook to the spring ICM?

ELSA Czech Republic: Yes.

Vice Chair: Any other questions?

Vice Chair closes the floor for discussion.

BFG continues the presentation.

Vice Chair: Any ideas or questions?

Vice Chair closes the floor for questions and passes the floor to BFG.

Vice Chair: Any questions?

ELSA Germany: Could be a longer SotN and longer Open call.

AC: Are you talking about surveys or SoTN?

ELSA Germany: SoTN.

AC: We are currently discussing how many questions per area we should have. The previous years there were more questions, and the evaluation was that it was mostly not appreciated.

Vice Chair: Any other ideas?

No more questions, Vice Chair passes the floor to BFG.

BFG continues the presentation.

BFG: Would you like any other way of formal reporting than the yearly report?

ELSA Germany: Not having a yearly report of the IB, but more like auditors. It could maybe help, but I don't know how feasible it is.

BFG: To give you a bit of insight from the previous groups. We discussed the IB tying the monthly report back to the individual goals or topics and in addition, every three months have a section with the milestones reached for example. Besides from any concrete milestones it might not be that useful for the network so it might not be relevant more often than that.

ELSA Poland: A report like a mini evaluation, I'm not sure that it is necessary, because Strategic Goals are a long-time thing. It would change the perspective. I think it should be at least one year.

ELSA Germany: I think one thing that could help is having the strategic goals in the minds of the national boards. If you reach a goal it would be good to tell the national boards. This would be nice over having only yearly reports and updates during the ICMs.

BFG: To answer ELSA Poland, it should perhaps be less regular, but be focused on milestones. To ELSA Germany, I really like this solution and way of thinking, we should try to celebrate a bit more, maybe in ELSA we tend to be a bit too problem-centered.

AC: I would like to say that I agree with both of the points. I have a small practical concern since some of the goals are more general and my view about achieving this goal could be different from someone else. Checking it off could mean people will stop focusing on it. If it is a concrete goal it would be a good idea.

ELSA Belgium: AC just said what I wanted to say, how to evaluate it when a goal is achieved. Where do we stand to see how much we achieved that goal?

ELSA Finland: In Finland, we have the mid-OYOP follow-up and consider the strategic goals. Every three months is too much, but in the OYOP you have the strategic goals you focus on so you could follow up on that.

ELSA Germany: I think the implementation handbook can help us to see if we achieved the goal. And if we can't see how we achieve them, then what's the point of having these goals?

ELSA Belgium: I agree with ELSA Finland. We evaluate ourselves and our OYOPs every six months. Regarding ELSA Germany's comment, sometimes you might not have the same definition of reaching a goal through the network but you can still aim for it.

ELSA Poland: I agree with ELSA Belgium. These are goals, not tasks.

Vice Chair closes the floor for questions.

BFG continues the presentation.

AC continues the presentation.

BFG presents the group work.

Vice Chair divides the groups and launches the group work.

Presentation of topic A:

Group 1, ELSA Austria: We think surveys could be a good way of getting as many groups input as possible to give a general overview. Not everyone is as involved as the groups present right now. Not everyone might have the motivation to put in a lot of work. We should use existing ways for informing the network, like OYOP. The mediums should be the ICM or if requested Open calls.

Group 2, ELSA Germany: Regarding involvement, the outgoing IB and NBs should give inputs. Open calls, and OYOP should be used as well for the information. It could also be included at the ITM as a workshop. Every medium is possible.

Group 3, ELSA Switzerland: We discussed the inclement to do a workshop during the ITM. How to inform, we feel like the IB should be flexible, if they think they need to inform us they should. As for the medium, we think Open calls, maybe Open calls for the key areas.

Group 4, ELSA The Netherlands: Everything was said. But we thought about anonymised forms for the involvement. For sharing, we could use the mailing areas. For mediums, we thought about mailing lists, OYOP, and IIM's.

AC: Thank you for the input. I have a question regarding the ITM. Would you want a general overview of what the IB will focus on in one area, like BEE, or should it be for each area?

ELSA Germany: You can do a little bit of both: a general one and in each area which could need it.

ELSA Czech Republic: I completely agree.

ELSA Switzerland: I agree as well, a small overview and then area-specific.

Presentation of topic B:

Group 1, ELSA Austria: We were unsure, of course, alignment of the strategic goals is preferred but they shouldn't contradict each other anyways. We think halfway through we should evaluate and if needed update them. If some goals are completely stagnant we will see it and can focus on them.

Group 2, ELSA Germany: Strategies should be aligned, with the President monitoring the working groups on them. It should be revised at the same time, could be every 2,5 years if shorter than SG.

Group 3, ELSA Switzerland: We think it should be aligned. We don't have a specific timeframe for the updates. In order we think the financial strategy should be on top, without it there is no HR strategy, and so on.

Group 4, ELSA The Netherlands: It should be aligned, but we were thinking about other strategies together but maybe not with strategic goals. There is a risk of over-regulation if strategic goals and strategies are aligned. Good point about not having them at the same time: different generations could work on them, so no « monopoly » on them by drafters (which would be the case if strategies aligned with strategic goals. Should be updated at ISMs (once every 2 years). We think the order should be Strategic Plan, First Financial Strategy (because it sets the tone for all the other strategies), Second Human Resources, and then the rest does not matter so much.

Vice Chair: Any questions?

ELSA Belgium: I have a question for all goals. When you say align do you mean that they shouldn't contradict each other or just make one document?

ELSA Czech Republic: We meant not to contradict each other.

AC: Question about having the president monitor all the strategies: for now it is FM that monitors the Financial Strategy, would you change that?

ELSA Germany: We didn't discuss that specifically but the way we do it is having the treasurer as the chairman and the president being involved sitting next to the treasurer so to say, but not that involved in the process itself.

Vice Chair: any other points or further questions?

Vice chair closes the floor and passes it to ELSA International.

BFG continues the presentation.

AC continues the presentation and puts the participants in line depending on their answer to her questions.

BFG shares closing reflections.

Vice Chair closes the workshop at 17:34.

GROUP 2 WORKSHOP MINUTES

Thursday, 8th February 2024

10:00 – 12:00

ELSA Math

Participants' list:

Adéla Chloupková (AC)	International Board
Michelle Henning (Chair)	ELSA Germany
Nives Edler (Vice Chair)	ELSA Switzerland
Rodrigo Prelhaz (Secretary)	ELSA Portugal
Bára Líbal (Secretary)	ELSA the Netherlands
Lovro Saraf	ELSA Croatia
Leona Rosandić	ELSA Croatia
Lucie Nováková	ELSA Czech Republic
Freja Moos Wagner	ELSA Denmark
Nathalie Labar	ELSA International Team
Jenny Schilpp	ELSA Germany
Charlotte Magez	ELSA Germany
Sverrir Páll Einarsson	ELSA Iceland
Ieva Sinevičiūtė	ELSA Lithuania
Jørn Ruiz Foss	ELSA Norway
Julia Kraska	ELSA Poland
Aliena Trefny	ELSA Switzerland
Puck Scheggetman	ELSA the Netherlands
Bronte Collins	ELSA the Netherlands

MH (Chair) opens the workshop at 10:04.

AC presents the *ELSA Math presentation*.

Vice Chair: If you have any questions regarding the presentation, now is the time to ask them.

ELSA Switzerland: Is the Gala Ball included in this data?

AC: It is excluded.

ELSA Germany: How do you get one fixed number?

AC: This data was taken from 2021/2022 and 2022/2023, and taken from all the Law Schools and calculated the percentages of all the Law Schools. Some Law Schools actually made a profit but I have the experience of organising a SELS in Brno, and we can have a loss.

Vice Chair: Any more questions before we head on to the group work?

AC: We want to ask all of you to give us an overview of how much you would pay for an ELSA Law School and how much you think the organisation of this event costs. I will send you a link.

AC explains the group work 1.

Chair: Now you have 15 minutes to discuss all the questions.

Presentation of the group work 1 Question 1 "Is the calculation properly set up?"

ELSA Lithuania:

- IIMs → more criteria (prices of accommodation and meals compared to the cost of living in the country, inflation) → taking into account the prices of the last IIMs
- ELS → should also have a changing fee like the IIMs according to cost changes
- Fallback option → "force majeure clause" → if your prices should be higher, (there should be something you can fall back on)

AC: Regarding the first point, to also include the prices of accommodation and meals of the country that is happening, the IIM (**complete**)

ELSA Germany: We need to set the time that the fee is set, the fees should be set early enough so the hosting group and the participants know how much it will be.

AC: We are usually appointed the Host during the ICM, and the organising group that wants to host the IIM should have a draft budget and agenda. When someone wants to apply, they should approach the IB, so they can see the budget that they will present to the Network, so they can set the maximum fee.

ELSA Lithuania: I think it would be good to know in advance what the price could be before voting where the IM would be. I don't know.

AC: Regarding the last point, did you mean that, for example, at one point the Organising Group could make the fees higher one month before the event?

ELSA Germany: The idea was rather to have a setting that already goes into place beforehand, so it is not in case something unexpected happens, but rather, if the hosting group has bad conditions from the get-go, they could have the opportunity to raise the prices right away.

ELSA the Netherlands: The idea of the force majeure clause is only in extreme circumstances. When the local group has to adapt to changing circumstances and is not completely boxed into a certain price.

ELSA Czech Republic: For me, I agree with what Michelle (ELSA Germany) said, for me is some percentage that we can lower in case the economy goes bad. I think some kind of percentage of what the Organising Group can afford.

ELSA Germany: Just to clarify, the point was based on the set idea of having it beforehand, and having a force-majeure clause in case something happens only came up towards the end of our discussion without a final conclusion.

ELSA Iceland: What is the definition of force majeure? What falls into the category of force majeure.

ELSA the Netherlands: A force majeure clause should be designed for circumstances like that, where the currency is being proven to be a bit of a problem in these circumstances.

Presentation of the group work Question 2 (Does it make sense to have the recalculation on the 1st of January?)

ELSA Iceland: So, what do we think about making it twice a year? We believed that if we had stuck around that area, it would be unnecessary to have it on the 1st of January - we wanted to move it to the 10th as we would have more accurate data. When we talked about the twice per year issues, we did not reach any ultimate decision on that - we floated a couple of ideas, keeping it on January 10th and the idea of having it for big Internal Meetings one year prior. For example, when you make a decision to nail down the participation fee a year in advance, the Organising Committee can have a more conclusive idea of what they will receive. However, we did not reach a unanimous decision. We also talked about whether the IB should have a chance to predict maximum fees. We landed on the word “prediction” - it is always hard to give someone the power to change the fees, we saw this in ELSA Law Schools with the controversy of raising the price by 5 euros - can you imagine this with Internal Meetings? It would have to be very clearly defined why they are raising it and what metrics they are basing that on.

AC: Thank you for the presentation. Regarding the procedure, I calculated one year prior, and the inflation increased 6%. Would you consider the recalculation or should the organizing Group should stay with the price that was calculated one year prior.

ELSA Iceland: I mean, yes, it is obviously going to be a danger to doing this. We are acknowledging that, but I think trying to predict inflation rates will always have that threat; anything can happen tomorrow, and the OC could have been completely screwed. You can never predict inflation. We can do our best to work around their predictions, but then you can have a force-majeure situation where, when you try to increase the participation fee, it sacrifices clarity for the OC, so they can know a year in advance.

AC: Thank you. About the prediction, I agree that it has to be clear and defined. I was questioning, imagine that ELSA Brno asked us if there was an option to predict and increase the fee before the 1st of January, we said that would be possible. But, if we would allow it, and the prediction would be incorrect, that would make a huge difference in the budget, but the Organising Group already sent the Application Form with the prediction fees, should the OG change the fees or stay with the bad predicted fees?

ELSA Belgium: I think the idea is really nice, but it will just cause issues for the participants and huge misunderstanding between the Organising Committee and the participants. So, I am not really in favour of changing it afterwards, even if the prediction is not right, as it will bring about misunderstanding, we should not have the risk that maybe we can change the fee because maybe we made a bad prediction. We need to go along with it.

Chair: Any more questions? I see none. Group 3 can present.

Presentation of the group work 1 Question 3 “Should there be a unified system when it comes to the calculation of the final fee?”

EIT: As our notes show, we did not really come to a conclusion like the other Groups. We said that in some cases, it does make sense to have different fees for different projects, as the events are similar in needing accommodations, meals, and socials. But we should have the option to regulate SELS and WELS separately, as the price could be higher than in Internal Meetings, however, it could be difficult for participants to predict the price, which may affect their decision to participate. Thus, it might be hard to increase the price every year, but maybe we should establish what SELS and WELS will increase each year. We also talked about the fact that instead of maybe Law Schools changing prices every year, we should regulate how often we look at the price, like every 2 years, to check whether we need to increase it, rather than changing it every year.

AC: Are you talking only about ELSA Law Schools or also about the IIMs? Should it stay like it is right now? Should the ELSA Law Schools have the fixed fee without the inflation and rechecking every other year, and the IIMs with the inflation?

EIT: We mostly talked about having it the same as it is. We did not really talk about changing it in Internal Meetings, so I do not have an answer for that.

Chair: Any more questions? I see none. Excellent.

AC: Let's continue with the group work; the groups should rotate. Come up with arguments in favour and against.

Chair: You have 10 minutes.

Chair: We will now discuss the questions.

Presentation of the group work 2 Question 1 "Should there be a unified system when it comes to the calculation of the final fee?"

ELSA the Netherlands: We prefer a unified system, it is easier to plan, and is better for communication, calculation.

AC: I don't know how the regulations would work, but in the Czech Republic, we had a calculation where they took the prices of the 3 NCMs before, and we took the percentage, and. I have a question about ICMs. In ELSA Czech Republic if you end up with more than 400 euros of profit, you have to give the money to the Board. For the ICM, the Organising group wants to show the organising in the best way possible. The venue that we had in Tbilisi was amazing, but was more pricey. That is why we can have a higher or lower loss. Should be considered in the calculation expenses like fireworks in Gala, or you consider that in the calculation should be specific expenses, like accommodation, or do you prefer to have everything there?

ELSA Iceland: I think it is a wonderful point. Taking the Gala examples, I think it is great to make it a spectacle, because it is fun and we love going there. As the venue in Tbilisi, I personally found it fine as long as we are not increasing it for the fireworks - there needs to be a balance between the two.

EIT: I agree to some extent, but I prefer to not have fireworks and have more NGOs present. As a student, the finances are hard, and we want people to be there.

Presentation of the group work 2 Question 2 "Is the calculation properly set up?"

ELSA Iceland: We concluded that no, if the increase in the cost is anything more than inflation, it does not make sense. We thought about taking the EU calculations, and not all the events are held in the EU, like the last ICM. We can put the two inflated rates, and divide by 2 to see the rate. If it is held in the EU, there is no problem, but if not, we should do that.

ELSA Belgium: I think it was also that only for non-EU countries and also some EU countries, the countries have higher inflation rates than others, although we are all in the EU.

AC: Would you make two different maximum fees for nations that are in the EU and one for the ones that are not, or only one in the middle?

ELSA Iceland: If I understood correctly, Georgia is not in the EU. So based on our theory, we need to check whether we need to have increases in the fee with the ECB - as in EU percentage, and compare it to the inflation of the organising country. Essentially, find a middle-ground. It should not be an issue, as

inflation is similar in a lot of countries. So take the number in Iceland and then in the EU - and find the median between the two.

AC: Would it be fair to the EU countries that are not the average in the EU, imagine if Czech Republic has 10% inflation, but Germany has 5%, I wouldn't do the calculations because we are both in the EU, but if Georgia has 4%, and have another fee because they are not in the EU. Would be listed in the Decision Book the not EU countries that have a different fee?

ELSA Belgium: As I said, we were not making a difference between EU countries and non-EU countries. We imagine, for instance, that Belgium will be compared to average EU rates in the same way that Georgia will be. Otherwise, it would be discriminatory.

Presentation of the group work 2 Question 3 "Does it make sense to have the recalculation on the 1st of January?"

EIT: We talked a lot about it. We talked about having different options, if the event is held in September, look at the numbers of August. So, always look at the numbers that are closer to the date. We also talked about having it three times a year.

ELSA Germany: We also thought if the Hosting Group is really struggling, the IB could increase the participation fees (essentially, having a certain wiggle room), but it would have to be diligently decided. That should be done before the application period starts.

EIT: The IB should not be able to predict the price as it would create uncertainties for the participants and the Organising Committee.

Chair: Any questions?

AC: Would you, as a National Group, no matter if the Group is paying for the attendance or you are paying yourself, would the financial planning be okay, if the participant fee got raised by essentially 2 euros/night. Or would this discourage you from applying?

Chair: We do not have sufficient time, so we will bring this question into the group work.

Group 1's question: Does it make sense to have the recalculation on the 1st of January?

ELSA Czech Republic: Based on what the other groups said, do it twice a year. However, it is a good idea to do it at the beginning of the term and then at the beginning of the year.

Group 2's question: Should there be a unified system when it comes to the calculation of the final fee?

ELSA Belgium: We agreed with ELSA Germany in Group 3, who said that ELSA Law Schools are more of an individual thing and that it is more important to make Internal Meetings accessible.

Group 3's question: Is the calculation properly set up?

EIT: We don't agree with anything, we should make it as equal as possible. This will only lead to the same countries applying over and over again - if we include the cost of living. We do not really have a solution.

AC: To conclude, thank you all for the points and the discussion, we will go through that with the IB, we will prepare for the daily debrief so the other groups know what we were discussing.

AC: I have two questions: Firstly, is there anyone who did not have a chance to say their own opinion, if you were maybe the only one who disagreed with the group, and secondly, if someone would like to reply to my previous question about the increase in the fee for participation?

Chair: Could you repeat the first question?

AC: The Organising Group could increase the participation fee, if you, as a participant who is paying the fee in the internal meetings, would be okay to pay more than you expected two weeks before?

ELSA Switzerland: Within a certain margin and, if the decision is communicated, personally, I would be okay with this. However, I think that this margin can't be too big. It just has to be reasoned, and communicated very openly and transparently.

ELSA Czech Republic: I would rather have the two extra euros/night in advance, in preparations and tell the delegates, rather than tell them later that we need more extra money - better in advance than changing it last minute.

ELSA Switzerland: I didn't necessarily mean that I would prefer it, I agree with you that it is better to know what you are actually going to pay, but my response to Adela is that I would be okay, if it is well communicated.

ELSA Norway: I agree with both of the points that were made. We would want it in advance as it would be easier to travel, especially because we have to pay for it from our own pocket, even for the travel fees.

ELSA Germany: The prices can be raised, if there is an emergency.

ELSA Belgium: I think increasing the price by a euro or two/night would be okay. However, if it were more than 3 euros/night, it would be too much.

ELSA Norway: we also have to make sure that the OC does not use this as a way to go in profit. Increasing the fee would have to be regulated.

AC: This I fully agree with, it can be easily checked, and the Network should see how the financials worked.

Chair closes the Workshop at 12:04

13:00 – 15:00

United we Stand, Divided we Pay

Participants' list:

Bjarki Fjalar Guðjónsson (BFG)	International Board
Xanthi Agoraki (XA)	International Board
Michelle Henning (Chair)	ELSA Germany
Nives Edler (Vice Chair)	ELSA Switzerland
Rodrigo Prelhaz (Secretary)	ELSA Portugal
Bára Líbal (Secretary)	ELSA the Netherlands
Arthur Tondeur	ELSA Belgium
Lovro Saraf	ELSA Croatia

Leona Rosandić	ELSA Croatia
Lucie Nováková	ELSA Czech Republic
Freja Moos Wagner	ELSA Denmark
Nathalie Labar	ELSA International Team
Jenny Schilpp	ELSA Germany
Charlotte Magez	ELSA Germany
Barnabás Hadju	ELSA Hungary
Sverrir Páll Einarsson	ELSA Iceland
Ieva Sinevičiūtė	ELSA Lithuania
Jørn Ruiz Foss	ELSA Norway
Julia Kraska	ELSA Poland
Aliena Trefny	ELSA Switzerland
Puck Scheggetman	ELSA the Netherlands
Bronte Collins	ELSA the Netherlands

Chair opens the workshop at 13:05

BFG presents the United we Stand, Divided we Pay presentation.

BFG: Is the division between favoured and non-favoured countries adequately representative?

Generally thumbs down.

BFG: It looks negative to mixed feelings. Would anyone like to elaborate?

ELSA Lithuania: I am from Lithuania, and I believe that there are countries that are worse financially than my country, but my Boardies cannot afford to be in IIMs. We are trying to apply to several funds, like EDF, and one of my members couldn't participate in the ICM, if she didn't apply for a fund.

ELSA the Netherlands: From favoured countries, we have rich people that can afford to go to IIMs, but also have people from non-favoured countries that cannot afford to go to IIMs.

ELSA Iceland: I can only speak on behalf of my own country. It is a good point that there is a difference between GDP/capita and personal financial situations. I have board members that are in trouble to finance to come to IM events, although it makes perfect sense for us to come. It will always be a difficult problem to solve. People are not the GDP of their own country.

ELSA Czech Republic: Regarding what Ieva said, it depends if you have a lot of sponsors, if you don't have sponsors. In the Czech Republic, we don't have this problem because we have a lot of sponsors that support us.

ELSA Portugal: It is true that if you have sponsors, it is easier to pay for the fees. However, for us it is almost impossible to get sponsors that would pay for our attendance or support our events.

BFG: The input is very valuable, and I believe it is very good that we have this venue to discuss your situations. I would like to elaborate on this from the perspective of general members, as we have been discussing this from the perspective of national boards. These general members want to attend law schools, etc. How do you think this division impacts the lower case of the network?

ELSA the Netherlands: I don't know if GDP is not the same as the income of the national group. Another thing is the disparity of raise between favoured and non-favoured countries. The disparity is not enough to discount 2 different categories, you are usually looking at a difference of 5-6 euros.

ELSA Czech Republic: This is regarding the IIMs, we were discussing our potential delegates because we didn't have as many as last year. I think that for students it is not accessible, and the National Board has to pay for them. For Local Groups, it is not a big problem because it is not mandatory for them to be there. For ELSA Law Schools it is different, because it is for the education of the person, is something more personal.

ELSA Lithuania: I agree with both of the points. Firstly, I want to say that participating in Internal Meetings is a duty of National Officers and when you work on your national level, you see some problems and opportunities in the international Network, so you want to participate and express your opinion. Then the problem is money, I also think that it is a problem for the International network as you are losing votes by not being there. Secondly, as the difference between the fees in the favoured and non-favoured countries is not that big, are they actually getting sufficient help?

ELSA Switzerland: While I agree with something, there is a very important part of our association, but our Network is so much bigger for active Officers, and we try to be accessible for everyone. We get a lot of applications.

ELSA Germany: Applications for what?

ELSA Switzerland: ELSA Law Schools. Considering individual situations would be very desirable, but difficult to realise.

ELSA Belgium: I like the differentiation, that is a good way to divide. I agree with the Czech Republic regarding ELS, that is for the personal career. I think that this differentiation shouldn't apply to ELSA Law Schools, but I agree that should apply to IIMs.

XA: Yes, just a final remake. I like the fact that we are already debating the difference between IIMs and S&C events. In the future, and in my opinion, keeping in mind that the purpose of being here is to offer better projects to our members. Both are to a certain extent related - if our members do not have access to them, what are we really discussing here.

BFG continues presenting.

BFG: Does the fact that for the past two years there's been a need for groups to move to another category indicate anything about the way the division is calculated?

ELSA Belgium: It is more the way that individuals get affected. Not every National Group has sponsors to go to ICMs, so it is more about how we should calculate it and look into it.

ELSA Germany: Do more countries need to go to the favoured category or vice-versa?

BFG: They can request to be moved.

ELSA Lithuania: In the last workshop, the group discussed inflation and all the costs. So maybe the GDP should be subject to inflation.

BFG: That is a valid point. That is indexed and updated every year according to inflation using the general average of the WB.

XA: They are updated in January. Every January, together with the update on fees, the favoured and non-favoured countries are updated too. Like this year, as Bjarki said, ELSA Montenegro was moved to a favoured country category. Also there are opportunities for National Groups to request to be moved; based on the economy of the country. This has been the case for ELSA Türkiye in the past few years - ELSA

Türkiye requested the IB be moved, and then, based on the decision of the IB, they are now considered a favoured country.

ELSA Belgium: The division is based on the GDP, why can't we do it based on the income of each National Board? If the income of a National Board is below some rate, it will be considered a favoured country.

XA: For me, it is something to consider, we are all here to brainstorm. But how can you actually evaluate the ability of a person to participate in an IIM, for example?

ELSA Iceland: You spoke about more groups applying to be a favoured country. Are they going below the mark, or are there any other arguments that they are using?

XA: For the past two years, and the case with ELSA Türkiye, the inflation has been so unstable, that they can't know if they are able to afford it. Since now, and I think we have established that on the slide, our fees not only affect active officers but also members of our Local Groups who are just active in ELSA because they want to participate in its activities.

ELSA Switzerland: If you put it like this, does it make sense to have two different systems? We are not really using the same criteria to say that members can participate in each event.

ELSA the Netherlands: So you're essentially saying that you need the GDP to be able to assess the ability of general members to come to the events. Do you not see a correlation between the GDP and the income of the national group?

BFG: I think, while it is an interesting proposition from Switzerland to divide it into a two-pillar system, I do believe that the point from Bronte (ELSA the Netherlands) that if we were to create two systems - this would become a cause for a greater disparity and lead to a greater division of the Network. While an interesting way to tackle the subject, that is interconnected, would be a divisive issue.

BFG continues presenting.

BFG: We have already touched on this, if there are any quick remarks on that, you can elaborate on that now but we will have group work that you can discuss.

ELSA Norway: I agree with the fact that we should make a division between favoured and non-favoured countries based on what the National Group's income is. We are an Association that is giving to our students, so if a National Board has a lot of income, it will break down to the Local Groups.

BFG: Are there any changes that could be made to better reflect the financial situation of the members of the network?

ELSA Germany: I feel like we need to evaluate based on statistical data.

BFG: Valid point.

BFG continues presenting.

Discussion on the reasons behind the division.

ELSA Portugal: Trying to give everyone the same opportunities, regardless of where they came from.

ELSA Switzerland: Accessibility for most people in the network.

ELSA Hungary: To be able to be represented equally, especially in voting.

BFG continues presenting.

ELSA the Netherlands: Point 2 to ensure that members have equal access to events - my point is that I just sat in workshops where people from non-favoured countries said that they cannot go to these events, does this not prove that the division does not work?

BFG: I think the short answer for this is that these questions are all intertwined. We want more participation from non-favoured countries.

XA: For me, if you have members from non-favoured countries that cannot attend, what is the situation of members from favoured countries that cannot attend. That is my question in general. For me, the biggest issue regarding favoured and non-favoured countries comes next. The fact that you don't have as many applications from people from non-favoured to favoured is an issue.

ELSA Czech Republic: I also think that it is important to know that we are only discussing the part of the members that are applying and how much they need to pay. I think that it is necessary to also think about the organising members.

ELSA the Netherlands: If the organisation is so expensive to run, should we not explore other alternatives, such as a hybrid session.

XA: I think that there are many ways to tackle an issue, investing in training on funding, and sponsorships. There are countries that are not able to organise these events because they will be at a huge loss.

BFG gives the floor to XA.

XA: The reasoning behind the division between favoured and non-favoured countries was to smooth out the financial discrepancies and to safeguard accessibility. There is a concern that needs to be discussed - when it comes to ELSA Law Schools, the Organising Committees we are in essence discriminating against favoured country participants because of the contribution to their budget. Which resulted in them not being chosen to participate and thus a lack of their attendance.

ELSA Belgium: They are 1/4 of the network, so of course there are fewer people from these countries .

ELSA Croatia: I just wanted to comment on the imbalance in ELSA Law Schools. I am Head of the Organising Committee for both SELS and WELS in Zagreb. There are so many people that are lying in the forms about whether they are from a favourite country or not, as the IB does not look into these applications, so it might seem that we might choose less of the favoured countries. However, this is an issue of lying, not a discrimination issue. Thus, I have different statistics - are the statistics of the IB really reflecting the real situation?

ELSA Lithuania: I think they are not lying, maybe they don't know the status of their country. There should be more explanation of who the favoured and non-favoured countries are.

Chair: I think that we do not need to discuss that further.

EIT: Can you know where the person is coming from? Can you see their name, etc.?

XA: There are a lot of ways to know where the person is coming from. They indicate where the invoice should be sent, etc.

EIT: My question is more targeted towards the fact that the reason for imbalance is that people know people and pick them to come there.

XA continues presenting.

ELSA Czech Republic: Just regarding the decision about the fees at the S&C events, I do not see a problem there. The ELSA Officers in the Council are elected by the members, so I do not see a problem there.

XA: We point out that you also need to look at the perspective of the participant. As when you are organising the event, your key issue is how much money you need to organise it and not how much money the participants can actually pay.

ELSA Portugal: Our decisions regarding IIMs and S&C events affect our members, but it also affects the organisers and we need to balance that.

Group Work:

Group A will approach the topic from a financial perspective - what are the differences between an IIM budget and an ELS budget (financial planning), especially if we bear in mind the differences.

Group B will approach the topic from a "qualitative" perspective - Will setting a quota for favoured countries in ELS really compromise quality? What other mechanisms can be set to ensure breaches of diversity are addressed?

Group C will approach the topic from a "practical perspective" - What are other measures?

ELSA Belgium: For the quota, we need like 6 non-favoured countries for SELS, or globally ELSA can have 15 spots/country.

XA: Having a specific quota that 10% has to be from non-favoured countries.

Group A presents:

ELSA Germany: The basic participation fee for ELSA Law Schools has to cover way more things than in IIMs - you have to fit more activities into the same budget, and that poses an issue.

XA: Any conclusion on financial planning is that in IIM you have to accommodate a certain number of participants, but in ELS you do not have to.

Group B presents:

ELSA Switzerland: We didn't all agree, quotas can be helpful, and both have a negative impact on the quality. When you apply, you know you have to have funding from externals. If you set a minimum quota, it could be helpful. But there is another opinion.

ELSA Belgium: We also talked about the fact that we did not agree on the way that the countries were divided, therefore making quotas does not make sense as we don't all agree with it. The fact that we would have quotas will impact the quality - we could refuse someone based on someone come we have not reached the quota, although they sent a good application.

Group C presents:

ELSA Czech Republic: We started talking about the fees for the ELSA Law Schools, but then we came up with something about the quotas, we were saying the same thing, if you have 5 participants from favoured countries that you have to take, even their application is not that good, and you can't take other applicants that have amazing application.

ELSA the Netherlands: We talked about supplementing the gap, we don't know how, IB could help with that. Maybe better in numbers than in percentages. We also talked about countries such as the Netherlands or the UK, which foster a large number of international students that are originally from favoured countries, however, are stuck under the heading of the non-favoured countries. This could lead to them not being able to afford the fees - maybe it would be better to let them apply under their nationality, rather than the national group they fall under.

XA continues presenting.

ELSA Iceland: I like the anonymization - but how does that work in practice? Could you actually send an application in a way that would be anonymous.

Chair: We don't really do discussion here.

XA: We know we have some solutions, some of them you might not like, some of them you might love.

Group work on SWOT analysis of solutions presented before.

Group A presents on "anonymization" and "agreement quotes for anti-discrimination".

ELSA Germany: We started with anonymization, that is important, but impossible to achieve. However, there is some information that you can take out. The anti-discrimination agreement is more of a psychological pressure, which doesn't hurt, but probably won't have a big effect.

Group B presents on "pretension" and "raising awareness"

ELSA Switzerland: We talked about one strength: pretension, raise awareness. But it is very hard to verify if a breach actually happened. It is hard to define what discrimination is, is very arbitrary. We talked about encouraging more people from favoured countries to apply, but it might create tension between National Groups/Local Groups and IB. For pre-selection criteria, there should be a more uniformed process for picking the participants. This now is at the discretion of the Organising Committees to pick. Such criteria might help to fight discrimination a little bit better. Regarding threats, the people that are applying for the ELS might not know of this criteria.

Group C presents on "defining diversity" and "checking by IB and EIT".

ELSA Czech Republic: We were discussing the checks from IB and EIT and then defining diversity. The checks for the IB and EIT - if there are thousands of applications then I don't think that the IB and EIT have sufficient time to check them. We had a point that it could be checked the same way as ELSA Traineeships - it would go local-national-international. However, a point is to omit suggesting any improvements to the applications. For diversity, we were talking about having the same criteria as ELSA delegations - really going into the motivational letters, and omitting whether the person is an active member or not.

BFG: Thank you all for the thoughtful inputs, this is a very hot topic, and can cause some diversion in opinion. Does anyone have any general reflections?

ELSA Germany: Would it be doable to not have ELSA Law Schools Organisers to deal with the gap, but rather have the IB pay for it, or somehow subsidise it?

XA: For me, I don't think this would be an option. The question is why is that necessary for ELSA Law Schools and is it not an issue in IIMs where you have to respect the quotas?

BFG: I understand your point, there is nothing that keeps us from doing that.

XA: In the end, it is not a matter of you not accepting, and know all of the people are coming from favoured countries. For me, tackling diversity is not ensuring that we will have 50/50 of favoured and non-favoured countries, there are less favoured countries so of course they are going to be lower.

ELSA Belgium: If there is no distinction between favoured and non-favoured countries for ELS, there will be no more discrimination.

XA: Is deleting the distinction really solving the issue of discrimination when the discrimination starts from us? Flucking in other ways would be better.

ELSA Belgium: I want to clarify that I am not against the distinction, I just do not like it for ELSA Law Schools. I just think it is important to work on criteria that will solve the excessive discrimination.

Chair closes the Workshop at 15:01.

15:30 – 17:30

Standards High, Pockets Empty?

Participants' list:

Yordan Kyurkchiyski (YK)	International Board
Nadia Dourida (ND)	International Board
Michelle Henning (Chair)	ELSA Germany
Nives Edler (Vice Chair)	ELSA Switzerland
Rodrigo Prelhaz (Secretary)	ELSA Portugal
Bára Líbal (Secretary)	ELSA the Netherlands
Arthur Tondeur	ELSA Belgium
Lovro Saraf	ELSA Croatia
Leona Rosandić	ELSA Croatia
Lucie Nováková	ELSA Czech Republic
Freja Moos Wagner	ELSA Denmark
Nathalie Labar	ELSA International Team
Jenny Schilpp	ELSA Germany
Charlotte Magez	ELSA Germany
Barnabás Hadju	ELSA Hungary
Sverrir Páll Einarsson	ELSA Iceland
Ieva Sinevičiūtė	ELSA Lithuania
Jørn Ruiz Foss	ELSA Norway
Julia Kraska	ELSA Poland
Aliena Trefny	ELSA Switzerland
Puck Scheggetman	ELSA the Netherlands
Bronte Collins	ELSA the Netherlands

Vice-Chair opens the workshop at 15:31

Vice-Chair: I pass the floor to ELSA International.

YK: We are going to discuss the Quality Standards of our International events. We are going to talk about the Quality Standards of ELS and IIMs.

YK and ND present.

Vice Chair: Anyone who wants to answer the questions?

ELSA Iceland: Yes, they are very well attainable in Iceland; however, there will never be an IIM held there because the costs are insane, which is sad. As for the factors and elements that drive costs up, we hold ourselves to high standards - we pay a lot of money, but we do get so much out of it.

ELSA Portugal: Quality standards wise - possible, but it would be difficult, maybe in Lisbon or Porto. However, ELSA Portugal has trauma from past experience, so we are not organising an IIM in the next few years.

ELSA Czech Republic: The quality standards that were written on the first page (not the five-star hotels) are attainable, however, there are only 2 hotels in Prague to do so - plus not sure if possible for the ICM or even big enough. However, if we go for the middle one - such as the 4th ISM or 3rd ISM in Prague, that is possible.

ELSA Switzerland: Switzerland is known to be a very expensive country. Quality Standard wise, it would not be a problem, the issue would be that organising it would be very expensive. We rely too much on sponsorships of externals, that only would be possible organising with a lot of advance.

ELSA Belgium: From my experience, we organised an NCM a year ago - the prices of the accommodation were too high, so we moved to the backcountry. It was way cheaper, but it was not very accessible, especially for foreigners that do not have cars in the country. We party a lot also.

ELSA Czech Republic: When I say that Quality Standards are attainable, that doesn't mean that is financially possible. The Local Groups that have a lot of sponsors, only the ones that have a lot of partners are able to .

ELSA Lithuania: In Lithuania, at least for ISM, we would find the suitable qualities for the hotel, but as a National Group we could not afford it financially to organise such an event, same goes for human resources.

ELSA Germany: The Quality Standards would be attainable for us, but the dietary requirements would be hard to attain, since it would be hard to provide a vegetarian or vegan meal.

Vice Chair: I see no more input, so I am giving the floor back to ELSA International.

YK and ND continue presenting.

Group work on alternative ways of organising International Internal Meetings.

Group 1 presents:

ELSA Switzerland: We had a lot of discussions. We had an input from ELSA Germany, which have a reserve that comes from the Groups that don't have the option of hosting - the other Group, which is organising an Internal Meeting can use it. Another idea was having a different type of ICM, shortening it, having some workshops online, and setting some ideas, and during the ICM would have the more important discussions. We discussed the option of using two different hotels, but that is recommended when they are close to each other and the venue. And regarding food, is having more vegan or vegetarian options, meals with meat are more expensive. And get sponsorships for IIMs, that would help financially the Organising Group.

Group 2 presents:

EIT: We do not think that the standards change, but rather the expectations. We talked about a scenario where, even if it is a very fancy hotel and something is not working, you will still be disappointed. We agreed that it might be better to explore other options with accommodation, as it is the easiest option to tackle at first (3-star hotels, or hostels), thus maybe find something more central as the fancy hotels are usually further from the centre of the city. One of the easy cuts could be to pick a place without a pool or a spa, as many participants do not even have time to visit.

Group 3 presents:

ELSA Switzerland: We talked about choosing an isolated location that does meet the Quality Standards. One problem that we see with this is that it is not accessible if you do not come by car; you would have to have a shuttle service. Potentially you could also establish a long-lasting partnership with a chain of hotels - that has venues nationally or internationally. Trying to establish an OC from different parts of the country is also an option, however, this might not be possible for a lot of countries. Catering-wise we thought about doing it ourselves, but it wouldn't be feasible.

ELSA the Netherlands: With the very remote country-side thing, sometimes there is good public transport in countries. So that could work.

ELSA the Netherlands: There is a merit to exploring a commercial contract, our Hotel provides what we need for these events. But it might not be feasible to explore.

ELSA Croatia: I wanted to say that, comparing ELSA to other associations such as ESN, psychologically, one of the big reasons there are so many expectations is the Gala Ball. I like the tradition, however, maybe since the standards are going up now, if you were to take them down right now - everyone would complain and be disappointed. The standards need to go down gradually.

ELSA Belgium: I want to comment on having a venue outside of the city, especially the feasibility. Not everyone arrives at the same time - taking a bus from the main city to the venue would be immensely difficult. We would have to set a meeting point and everyone would be expected to be there. Can we do that, or is it too complicated?

YK: It depends if the people are willing to arrive at the same time. In practice, there are restrictions.

ELSA Lithuania: I have one thing to say, everyone is saying that we can reduce our expectations and then that those people will complain. But we are the people that will complain - we need to decide amongst ourselves.

YK: Together with the IIM Team we administered the feedback of the ICM Tbilisi, and even with the luxurious conditions, there were still complaints. Some Groups complain that every NG should have a room to meet.

YK: Let's continue, Nadia and I will discuss for a minute and pick 3 of the alternative solutions, which you will later discuss.

Technical break.

YK: We will proceed with the SWOT analysis. Each group will have to do a SWOT analysis of one of the three solutions. Group 1 - remote location, Group 2 - different hotels, potentially having worse hotels, Group 3 - having a long-lasting partnership with a chain of hotels.

ELSA Belgium: Which number are we?

ELSA Germany: We got the topic that came from our group, is it supposed to be like that?

Group work on SWOT Analysis of each alternative solution.

Group 1 presents:

ELSA Switzerland:

Strengths:

- Obviously cheaper
- No logistical issues once you're there
- The culture of the country is more accessible and will be more immersive
- Less restrictions around
- Networking is easier
- Less costs on accommodation, which you can put into the socials, etc.

Weaknesses:

- Getting there - logistics
- The OC should know the place to plan it better
- Internet connection and other logistical issues
- Finding such a place

ELSA Iceland: How was ICM Cosenza? How did people get there?

ELSA Switzerland: Some people went by train, others by bus or car. I flew to a nearby airport and then caught a taxi because there were no other options at that time of the day.

Group 2:

ELSA Germany: Two separate hotels should only be taken into consideration, if there are no other options available and the hotels need to be close by. They should also be in the same category regarding comfort. The venue should be at a third place and it should be at the same distance, so no one feels discriminated against. Food would be alright to be at separate hotels - also would be okay to have it at a third location.

Strengths:

- Cheaper
- Bigger pool of hotels to choose from

Weaknesses:

- More planning required
- Larger separation of participants

Group 3:

ELSA Belgium: We taught about partners with a chain of hostels. It would be the same place every year. It would be less pricey. The OC would be able to arrange better socials.

Weaknesses:

- Less flexible, since we are always going to the same chain, and some countries don't have it. If something happens, it can be bad for the chain. It would be very time consuming. It requires very good negotiation skills. We could exclude some hosts if they don't have chains.

Threats:

- Only the same countries would be able to organise.

ELSA Iceland: We think it would be an amazing opportunity. It would be to find a middle ground between expensive and cheap chains. It would be hard to find a hotel chain to fulfil our needs.

Chair: Any questions? I see none. I pass the floor to ELSA International.

YK: It is nice to hear some different ideas. The idea of partnering with a hotel chain could be ideal to get the costs down without necessarily losing the standards. We will review all the ideas.

YK continues presenting.

ELSA Iceland: I think there are always a lot of opportunities to do something differently. Is it necessary to be at a five-star hotel?

YK: The way it has been, to a certain extent, is the expectation and the competition between hosts. We have the situation that when the hotel is not that fancy, we have more complaints from the Network.

Vice Chair: Any other?

ELSA Iceland: If we were to lower our standards, it would have to be a decision taken at an ICM, no Organising Committee will be willing to be the one to decide to lower the costs and go for a lower-standard hotel. It needs to be collectively taken. I love the hotels I have been staying at, the galas and my experiences. I personally think it is worth it, I have no willingness to lower the standards.

ELSA Switzerland: Quality Standards means what needs to be included? Accommodation, meals? Or is the Quality Standards the 5 star hotel?

ND: No, the Quality Standards is solely what was in the presentation - basically a hotel with basic needs/amenities, like it was before COVID. After COVID, we just tend to have higher expectations.

ELSA Switzerland: It is not about lowering quality standards, but lowering the expectations, because after COVID, the expectations are higher. Lowering the expectations and opting for much cheaper options. I would be willing to stay at a hostel if it means that it will be more accessible to other people.

Vice Chair: Any further inputs? I see none. ELSA International please continue.

YK continues the presentation with closing remarks.

YK: What would you bring to discuss with your Board after this Delegation?

ELSA Belgium: I think those standards are a good baseline to organise NCMs as well, just to give not high-quality standards but standards so they can follow them as a guideline.

ELSA Lithuania: I think that I will take back to my Delegation what our expectations are and what would be okay for us when we talk about IIMs.

Vice Chair: Any other reflections you'd like to share with us? I see none.

ELSA Belgium: We have a question regarding the partnership with the Chain Hotel - would this be the IB looking for the partnership, the national groups, or a team created for that purpose?

YK: We technically already have, it is not a hotel chain, but is a partnership with affiliate hotels and there are discounts for the Network. That is something that exists but is not the purpose of it. The effort would be collaborative if we started to look into something like this, it would have to be coordinated by the IB at least in finding a chain that is represented in the majority of the countries and that would also be affordable. We already had some discussions with hotels that have approached us with regards to hosting a meeting in that country, but they tend to be outside of our budget, and most of them are based in the northern part of Europe, therefore exacerbating this effect.

Vice Chair: If there are any other questions, raise them now otherwise we can close this workshop.

Vice Chair closes the Workshop at 17:17.

Friday, 9th February 2024

10:00 – 12:00

5 Days of Autumn, 7 Days of Spring

Participants' list:

Adéla Chloupková (AC)	International Board
Michelle Henning (Chair)	ELSA Germany
Nives Edler (Vice Chair)	ELSA Switzerland
Rodrigo Prelhaz (Secretary)	ELSA Portugal
Bára Líbal (Secretary)	ELSA the Netherlands
Lovro Saraf	ELSA Croatia
Leona Rosandić	ELSA Croatia
Lucie Nováková	ELSA Czech Republic
Freja Moos Wagner	ELSA Denmark
Nathalie Labar	ELSA International Team
Jenny Schilpp	ELSA Germany
Charlotte Magez	ELSA Germany
Barnabás Hadju	ELSA Hungary
Sverrir Páll Einarsson	ELSA Iceland
Ieva Sinevičiūtė	ELSA Lithuania
Jørn Ruiz Foss	ELSA Norway
Julia Kraska	ELSA Poland
Aliena Trefny	ELSA Switzerland
Puck Scheggetman	ELSA the Netherlands
Bronte Collins	ELSA the Netherlands

Chair opens the workshop at 10:04.

AC: Today we will discuss the ICM and how you feel about the autumn ICM and its structure. We will discuss if there is enough time.

AC presents.

EIT: I actually never thought about it before, but I think you raised an interesting point that maybe because of ITM not really being what we want it to be - which then leads to the autumn ICM lacking. Therefore, the issue is maybe with the ITM, not the ICM.

ELSA Czech Republic: I understand that there are financial advantages to the autumn ICM, because it is cheaper. But it is not that much. We didn't have enough time to discuss things.

ELSA Germany: I would agree that obviously some of the workshops and discussions could have been longer than they were, however, if there is a general consensus that people want less days then maybe there are opportunities for a different format, such as having open calls etc. beforehand.

ELSA Switzerland: I think that we have too many things to discuss and I don't know if a 7 day ICM will be sufficient so I agree with Germany, we should have more open calls. Having a shorter ICM is less stressful, a smaller burden for people who are studying and working. And also for the IB, a 7 day ICM can be a bigger burden.

ELSA Norway: I am a fan of the idea of having more open calls beforehand of the ICM and for the networking concern that was brought up in the questions. Maybe extend the ICM by a half-day, so we can use it for internal discussions and networking.

AC: So, regarding the open calls, personally, I think it is a good idea. However, when we have open calls, no one is really engaged - we were discussing the implementation handbook, the proposals, or if anyone wanted to share something about the term so far. There were about 3 questions asked. Thus, even though I would be in favour of such open calls before the ICM, there is the main concern of the participation. Regarding the feasibility of having it for 7 days - one of the arguments in favour was that people had to take holidays from work and it was not always an option. Moreover, in schools, you have mandatory seminars and thus missing them causes additional work. This was the argument in favour of having it for 5 days. However, we see many people arriving 2 or even 1 day before in order to have a fresh start, therefore not sure whether the 5 day ICM actually changed anything.

ELSA Norway: Personally, I think the open calls are a great idea. The system of getting the notice of the open calls, do you think it is possible to change the system? We get a lot of emails, and the emails of the open calls disappear in the mail. Do you think it is possible to have a set day so it is easier to have attention to the open call?

AC: Thank you for this question, we discussed this at the beginning of our term, when drafting the OYOP. It really depends on the idea, for example for PD, they have an exact time schedule of when the calls will be. Thus, PD knows when the next call will be. But for me as FM I do not see that many interesting things to discuss during the open call - maybe only discussing the finances prior to the ICM and maybe the EDF, but other than that I am not sure. Therefore, it depends on the area and whether or not they can set the data. However, all of us agreed on the board that we will have an open call before the ICM to discuss the proposals and ideas, this is the plan for the spring ICM. Should be communicated earlier than a week before the call.

ELSA Switzerland: You are mostly talking having an open call about the proposals, and that is understandable. But in the ICM we have a lot of workshops that have discussions that can be shortened. We could have an extensive open call to discuss such things and people can express things that they can't during the ICM.

AC: It is a good point. I cannot speak for the rest of the board, but I asked if anyone wanted to discuss anything from the working materials, or if they wanted to discuss anything. But maybe focusing on workshops with an expected discussion could be better. One concern, although I am in favour of the proposal, is that not everyone can always make time for this call, and then it depends on the people whether they are okay that they missed the call - as there will be some discussion that you might miss and then follow up on at the ICM. This might lead to a fear of some participants engaging in the discussions.

ELSA Germany: We could have monthly calls, so we can skip some knowledge transfer workshops during the ICM.

AC: Personally, I did not think about that.

Chair: Is there any other input? If not, seeing as we are good on time, maybe we need an energizer.

Dance break.

Vice Chair: We are continuing by having a group work session.

AC continues to explain the group work which is to create a agenda for the Autumn ICM and explain the reasons behind the structuring.

Vice Chair: We will now move forward with the presentations. Group 1 can go.

Group 1 presents:

ELSA Switzerland: We were discussing finding a middle-ground. Some of us wanted seven days, some of us five. We did not really see a need to change the first day, and we felt that it would be enough to discuss proposals later. This is what we discussed.

ELSA Germany: We discussed shortening the time to submit the Letter of Authorisation, since you can do this via email beforehand. It should not be the main option to hand in the letters. We also briefly discussed moving the sponsors fair - however, we decided that there was not a good time in general, so we left it as it is.

ELSA Czech Republic: About the Letter of Authorisation, we decided that since the Opening Plenary starts at 16h, it can be an hour since it does not affect the Opening Plenary.

AC: I just have one question - so you are proposing it from starting on Wednesday to starting on Sunday? Is this reflecting your idea behind it?

ELSA Switzerland: No, I think it would still be better to have people arrive in the middle of the week and then have the plenary on Sunday.

ELSA Czech Republic: I said Sunday because it is the weekend and it is easier.

AC: Your proposal is to have one more day of workshops, and start on Sunday, so 6 days, right?

Vice Chair: Alright, then we will continue.

Group 2 presents:

ELSA Iceland: We decided to keep it on the same days, and we also decided that we did not want to shorten or lengthen the ICM itself. We proposed to move the sponsors' fair - from the beginning of Wednesday to after the Opening Plenary. This was reached after the discussions of yesterday - doing something with the partners; it gives us many opportunities to get more partners and sponsors. The other proposal we made is that we cut down the workshops, and those who stayed were made longer. This is because some workshops can be done through open calls, such as presentations and training. We have face-to-face meetings to talk about things that need to be discussed, such as the conversations about raising the price of the ELSA Law Schools and these are the kinds of discussions that should happen at the ICM. We also moved the Opening Workshop to the second day, so you can then go straight to the workshop. We cut down the Letter of Authorisation time, so it flows in the arrival time. Am I forgetting anything?

ELSA Germany: You mentioned the shorter workshops are for knowledge transfer and can be moved out, that's why we aim to have longer workshops and fewer topics instead and also to have scheduled breaks beforehand, especially during the plenaries. There are breaks anyways, but it would be nice to know when they are coming.

AC: Thank you for the presentation. Regarding Letter of Authorisation, for the IB is fine having it for half an hour, this time is for the Groups to hand the letter in. We prepare the Opening Plenary in the morning and if it is okay for you as a National Group to have the Letter of Authorisation for half an hour, the IB is okay. From the side of IB, it would be okay to have it for 30 minutes, but the time is more for you, thus

depending on whether you can hand it in. But as was mentioned, you can send it via email. I am a bit concerned about having the opening workshop the next day, because we have the officers' workshops. My question would be if you are proposing to completely delete the officers' workshop, because it is really hard to find secretaries.

ELSA Iceland: I forgot to mention, we decided to go away with the officers workshop that we thought could be done online a week prior. We did not take into consideration that it is difficult to find the secretaries. We also decided to have the freshers and other workshops at the same time, as it is meant for different actors.

Vice Chair: If there are no further comments or additions from this group, we will move forward.

Group 3

EIT: We made some changes and added a day, instead of starting on Wednesday we are starting on Tuesday. We are only having one activity in the evening and move the rest to the next day. We added a network day Thursday. Having one more day is an opportunity to get to know everyone. And then we added a longer time for Reporting Time, to give National Groups more time to prepare for the Mid Plenary. We changed the Sponsors' Fair, the Mid Plenary is not changed in time. Instead of having one hour and then lunch, we moved it up, so it is half half. On Saturday, we added a shorter reporting time and the preparation for the gala.

ELSA Switzerland: We talked about the workshops in general, we came to the conclusion that certain topics arise throughout the workshops and the plenary, and we took them into consideration.

ELSA Germany: I have a question regarding the networking day: Do you imagine it being a free day or do you think that OC should plan it?

EIT: Usually at the pre-ICM you have a whole day package, we wanted to cut that day and then move the activity to that day.

AC: I also have a question regarding the networking day, would you imagine this also hosted by the IB - such as certain topics where you could network or a room where the participants can go and discuss what they want. What do you imagine, and what would be the involvement of IB? Should we have a room for the participants to go and network about or they can just grab a coffee and talk?

ELSA Norway: We can do both.

EIT: It is a mixture of it. On the networking day, we are talking about the activity that we had in Malta.

ELSA Switzerland: Not necessarily that the IB has to plan anything, as that would be an additional task that the IB most likely does not have the capacity for, therefore, it is more about networking and discussing certain topics you want.

EIT: We just called it a networking day, but we were thinking about the OC planning something.

ELSA Germany: I think the networking day would be a good day for re-charging, but since we were talking about financial sustainability yesterday, that would be an extra day you have to pay for, and that can be a burden for some Groups.

Group 1 presents:

ELSA Iceland: Many people in our group have never been to an ICM, it is very scary to go to these events. We think that the IB does many things already, just to clarify, is there an open call in preparation to the ICM?

AC: Do you mean what ICM is about?

ELSA Iceland: Yes.

AC: There is no open call before it, there is the freshers' workshop so we don't have that.

ELSA Iceland: Me and Anita, have never come to an ISM before, so we requested a training from our coach. I think you can always request to have one to talk about the ISM/ICM. The one thing that we would have liked, for example in Tbilisi, is when the discussion about the ICM in Azerbaijan was happening. It was difficult because the arguments from the IB made sense, however, I needed to communicate with my board. It would be good to have the opinion of the IB beforehand.

ELSA Germany: We also thought about having a short recuperation time to be able to discuss bombshell topics when they get introduced. The freshers call is nice to get to know people, but going somewhere before to get to know the necessary information, would be good.

Group 2 presents:

ELSA Switzerland: We generally agree that we feel prepared enough for the ICMs, we discussed how we prepare for the ICM and it was very similar, every officer goes by the Working Materials and then discusses the proposals in a call. It is really helpful to have that call, we also have discussed how we prepare our Locals. Since we know the date of the ICM, we inform the Locals when they can apply, and what they should do. If they are talking about a personal opinion, they should say that because they might be talking on the behalf of ELSA Switzerland. We would appreciate it if the workshops were more about discussion, because we have the ITM first and we have knowledge transfer there.

ELSA Germany: With the open call that we suggested, we did not want to target groups that are very well structured but rather groups that have boards that have never been to an ICM. The groups that do not have input or an insight to this.

ELSA Iceland: I had a board meeting where we talked about everything on going to an ICM. It is important for people that go to this meeting and not be blindsided.

Vice Chair: We can go to Group 3.

Group 3 presents:

EIT: One thing that we were thinking that the IB could do is to help with the transition - the document that is starting to be created in the BEE team, where you can read about how everyone else is doing it. We also talked about having an open call for the HoD, so they can prepare their team. We also discussed that the IB could have an open call to introduce some topics and maybe present them. Also, for certain topics, you need prior knowledge to be able to take part in the discussions, so maybe the time for workshops could be prolonged by doing these presentations beforehand.

ELSA Germany: The mentioned workshop for the delegates is for giving insights and tips and tricks for the ICM.

AC: Thank you for your inputs. I would like to ask you if you have any questions.

Chair closes the Workshop at 11:59.

13:00 – 15:00

How to Train Your Officer

Participants' list:

Yordan Kyurkchiyski (YK)	International Board
Xanthi Agoraki (XA)	International Board
Michelle Henning (Chair)	ELSA Germany
Nives Edler (Vice Chair)	ELSA Switzerland
Rodrigo Prelhaz (Secretary)	ELSA Portugal
Bára Líbal (Secretary)	ELSA the Netherlands
Lovro Saraf	ELSA Croatia
Lucie Nováková	ELSA Czech Republic
Freja Moos Wagner	ELSA Denmark
Nathalie Labar	ELSA International Team
Jenny Schilpp	ELSA Germany
Charlotte Magez	ELSA Germany
Barnabás Hadju	ELSA Hungary
Ieva Sinevičiūtė	ELSA Lithuania
Jørn Ruiz Foss	ELSA Norway
Julia Kraska	ELSA Poland
Aliena Trefny	ELSA Switzerland
Puck Scheggetman	ELSA the Netherlands
Bronte Collins	ELSA the Netherlands

Chair opens the workshop at 13:05

Energizer

YK and XA present.

ELSA Lithuania: I participate in the ITM, unfortunately, I wasn't able to participate one of the days. I was very happy because we had 11 delegates from Lithuania, and that was really good considering the number of officers in Lithuania. I really enjoyed one workshop, the other ones were basic info, I didn't get the information that I was expecting from the guest. Maybe one of the factors of the attendance is that it is in the beginning of September and we have a lot of events for freshers in Lithuania.

ELSA Czech Republic: I think as the statistics show - there is too much focus on the attendance of the trainings, however, I do not think it was as bad as what we heard from the workshops. I only attended the training and those were good. I was personally allocated to two workshops and attended both of them. What I heard from my other board members who attended more workshops - it seemed as a transition to those NBs who did next receive one from their ex-boards. Therefore, I think it was not as necessary, as you can always reach out to the IB on your own if you did not get a proper one.

ELSA Switzerland: I agree that more training would be welcome. I attended the whole event, so there was not much new information. But as a fresher it is really good to know about International events, like it

was in the AA/C events. It is a shame that people don't join the discussion and participate a lot, this is not the fault of the IB or the trainer, but this is something that needs to be changed.

ELSA Germany: I feel like the ITM is more of an introductory transition, so I did not learn much. However, it needs to be said that I had a very intense transition. So, I believe that it was very good for freshers, which is where the issue is, as the statistics show that freshers do not attend these events.

ELSA Germany: Too add on to that, the other thing that we see is that besides people not going to online events, they are not interacting much.

ELSA Czech Republic: Also to clarify for everyone, it is also the fact that in our Decision Book, we only have that we need to attend the training, not the workshops. We have this written down in the Czech Republic, we have this as we have found that the workshops are not beneficial for us.

YK: I have one more question related to what you mentioned: to what extent there is negative impression of the ITM? It was something that your predecessor told you?

ELSA Lithuania: I think we don't have. In the previous years, the ones who attended were the most active people in Lithuania on the international level. It was always 2 or 3 people from the country, so they that participating is good to find your purpose. There is no tradition to go to such events, so I do not think that there is a negative perception. However, I do not want to lie to them and use it to convince them to come, as sometimes there are officers that have been in the network for 3-4 years.

ELSA Germany: I don't think there is necessarily a negative view on the ITM, it is just kind of established that the ITM is not useful for us. We go because it is the first international meeting, the first chance to get to know the current network, and it is our responsibility. We do in any case recognize that it can be very useful for freshers.

ELSA Czech Republic: I agree with what Michelle said, we do not view it in a negative meaning. What we know from the transition and predecessors, it is not giving us the information we want. I was also thinking about the social aspect - here the issue is that only 4 people attend the workshops and it is usually the experienced people who you already know from other international events.

Chair: Any comments? I pass the floor to ELSA International.

XA: Thank you very much for all your input. We thought it may also be nice to share some of our experiences.

XA and YK continue presenting.

XA explains the group work.

Group work.

Vice Chair: Now we will start with the presentation of your conclusions. Group A can present.

Subject 1: Lack of participation in the International Training Meeting and involvement of the National Boards in fostering participation.

Group A presents:

ELSA Switzerland: For the first question, we came up with some ideas: the Local Groups don't know that the ITM is happening, the communication between National Group and Local Groups maybe is not good and don't tell them. Some people might be on holidays or in classes. Not knowing the importance of the meeting and not seeing the skills that you can learn. You can provide some kind of portfolio and share it with the National Groups. One more thing that mostly concerns the training is to provide some certificates for the CV that show the skills that you learned in the trainings, that could be an incentive. And promote it with Marketing.

Vice Chair: Asking the group from the back if you have any additions in regards to the first question.

Group B presents:

EIT: I didn't really hear a lot, but we talked about how to increase the participation. We did not really talk about how the National Boards can engage their locals as we assumed it was not meant for the locals. The scheduling is difficult as it is often in times where people study or work. The perception of the meeting also needs to change, the National Boards can foster participation by talking about the meeting in a more positive light.

Group C presents:

ELSA Germany: We want to improve the quality and tailoring more to the actual attendants, and after that promote, because we don't want to promote something that we don't necessarily support. Also we should market it to the Local Groups.

Subject 2: Content of the Workshops and Trainings of the International Training Meeting.

Group A presents:

ELSA Switzerland: We were in a general agreement that the ITM should be shorter and that we should have more training and less workshops. The content should be very basic, starting with an introduction for everyone, then have an international update as this is interesting for both experienced people and freshers. Also for freshers, there could be an area-specific workshop, the same then applies to the experienced people. Therefore, you would have to attend less workshops and freshers might then not be as scared to speak. I believe that it is really important to keep areas divided; if there is something that needs to be communicated on a general level then it is something that needs to be communicated at the beginning of the year if they want to raise that - so the national group can plan ahead.

Group B presents:

EIT: We took a different tour. We also think that it should be this long. The workshops should not be so introductory but deepen the knowledge of the officers. It is a responsibility of the National Officer to have/give a transition. The freshers should be transitioned before the ITM. We also talked that if we go deeper on the workshops it would make sense to have them. IB should emphasise for the participants that they need to read the Working Materials and ensure that the workshops are not too similar to each other.

Group C presents:

ELSA Germany: We want 6 hours of workshops and 8 hours of trainings, that way you could condense it down to 2 days. These would be mixed, so that there would not be an 8 hour block of trainings. We wanted an event for freshers and advanced people alike, so we would have 2 strings of workshops, one for advanced people and one for freshers. The trainings should be in a more general fashion and focus on personal skills, such as negotiating, rather than ELSA knowledge. Regarding the workshops, they should be more focused on internationality and not for the national or local levels, as that is realisable by the NTMs.

Subject 3: Structure and Agenda of the International Training Meeting.

Group A presents:

ELSA Switzerland: We created a table. We decided to start with an opening for everyone on Friday at 13:00h. Then have one area specific workshop with an international update, and then continue the freshers workshops, then a break then a workshop for more specific officers. On Saturday and Sunday, we would like to have more trainings but it depends on the number of trainers available.

Group B presents:

EIT: We think that it should be Friday to Sunday, we think that workshops shouldn't be on weekdays; and we are not having socials, but having icebreakers and energizers. On Friday we would have an opening and workshops in the evening, so people that study or work have the opportunity to join. On Saturdays and Sundays, having workshops until lunch and then trainings. We wouldn't have a closing workshop, instead the last workshop would be more general.

Group C presents:

ELSA Germany: This is the structure I just explained. We would start on Saturday at 10, with two sets of strings. We would start with the Opening workshop for freshers. We separated the workshops by areas, so the opening workshop is by areas and therefore you are more inclined to meet the people that are in your workshop online. The trainings and workshops are alternating, so it would be easier for the IB to coordinate the trainers. We forgot about the closing workshop.

ELSA Germany: There are only 6 hours of trainings in the plan, cause we ran out of time and the original idea was to have an opening and closing workshop.

Vice Chair: Any comments? I see none. I am passing the floor to ELSA International.

YK presents.

ELSA Czech Republic: I really like the schedule that Aliena presented, it was perfect for me. I will remember it.

ELSA Germany: It appears, there will be some changes in the ITM, so I will take it to my group to promote it more, as it is very sad that people don't have the opportunity to go.

ELSA Switzerland: After this discussion, it is really important to promote this more to our Locals and promote the knowledge and existence of this.

Chair closes the Workshop at 14:53.

15:30 – 17:30

For the Plot!

Participants' list:

Bjarki Fjalar Guðjónsson (BFG)	International Board
Nadia Dourida (ND)	International Board
Michelle Henning (Chair)	ELSA Germany
Nives Edler (Vice Chair)	ELSA Switzerland
Rodrigo Prelhaz (Secretary)	ELSA Portugal
Bára Líbal (Secretary)	ELSA the Netherlands
Lovro Saraf	ELSA Croatia
Lucie Nováková	ELSA Czech Republic
Freja Moos Wagner	ELSA Denmark
Nathalie Labar	ELSA International Team
Jenny Schilpp	ELSA Germany
Charlotte Magez	ELSA Germany
Barnabás Hadju	ELSA Hungary
Sverrir Páll Einarsson	ELSA Iceland
Ieva Sinevičiūtė	ELSA Lithuania
Jørn Ruiz Foss	ELSA Norway
Julia Kraska	ELSA Poland
Aliena Trefny	ELSA Switzerland
Puck Scheggetman	ELSA the Netherlands
Bronte Collins	ELSA the Netherlands

Vice Chair opens the workshop at 15:31.

Vice Chair: I give the floor to ELSA International for their presentation on International Strategy Meetings.

BFG and ND present.

Group work.

Topic A: Purpose and content of the ISM

Group 1 presents:

EIT: We are in favour of having more concrete discussions, it would be nice to see in ICM how we did and evaluate the goals of the Strategic Plan. The meeting should focus on setting the direction we are going towards. If the topic is urgent, it may be better to talk about it in ICM. The ISM can be a great opportunity for ELSA International to present how they are going with strategic planning and can be a great way for National Groups to learn about strategic planning.

Group 2 presents:

ELSA Switzerland: First of all, we had the opinion that the proposal could be discussed in not much deepness, because one part should be to address issues that are present or could be. For National Groups, it would be beneficial if National Groups join more. National Groups could learn how to implement the Strategic Plan on their level and learn from the mistakes. Another thing is sharing ideas, and the good thing is that the areas are mixed so you have different perspectives on different topics.

Group 3 presents:

ELSA Switzerland: With regards to the outcome we expect - no need for a concrete plan but rather something that the IB can use for proposals. It is a bit of both, it is about understanding the process of how a proposal might end up. Evaluation and also abstract discussions are both necessary, for example for

topics which do not get sufficient time in the ICMs, or where there are discrepancies between the network. If there are certain issues that require more in depth discussions and you need to open the floor a bit more to find different kinds of solutions. Benefits for the national group - difficult to answer this now, as we do not know how the IB is going to use the outcome of the discussions. What would be beneficial is that for certain topics of the workshops, that might be a bit more technical, such as ELSA Math, then we should be more concretely informed about what the workshop is about so we can prepare for it.

ELSA Czech Republic: Maybe be more informed about the topics of the Working Groups and Workshops, so we can prepare for them.

Chair: Anybody want to add anything or have questions?

ND: I have a question for all of you - and I am confused in the way that you guys have it in mind. When you are saying that you are not sure how we are going to use everything that is discussed in the meetings - do you want us to say that this will be used for proposals, or concrete things?

ELSA Germany: As an example, you say beforehand that you will talk about the ITM and the overall structure and then set the goal at the beginning of the workshop, such as rework the agenda. Then it would be easier to know what we are going in for. However, this is not applicable to every workshop.

ND: Got it. Thank you.

Topic B: Structure and effectiveness of the ISM

Group 1 presents:

EIT: We talked about choosing the people knowing the topics beforehand and having an introduction of the topics, last year we didn't have it and it was harder to start the discussion. Not having minutes is an issue too. We also like the daily debrief. It would be nice to have an open call before the ISM to explain how it works. The randomised allocation could not be an issue, if we know how to come and represent. The 3 spots are good, and this is a meeting more effective than ICM.

Group 2 presents:

ELSA Switzerland: For the first question, until now the discussions we were having were helping to address the topics that are going to be in the upcoming ICM, and they were good to get the perspective of all the National Groups. Regarding the spots, we think it is not about the number of people that are joining, but about the National Groups that are joining. It is nice to have more people, but it is more important to have more National Groups giving their input.

Group 3 presents:

ELSA Switzerland: I will keep this short. Last ISM, as far as I remember, the discussions were much longer on less topics. I felt like it was less structured and the outcome in this ISM is much more clear, especially having conclusions and a summary of them. The programme is more packed, sometimes it would be nice to be able to discuss more on a certain topic. We agree that the three spots are sufficient and that it is inclusive enough and we think that it makes sense to have 3 areas (recommended beforehand). However, we believe that the topics could be announced before, as certain officers can have more experience with a topic that will be discussed. From last year, the non-political status is a big topic and I think it would be too early to bring it up again, so the discussion would lead nowhere. This discussion needs to be more structured - if we cannot manage this till the next ICM, maybe it would be good to bring it up again.

Topic C: Duration and Outcome of the ISM

Group 1 presents:

EIT: This goes a bit on what talked in the first question, the outcome of National Group is how they can implement Strategic Plan themselves. The ISM could be 4 days, moving the opening and the daily debriefs to the morning. This would be easier to organise and would be cheaper. The structure is good, we could have an open call before to prepare for the difficult topics. It would be nice to include the goal of the Strategic Plan that we are talking about.

ELSA Lithuania: Why do you think it would be cheaper if you start in the morning so you have to arrive a day earlier.

EIT: Yes, good point.

Group 2 presents:

ELSA Switzerland: About the outcome, it is about strategy, that is the name of it. It is good that we are talking about hot topics that should be addressed, not only things of the past but also the future. Get the opinion of the Network as a whole. It should be an input for the IB to prepare for the ICM, but it also concerns the EIT. We wanted to point out that the time when the ISM is taking place, being February, is perfect as it gives a possibility to change some things in the current term. Duration - it should not be longer, 5 days seems like the best amount as you can actually talk through things. As for the structure of the workshops, it is good to have some input from the ELSA International on what is actually meant and then have an interactive session, it is helpful to exchange individual thoughts and national perspective. We are also fans of the rotating schedule so the IB is giving the same presentation. It is helpful in giving solutions, starting on the same basis. The amount of people in the workshop is already good, as it simplifies the discussions without only seeing like 2 different perspectives, without being too much.

Group 3 presents:

ELSA Switzerland: We agreed that the ISM is the step that comes up with a specific plan, the outcome would be to know what the network feels about the topic, and to get as many opinions as possible, and in the ICM present a solution. For the Network to be informed about the bigger topics and get a better understanding because they can discuss. We agree with the duration, we tried to make it shorter but 5 days is a good duration. Maybe move the sightseeing to later so we can get something of the last day. We would like a little more flexibility, you present and we have a group work, but we would appreciate having a discussion on a topic not specifically related to the topic presented, an open discussion of what comes up.

ELSA Czech Republic: The workshop yesterday on favoured and non-favoured countries, the questions were written in a way that discussions were not allowed, which I did not appreciate. So maybe do the group work, and be able to discuss something more.

BFG: I do understand your point, some topics were more tactical.

ELSA Czech Republic: I think that we expected for there to be a discussion on the topic after the ICMs, we thought that this would be the time to discuss it. This would have been good to ask what are the opinions on that, rather than going straight into the SWOT analysis.

BFG: Not necessarily related to that workshop, I am talking generally.

Vice Chair: I give the floor to ELSA International .

BFG: We would like to take a bit of a step back, so we can reflect. From yourself what are you taking away, how will it impact your work, and then general thoughts on the ISM as an IIM. More specifically, what will you be taking back to your national group? You can share any thoughts.

ND: You don't have to go point by point, it can be a general input.

ELSA Switzerland: Because there were a lot of questions that I have not asked myself before, discussing these questions made me really recognize the meaning of this. It is actually a really really really valuable meeting that I hope will stay in the network.

ELSA Germany: This may be very specific to Germany, but we have to write 3 new strategies and are about to have a National Internal Meeting regarding these, so we will try to implement a lot of the discussions on the structure and content on the national level as well.

ELSA Iceland: The way that this ISM is going is fantastic, it is a really good addition to keeping everything, and it works really well.

Vice Chair: I do not see any other input.

ND: I want to thank you all for engaging and pushing through. Both the positive and critical feedback is appreciated.

Vice Chair closes the Workshop at 17:23.

Saturday, 10th February 2024

10:00 – 12:00

Houston, we have a Plan!

Participants' list:

Bjarki Fjalar Guðjónsson (BFG)	International Board
Adéla Chloupková (AC)	International Board
Michelle Henning (Chair)	ELSA Germany
Nives Edler (Vice Chair)	ELSA Switzerland
Rodrigo Prelhaz (Secretary)	ELSA Portugal
Bára Líbal (Secretary)	ELSA the Netherlands
Lovro Saraf	ELSA Croatia
Leona Rosandić	ELSA Croatia
Lucie Nováková	ELSA Czech Republic
Freja Moos Wagner	ELSA Denmark
Nathalie Labar	ELSA International Team
Jenny Schilpp	ELSA Germany
Charlotte Magez	ELSA Germany
Barnabás Hadju	ELSA Hungary
Sverrir Páll Einarsson	ELSA Iceland
Ieva Sinevičiūtė	ELSA Lithuania
Jørn Ruiz Foss	ELSA Norway
Julia Kraska	ELSA Poland
Aliena Trefny	ELSA Switzerland
Anna Piliuk	ELSA Ukraine

Vice Chair opens the workshop at 10:02.

Vice Chair: I am passing the floor to ELSA International for a presentation on the Strategic Goals 2023-2028.

BFG and AC present.

BFG: Now regarding Strategic Planning, I pass the floor to Nathalie, Director for Strategic Planning of the EIT.

EIT presents.

BFG: Thank you Nathalie.

BFG continues presenting.

ELSA Germany: I don't know if that is necessarily something you can improve, but the open calls were fairly early in the term, thus it was more forced, as it was not something I was working on at the time. Therefore, for groups that were still trying to find their way, it was an immense pressure to go through the entire handbook and go to the open call.

ELSA Lithuania: I totally agree, I think this topic is very difficult as itself. I also participated in the Open Calls and for me it was hard to understand everything because it was really early in the term. I think it would be a great idea to explain everything slower and in more detail.

AC: Thank you for these inputs. When I was imagining why the engagement is not as high as we would like, I would also not feel as comfortable talking about this stuff too as this is the plan for the next five years. It might have seemed rushed because according to our regulations, we had to present it at the autumn ICM. Would you think it would be better to present it after the ICM, including the ISM, etc.?

ELSA Germany: I think it would lead to more input, but I am not sure if it would be feasible, because then we do not have an Implementation Handbook for a longer time, while the National Groups still have to implement the goals.

AC: So, to be honest with you, we already discussed a bit to maybe change the procedure regarding the Implementation Handbook to wait for the ISM, which means that the first two months will be without the Handbook. The previous handbook was supposed to end 31st December 2023, and now we should have had a new one in January, but since the strategic plan was approved in Malta, it was easier for us to start working immediately on the goals. The Handbook itself is very helpful as it will force you to look at the goals and come up with solutions for it, which means you are not as confused at the beginning of your term. It could be disadvantageous to have it after the new year, however, it would not be as big of an issue.

EIT: I also want to give credit to the IB. When we started talking about the strategic goals for the next five years, some of them were already started, even without the Handbook.

Vice Chair: Any more inputs? I see none. Let's proceed.

BFG continues presenting.

ELSA Germany: We don't necessarily have a different way, but we would like a list of goals. You can create a list with the goals you are prioritising, which isn't exclusive, and still respects the other goals.

Vice Chair: Any other thoughts? No, good. Then, I am passing the floor once again to ELSA International.

BFG continues presenting.

ELSA Germany: I think one way, if you want a broad amount of input, would be a survey, like the Advocacy Questionnaire. Maybe you can also add some questions about Strategic Planning in the State of the Network, since everybody needs to fill this out anyways.

Vice Chair: Would someone else like to take the floor? I see none. ELSA International you can proceed.

BFG continues presenting.

ELSA Germany: I think it is generally absolutely fine with the annual reports, but it would be nice to have a few points in the monthly reports about strategic planning so National Groups could know.

AC: I think it is a great input to include in the monthly report, however, would it be beneficial only under BEE, or maybe include it in every area if that person was focusing on a certain kind of goal.

ELSA Germany: I think both would be fine. It probably depends - for some Goals, it would make sense to have it under each area, but we have to be consistent.

ELSA Switzerland: I think it could be very beneficial to have it under the areas, and maybe find a middle way because of the additional administrative method by not making it mandatory, but only when an essential step or sub-step has been achieved. This would also give the National Boards and Local Boards an idea on how such a step could be achieved on the national and local levels.

BFG: A lot of things we address in Monthly Reports are related to strategic goals but we can tie it more to the Goals.

Vice Chair: Any other inputs, questions, thoughts? I see none, so ELSA International you can continue.

BFG and AC continue presenting.

Vice Chair: I am opening the floor up for discussions.

ELSA Germany: The way that we have it for us right now, is we have a Strategic Plan and a Financial Strategy for 5 years and it is really good to have it this way, because we achieve goals in both strategies. This might lead to more input from the National Boards, if they are already concerning themselves with the topic, and can then work on both at the same time.

Vice Chair: Do we have anyone else who would like to take the floor? I see no one, back to EIT.

Group Work.

Topic A: Prioritisation and evaluation of the Strategic Goals

Group 1 presents:

ELSA Germany: Regarding how the Network can be involved in the implementation of the goals selected by the International Board on an annual basis: We thought that we could involve them in the choosing process first, e.g. through a survey at the end of the previous term as a guideline, then force them to think about the topics, e.g. through surveys (depending on the topic). Also more knowledge transfer regarding the current goals, especially for other areas than BEE would be good, as well as compact and specific guidelines on implementation, e.g. for each area. Regarding how should the Network be informed of the selection: We could have a list of goals to focus on as a guideline at the beginning of the term and more notices/indications when something is indirectly prioritising or implementing a goal (e.g. how you choose your workshops). Regarding what mediums can the IB use to update the Network on the progress: You could mention it in the monthly reports, during international updates and introduce more notices/indications, when something is indirectly prioritising or implementing a goal (e.g. how you choose your workshops). You can also provide practical implementation mediums (e.g. if there is a new template, NGs could also use) and otherwise utilise the International Strategy Meeting and have a short written report afterwards (halfway to the yearly report).

Group 2 presents:

ELSA Switzerland: We talked about the same things as Group 1. However, we also talked about the fact that new officers at the beginning of the term might not feel as comfortable and have enough knowledge to form strategic plans and strategies, it could be clever to have these discussions in spring and summer, so the IB can know when to start. Regarding the second question, ITM could be a good option to have some discussions there, but only if it works out with the ITM and the participation increases. Regarding the mediums, newsletter, monthly reports, open up the IIMs with an update, and of course, regular open calls.

EIT: The International update is something that we have, especially in the ICMs, and we really like them.

Group 3 presents:

ELSA Germany: We said that we would like a monthly report by the IB in the existing monthly newsletter and report. We would like more concrete information about how a national board could implement something, which could be especially good for countries without a Strategic Plan. We also agreed that all the areas should be involved and that every area can join into the development, many areas did not receive the email to join the open call. Moreover, we would like the open calls to be scheduled way ahead of time. How should the network be informed, every medium possible - email, calls, in the IIMs. It would be nice for the IB to tell the national BEEs who can then spread it further, but also inform every area individually. Another thing to say is that we would like the communication to be more clear, as we did not see certain workshops be in accordance with the Strategic Plan and it would be nice to do so. Lastly, it would be nice to have a key notes document from the Strategic Plan.

AC: I have a follow-up regarding pointing out which goal it is. Did you think this in the way that the working materials would say, in this workshop we will discuss the strategic goal of accessibility which is under point 1.5.3 of the strategic plan? How did you imagine this?

ELSA Germany: We did not talk about it - we would really like to have a roadmap of the workshops in order for us to prepare better. If you put it in the workshop description and then say it again in the beginning of the workshop, it would be helpful.

EIT: If there is a goal in the working materials, do you think that the outcome section in the materials does not fulfil that purpose. Because, the point of the outcome section is to respond to that. Do you think it is lacking something?

ELSA Germany: We didn't talk about that in specific either - the consensus is that it would be great to have it stated more clearly, as it is not fulfilling the potential it has.

Group 4 presents:

ELSA Lithuania: We took this question from two sides, firstly not all the goals from the IB can be implemented at the national level, so the goals should be very broad. It would be very good to have open calls, in order for the NG to participate in the selection goals. Regarding the selection, the best way is open calls, but also the minutes, so people that couldn't attend could take a look at what IB was selected as their main goals. The mediums would be the open call, the minutes, and also the facebook groups of the different areas.

ELSA Germany: We think it would be good to spread it between areas in order to not burden the President, and allocate the goal to the area that makes most sense.

Topic B: Harmonisation of the Strategic Goals and other strategies

Group 1 presents:

ELSA Germany: Regarding if, the strategies should be aligned: We think that they should be aligned. More specific strategies can include unmentioned goals, but cannot contradict the Strategic Plan and the Financial Strategy. We should update them in the same 5 year cycle, so every five years and at the same time. The more specific strategies can have a shorter cycle, depending on how much time they need. The revision should happen at about the same time for the Strategic Plan and the Financial Strategy, as they are the baseline, and then the Public Relations Strategy, as this needs to happen fast, and the Human Resources

Strategy, as you need the people first. The Advocacy Strategy and IM-related strategies can come at a later point in time.

Group 2 presents:

ELSA Switzerland: We said as well that strategies should be aligned to not have contradictory goals and aims. It is minimising the work of the all board because you are aiming in one direction and indirectly fixing problems in other strategies. 5 years is a good timeframe to implement it. Firstly, we would have a main strategic plan and the other to support it. The financial strategy is the second priority because it has a lot of influence in other projects. And the main plan would already contain the most important key points for the other strategies.

Group 3 presents:

ELSA Germany: We agreed largely - the only thing we discussed was that the 5 years and 3 years seemed to work pretty well. We thought that if you have 5 years for the main plan and then 3 years, so you have the Financial Plan in effect one year after the main one ended, you still have a roadmap as for what you can work for financially. However, it could be difficult for the National Presidents, for example, because ELSA Denmark has a 4 year cycle and ELSA Sweden a 3 year cycle. This works for the countries, but we acknowledge that IB works differently. We also acknowledged that the Strategic Plan is the centre and the rest should be made around it.

Group 4 presents:

ELSA Lithuania: Strategies definitely should be aligned. The length of the strategies would be very good to revise it before ICM, so if anything comes up, we can update it in the spring ICM. The short term strategies should be revised first, because long term strategies cover more things, and something comes up there it is to change the short term strategies.

Chair: Any questions? Then I pass the word back to BFG.

BFG: Thank you for your input.

BFG and AC present.

Vice Chair closes the Workshop at 12:13.

13:00 – 15:00

More Energy, More Passion, More People

Participants' list:

Yordan Kyurkchyski (YK)	International Board
Michelle Henning (Chair)	ELSA Germany
Nives Edler (Vice Chair)	ELSA Switzerland
Rodrigo Prelhaz (Secretary)	ELSA Portugal
Bára Líbal (Secretary)	ELSA the Netherlands
Lovro Saraf	ELSA Croatia
Leona Rosandić	ELSA Croatia
Freja Moos Wagner	ELSA Denmark

Benita Steger	ELSA International Team
Jenny Schilpp	ELSA Germany
Charlotte Magez	ELSA Germany
Sverrir Páll Einarsson	ELSA Iceland
Ieva Sinevičiūtė	ELSA Lithuania
Jørn Ruiz Foss	ELSA Norway
Julia Kraska	ELSA Poland
Roman Szuter	ELSA Sweden
Aliena Trefny	ELSA Switzerland
Anna Piliuk	ELSA Ukraine

Vice Chair opens the workshop at 13:08.

Vice Chair: I pass the floor to ELSA International for an introductory presentation.

YK presents the context of the HR Strategy and its place amongst the other strategies,

EIT presents the HR Report - what has happened since the beginning of the term, what we are doing now and what will happen.

Vice Chair: We are opening the floor for your inputs: What do you think are HR wise the biggest problems in the network for ELSA International?

ELSA Germany: The elephant in the room is that there is a declining number of ELSA members but also ELSA officers.

ELSA Lithuania: The problem is to keep the most qualified people, most of the time the most qualified people don't have time so they can't focus on their positions.

ELSA Germany: I also think that we are facing a time in which a lot of new officers come to the network and therefore we have a knowledge management problem because of that, so that is maybe why people think they are not qualified enough.

Vice Chair: Does anyone else want to take the floor?

EIT: I would like to ask you another question: after this term ended, are you actively thinking about joining the EIT?

Generally thumbs down.

EIT: What is the main reason to not join?

ELSA Czech Republic: I think the main point why I am thinking about it but I am not sure is that there is not much information on what the EIT is doing and I am not sure whether or not I am qualified enough. Therefore, I would appreciate more information.

ELSA Norway: The main reason is that I am to finish my studies so I will not have anything with the students.

ELSA Germany: I have been in the system for a while now - it is my 3rd year now - and I want to do my ERASMUS next year and after that the "hot" phase for my studies will start and I am not sure if I can balance my studies and the EIT. Therefore, I agree with the Czech Republic that it would be nice to have more information about what the EIT does.

ELSA Sweden: I am also in the end of my studies, and I am in the end of my ELSA Career and I have been more focused on the Swedish Network and I have a lot of knowledge on the Swedish reality but not internationally, so I might stay as Director for ELSA Sweden to help in some way.

EIT: Now we are coming to group work. There will be 3 stations to work on.

EIT explains group work further.

Station A: Structure: How should the strategy be structured, models of other strategies (EI & Related associations), how concrete - with or without implementation suggestions?

Group 1

ELSA Sweden: We were discussing the strategy, it should be quite practical, it would be also good and it would be useful to have the implementation in the same document. It depends on how long term the strategy is, but 2-3 years would be good. There shouldn't be too many goals, maybe 4 to 5 bigger goals.

Group 2

ELSA Switzerland: In short, we would agree with what Group 1 said. The strategy should be as practical as possible, including trainings for the officers - maybe someone external with more knowledge in HR. One thing that was also very important for us was to have a continuous flow of evaluating the current problems and the wished scenarios of what we should do and what we should have. So as long as people know about HR, good.

Group 3

ELSA Switzerland: We mostly started by looking at other strategies, because they separate the steps of the procedure really well, we didn't reach a conclusion in the end, but the focus of the strategies should be provide as many information as possible, even though there are already description of the positions, being transparent would be good for people.

Chair: Any questions?

EIT: I have a follow up question to Group 2: you are mentioning a trainer, we are now talking about the structure, would the trainer help to draft the strategy or would be a trainer within the team?

ELSA Germany: This was a point that came up at the very end, but we stated that in general we do not have problems that are new to the world, so with the structuring of the strategy, it would be helpful to have someone external or someone from the ELSA network, who could help.

YK: Do you think it would be good to include points regarding local and national officers?

ELSA Germany: I think that depends on some aspects you keep the main focus on the international board but some implementation suggestions could still be for the national or local groups if the problem is stemming from there.

ELSA Switzerland: Just to add, that would create more sustainability, people usually start on a local level, if you had them it would create more sustainability and would attract them to the EIT.

Chair: Anything else? Then we move on to Topic B, regarding the possible solutions for the HR strategies.

Station B on Solutions - Analysis of the problems EIT (Change of the term and general structure) & IB (attractivity)

ELSA Sweden: We were discussing the ups and downs of starting earlier in the year, and we think it is okay to start earlier.

EIT: To clarify, what we mean by the current system, on the day of the appointment, by decision of this year's IB, the working period is going until the 31st of August, we are working one more month.

ELSA Sweden: We were also discussing if we should bring it earlier, and maybe if they have another position such as the NB, it is difficult to decide whether or not to go for the EIT. Then for the IB it might be difficult to start working if they get their team later in the year, thus the current time system works. When it comes to the IB, we have a note that there are some downsides, like the financial one and the fact that you need to take a break from your studies. And yes, those are things that aren't that easy to fix, so we have no concrete solutions to those downsides. But we also discussed transparency in the process itself - meetings, nominations, etc. Transparency is very good to have a meeting - open call, another idea was that it would be good to have a meeting during an IIM as you can see each other and talk to other potential candidates.

Group 2 presents:

ELSA Switzerland: On one hand, we discussed the timing of the EIT, it makes a lot of sense to have a shift of the IB terms, because it helps a lot to keep the knowledge management, there is a lot of responsibility for the IB to make sure that everyone is transitioned. We were talking about getting more people interested and being in the EIT, IB and EIT can do more to show people what we are actually doing, if they are going to stay in the National Board, if they are going to EIT. We can have some kind of campfire, in the ICM, to give people the opportunity to give to EIT members, and find out what they do. Doing it in spring will help people to know what they are going to do next year. We think that it is important that the IB have the flexibility to choose how many members their teams should have.

Group 3 presents:

ELSA Switzerland: We do not have that much to add. We are happy with the extension of one month, in regards to knowledge management and getting as much information as possible to the successor. With regard to the amount of people needed, that really depends on the team. We also thought it would be important to keep flexibility for maybe a second or a third call, as the IB member may only notice after the first few months that they need additional help. With regards to running for the IB, there are general things that might be the problem, as mentioned by group 1, and there are no solutions. But we said that it might create more transparency by seeing day-to-day tasks or work that it entails as it is far from what we are doing on the national or local level. Such as the ITM last year presented a workshop on how the work of IB looks like, I found that very interesting. This will create more transparency and a better impression of what the work entails. Also talked about the fact that if you get more people in the EIT, you will have more people that are fit to be in the IB - so maybe by tackling the problem with not enough people in the EIT will have a positive impact on the IB.

ELSA Germany: To add to that, in Germany we have a behind the scenes account, as you do. We also have a part in the newsletter, in which we tell the network what we are doing, and they enjoyed it a lot. We also tell it in the open calls. Also, the ELSA Spirit is really important, if you go to a meeting and enjoy being there, you will most likely be interested in running for IB or EIT.

Chair: Any more questions? No? Then I am opening the floor to general input regarding the results from the groups.

EIT: It is a general question that I want to have your opinion on, because it came in the last workshop, regarding transparency. If you were interested in joining the EIT, would you know where to find information, and know which people you should talk to?

ELSA Switzerland: We were talking about how to get information and how to talk to people from the EIT and find out what is going on there. We had the idea to have some kind of a coordinator, someone who could direct you towards someone, etc.

ELSA Germany: It is like matching people with the same experiences. In Germany we have a campfire talk and it is basically an open call but in person dedicated to a certain topic and they would respond to any question about the EIT and how it is to work with the IB. ELSA Portugal mentioned that could be done during the Network Day, which was suggested yesterday.

ELSA Lithuania: I wanted to mention that there was a call for EIT, I didn't even see the deadline for application. So for me, it was not enough information.

YK: The reasoning behind this is because it was intentional, in the first two calls we needed to recruit the team with some urgency, but in December we decided to open vacancies and people would apply and be interviewed on a rolling basis.

Chair: Ready for thumbs up and thumbs down? Any more input? Then moving onto the last topic

Generally thumbs in the middle.

Station C: Implementation of the Strategy (How should a control mechanism work? Own HR Report? Working Group in the final year of the implementation? How can we measure if we have achieved the goals?)

Group 1 presents:

ELSA Sweden: The first question, we discussed having a group in EIT that is responsible to control the HR Strategies in ELSA International, there were some questions on how you can regulate their work and how you can report. We concluded that it would be best that they can report directly to the Council, if the IB was against the plan. The HR Report we think that might be better with shorter reports than with bigger formal reports, that can be discussed during reports, there could not be written reports, being more informal. When it comes to the opening of the WG, it shouldn't be obligatory, and the IB could have input from the Network. A lot of what we can measure, depends on how the strategies are written, when making the strategies you would have in mind how you are measuring it.

Group 2 presents:

ELSA Switzerland: We didn't really think that there should be some sort of control organ, but it should be on a rolling basis - the network should sit together and discuss strategies, and a SWOT analysis, what went well and what did not. As well it should not be a very organisational and strict thing, such as report is. Although, the Network should be informed, the HR newsletter could be an instrument to inform about the new things and what worked or not. There should not be a working group, and only having it in the last year would not make sense. Measurements, it is not something that can be fixed in questions, but you could make arguments.

Group 3 presents:

ELSA Switzerland: We are in favour of having a control organism like an independent committee, who also has the obligation to write the HR report. This might solve the issue of people going into the unknown, with this report, it could help people to decide to apply to EIT. The EIT could fill some surveys regularly,

in order to make changes in the durations of they're work. We thought the evaluation from the IB is something very good.

EIT: You mentioned that your group is in favour of having an HR Report, but who should write it?

ELSA Switzerland: No, we did not fix any person or organisation, but it would be useful to have a collaboration between the control mechanism - IB, Director for HR, etc.

YK: I want to highlight that we have currently a feedback form of the work of the IB, if you want to submit it is totally anonymous. If you want to submit your opinion, it would be very welcome.

EIT: Thank you very much for your participation. I want to mention something, if you have any questions about the EIT feel free to contact me. Also, I would like to provide an insight, joining the EIT was the best decision I have made after leaving ELSA Germany in July.

ELSA Germany: In Group 2, we said that it would be nice, if every area got these at the start.

EIT: The HR newsletter was an idea that I brought to ELSA International this year, we talked about sending it to everyone. The thing is HR is located in the area of IM.

YK: As always, any closing reflections. Think about some of the main points you will take back to your delegation.

Vice Chair closes the Workshop at 15:03.

15:30 – 17:30

(Knowledge) Sharing is Caring

Participants' list:

Nadia Dourida (ND)	International Board
Xanthi Agoraki (XA)	International Board
Michelle Henning (Chair)	ELSA Germany
Nives Edler (Vice Chair)	ELSA Switzerland
Rodrigo Prelhaz (Secretary)	ELSA Portugal
Bára Líbal (Secretary)	ELSA the Netherlands
Lucie Nováková	ELSA Czech Republic
Freja Moos Wagner	ELSA Denmark
Jenny Schilpp	ELSA Germany
Charlotte Magez	ELSA Germany
Sverrir Páll Einarsson	ELSA Iceland
Ieva Sinevičiūtė	ELSA Lithuania
Jørn Ruiz Foss	ELSA Norway
Roman Szuter	ELSA Sweden
Aliena Trefny	ELSA Switzerland

Chair opens the workshop at 15:42

ND and XA present.

Open discussion with the guiding questions: Which materials contribute the best to our Areas? Do we need a unified approach or every area needs and thus, should have different materials?

Chair: Any inputs?

ELSA Lithuania: I am really in touch with the materials because I am also responsible for the PD area, and I don't have any background on PD, and Mavi has sent me a lot of materials and it was very informative and helped me a lot, even though I had no background.

ELSA Germany: I think it is really necessary to have different materials for different areas - in marketing, the videos could be very good, as then you can give the officers the knowledge they need to work with the programmes.

ELSA Germany: I agree that different areas might need different materials, but I still think we should have a unified structure.

ELSA Germany: One practical example, when it is great to have one shared structure is when you have a certificate of participation for NMC, and marketing wants to access them, it is easy to find them and vice versa.

ELSA Iceland: When we were creating ELSA Iceland's officers' portal, it was a great help. As a fresh group, having a general overview of what ELSA is, would be good.

XA: Thank you for your input, we wanted to have an open discussion and gather your ideas on a more general level. The way we designed the workshop is to look a bit in depth in all the different areas - capturing the knowledge, organising the knowledge and then sharing such knowledge. Now we will discuss how the knowledge is captured, thus the group work we will now have is the content of the officers portal, being handbooks, tutorials, guidelines, etc. The content of these materials per se, later on, we will talk about the structure of the officers portal, and then you are going to discuss the way that we share the information.

XA continues to present.

Group work regarding the content of the officers' portal.

Group 1's topic: BEE, MKT, PD

ELSA Iceland: We talked about BEE first, there are some general things missing about the board's management, out to engage in external relations. The general feeling is how to work with people, and this was not present. If some of the presentations of ICM could be put here, it would be nice. Regarding Marketing, most of us use Canva, and there are a lot of tutorials on Photoshop, and having it with Canva would be good. We also talked about including stock photos of events on the website. Regarding PD, some stuff has to be updated, something still talks about STEP, and for new officers, it might be confusing.

Vice Chair: If there are no further things from your group, we can move on.

Group 2's topic: AA and Competitions

ELSA Switzerland: For the areas of AA and Competitions, we just pointed out what kind of documents there were - handbooks, presentations, certificates, outlines, packages. The documents that are available are

very very useful, and we would say sufficient to implement a project or organise an event, However, we feel like there would be certain documents that could be useful - such as a video explaining the areas generally, or certain projects, such as pointing out the values. Then for, mostly Competitions, a database with cases (not with free access). Then, fact sheets or partner packages (ELSA Germany calls this a Media Card), so when you need to look for a partner for a project, you can have some kind of overview. Then some updated templates and marketing packages to also have it under the area itself. Then, draft texts or emails, if it is something that can be explained very generally, such as about the projects itself. Maybe also links to materials of other areas, to have some kind of checklist of what should be included in a privacy policy, etc.

Group 3's topic: S&C, IM, FM

ELSA Czech Republic: FM and S&C are generally more happy with the content, they both said that they have everything that they need, just need refreshments. SC would appreciate general guides for delegations. All IM agenda is moved someplace else, I would really appreciate a handbook on data protection.

Vice Chair: Thank you, giving the floor back to ELSA International.

ND explains the group work.

Group 1 presents:

ELSA Germany: We first established that there are similar structures in Officers' Portal, but there are categories that are differently named and sorted, and it would be nice to have these be alike. We also talked about how it would be good to have an introduction structure explaining what the Officers' Portal is. Maybe we could also add a forms section at the end of each area, so that people can submit questions and suggestions. The last thing we talked about was maybe converting it into a shared drive, since you can upload a lot more things like in Marketing, uploading pictures, etc.

Group 2 presents:

ELSA Switzerland: We are pretty much in agreement with what has been said. They are not unified or organised in a unified way, the names vary a lot in the folders. We think that unification is necessary, it would avoid a lot of misunderstandings - in some areas one thing is a handbook, in another, a manual. It would be better to unify this and may counter some misunderstandings. With reward to what steps should be taken - use the same terms, the system for knowledge management would try to come up with a structure and make a suggestion to the IB, then review this and try to come up with something that the IB could then organise the documents into this new structure.

ELSA Germany: A lot of the time people fill two different positions, so it would be nice if the structures were the same, so people didn't have to learn the differing ways in which the different areas are organised.

Group 3 presents:

ELSA Czech Republic: In our group, we agreed that it is not necessary for the materials to be unified as every area has different needs, so there will always be something extra. However, in the same categories - there are handbooks, so the parts that are the same, would benefit from unification. Concretely, more to IM, if you have ever seen the IM portal, there are working materials and minutes from there - we think it would be nice to have an extra page for general ELSA documents, like the OYOP, etc. would be put there, and then the IM page would be moved to the Officers' Portal as well, which would help with accessibility. Also have a short annotation under the name of the document, at least what it contains and then have the data of the document in brackets. Also ELSA Wiki should be shared. Also share the minutes from open calls or summaries

Vice Chair: Very good, thank you so much!

ELSA Switzerland: Sometimes when you click on a package it automatically downloads, sometimes leads to a drive, sometimes it just opens, it would be good that it is unified too.

ELSA Germany: For most of the marketing kits, it is actually a link to a Google Drive, and if that would be in one folder that you could access through a link, you would have everything sorted. So it would be nice to have a shared drive there.

ELSA Germany: In our group we tested whether the webinars work in the AA area - only one was playable. It would be great, if you could fix that.

XA: We discussed, in another workshop, the issue with something not opening, sometimes some things are moved so the links need to be changed. That's an actual thing that can be tackled. In the sense of, we are sort of mapping the Officers' Portal to see what is updated, what is not, to start creating a plan to update the materials. That's why we wanted to have this workshop to shed some light on what needs to be updated.

Vice Chair: If there is no further input from you on this, I will pass the floor back to ELSA International.

XA and ND continue presenting.

ELSA Switzerland: I think I speak on behalf of almost all of us, it is about consistency of if we had the manuals for IM linked there, and have still access through the portal being only available through the ELSA e-mail.

ELSA Germany: If there are things that need to be put in the drive anyways, we should just have it all there.

ELSA Czech Republic: For me, from the IM perspective, I find the OP better for ELSA Documents, like WM, you can see things more clearly, I think for things like this works very well.

ELSA Norway: For our external sponsors, it looks good to have a website to go and see a professional website.

ELSA Iceland: What are the informal materials that cannot become available?

XA: I gave an example already, such as IIM presentations from previous events but this might contain internal information, such as our problems, and we do not want people to be able to access them. Currently, we do not know how to password protect anything else but the folder of minutes. Since we have not yet figured out how to password protect such documents that might be unprofessional from an external POV or might contain info that should not be approached by the external people, we cannot do so.

ELSA Switzerland: I think it could be very useful to have a shared drive, but still maintain the OP, would be to have the basic documents in the OP, and then having a link to the shared drive. I am speaking for my area, and maybe key areas, it would be nice to have the packages for our projects, like in Marketing.

ELSA Czech Republic: I think it also depends whether the shared drives would only be for people in the NB, or also for the local officers or board members of other areas. Some time ago, I was trying to find something for PD and I had to go through presentations to find it, so I think we also need to have access to other areas as an officer.

ELSA Switzerland: I completely agree that the documents to other areas should be accessible, too many people have too much access if you extend it to locals, so if you give access only to nationals, and the nationals officers share the needed documents with their locals.

ELSA Germany: I completely agree with that, and maybe one way of doing that is for the National Group to choose whether or not they want to give their Local Groups access. It is also smart to create one big folder in general and add the areas there, so everyone has access to everything, rather than individual shared drives for each area.

ELSA Lithuania: It depends on the national board to give access to the locals or not, will the locals be in equal positions to the National Groups?

ELSA Germany: Do you mean like, the Local Groups of one National Group compared to the Local Groups of another country?

ELSA Lithuania: Yes.

ELSA Germany: I think in any case, the responsibility to bring the information to the local officers lies with the National Groups. In our case, even if we gave them access to the drive, they wouldn't use it, since there is too much information there.

ELSA Germany: I think a good example is that Germany has over 40 Local Groups, so it makes sense to compile the information for them, but then Norway has 3 local groups, so maybe it would be easier to just send them everything.

ELSA Switzerland: I am not sure that I agree, because for a specific project you as NB, you are supporting the local group. It is more helpful to give them the information they need, not share a folder with multiple documents.

XA: Do we simplify access or overcomplicate it by opening this discussion?

ELSA Switzerland: I think we need to differ between the ELSA portal in general and the documents. The portal can be accessed anyway, as it cannot be password protected, and the drive is not even shared with all the local groups anyway. I keep it at that, as it seems to work. What does not work can be changed in the future, having everything sorted is the first step we need to take.

ND: What is not shared with Local Groups?

ELSA Switzerland: the IM shared drive is just shared with the National Groups and some EIT.

ELSA Germany: Yes, it is very annoying to ask the specific officer for access, plus you do not even know what is in each drive. Only one person having access overcomplicates it.

ELSA Czech Republic: I just wanna say, for the sake of the minutes, regarding the missing materials. I think it could be good for some areas to share knowledge. In IM in the HR section, there could be testimonials from national or local groups about what recruitment strategies are working for them, so the local groups can have a clear image.

ELSA Switzerland: Regarding that, I know that at some point in the BEE area we were trying to compile knowledge from the National Group regarding IIMs, maybe that is something that IM should have as well.

ELSA Germany: That is definitely the idea behind the BEE drive, so the National Groups can share the info, but nothing is really happening there. So, per se it would be nice to have a platform, but it would probably not make that big of a difference.

Vice Chair: If there are no more inputs I will pass the floor to ELSA International.

ND continues presenting.

ELSA Czech Republic: I think it was a great workshop for us to realise what it is missing, a lot of times we don't realise until we see, it was very beneficial for both sides.

ELSA Germany: I am mainly glad that there is meant to be work done on it. Beyond that, I think it was also very helpful to get input on what are the specific ways we are missing, maybe having a form constantly open, so maybe the feedback form there would be great.

ELSA Switzerland: I really enjoyed thinking and talking about this so much. This also gives me the incentive to bring it up in our NB to maybe have our drive that we share with the locals and our private drive to work on this again.

ELSA Lithuania: I have a question, did you decide to not have ELSA Wiki no more in the Officers Portal? We use it a lot in ELSA Lithuania.

XA: There is not a specific reason to not use it because it didn't come from our board. Personally, having too many platforms for knowledge is a little difficult for us. That is why ELSA Wiki has been neglected.

XA: Thank you for your input! It was really important to know this, the IM team is mapping and planning everything.

Chair closes the Workshop at 17:27.

GROUP 3 WORKSHOP MINUTES

Thursday, 8th February 2024

10:00 – 12:00

Standards High, Pockets Empty?

Participants' list:

Yordan Kyurkchiyski (YK)	International Board
Nadia Dourida (ND)	International Board
Sebastian Kowalski (Chair)	ELSA Poland
Sílvia Shulzhyk (Vice Chair)	ELSA Portugal
Meysam Khadivi (Secretary)	ELSA the Netherlands
Aníta Lind Hlynsdóttir (Secretary)	ELSA Iceland
Paula Bačić	ELSA Croatia
Niko Anzulović Mirošević	ELSA Croatia
Markéta Řezníčková	ELSA Czech Republic
Dario Schönbacher	ELSA International
Mikko Laitinen	ELSA Finland
Ketevan Makharashvili	ELSA Georgia
Ben Gödde	ELSA Germany
Johannes Däuwel	ELSA Germany
Jorun Jeß	ELSA Germany
Marcell Gerencsér	ELSA Hungary
Ignas Čiginskas	ELSA Lithuania
Karl Rødde Opseth	ELSA Norway
Julia Johnsen Halsebø	ELSA Norway
Anna Bonander	ELSA Sweden
Lirona Sadiku	ELSA Switzerland

YK opens the workshop at 10:13.

YK and ND present Standards High, Pockets Empty?

YK opens the floor to the discussion.

ELSA Georgia: With the Quality Standards we have now, it is attainable because last year we did want to have more Participants, but the hotel did not have more rooms anymore. It always depends on the Participants. The difference is that the Participants do not expect something like this, as opposed to IIMs. We can raise the Quality Standards, and we do not think that the fee is low right now. In addition to that, I think it would be better to have lower expectations. It would definitely be easier to raise the standards in law schools as opposed to ICMs for example.

ELSA Germany: I think raising the Quality Standards is not complicated. In every IIM I remember the rooms were always for about two to three people. The expectations of the Participants need to be lowered,

but that is hard since many people would not like it. It would be hard to lower the standards that have been set since Covid.

ELSA Germany: I would like to add that we need to add a distinction about what Quality Standards we are talking about. We need to check and see in which way the Quality Standards should be raised. In my opinion, Quality Standards regarding food should be met at all times. We should focus on which Quality Standards we need to work on and what we must maintain.

ELSA Czech Republic: I don't think there is anything bad about the Quality Standards as a whole, it should be communicated in more detail. That could be a potential risk for any hosts, that they won't meet those Quality Standards. The important point with the Quality Standards is to provide detailed guidelines regarding these standards.

YK: To add more to the discussion and based on your experience, are your National Groups able to organise IIMs?

ELSA Germany: To meet the Quality Standards won't be a problem. Getting to the Quality Standards set is not hard, the problem is rather the expectations and the prices.

ELSA Finland: In Finland, you can find one or two conference hotels, but it is hard, as we organise our NCM on campsites, so, in the end, it will only work for an ISM if we stretch.

ELSA Croatia: It is easier to meet the standards and prices for IIMs even though they are much higher than for law schools.

ELSA Georgia: For us, it is easier to meet the standards for law schools because it is easier to get sponsors. It is also easier to cut prices with for example transport with fewer participants than for IIMs. For law schools, the organisation is much easier because of the sponsors.

ELSA Finland: I wanted to say something similar because for law schools you have more options with for example hotel choices.

The Chair closes the floor to the discussion.

YK: We want this ISM to be more group-oriented and we do not want to only point out issues, but to find solutions to them as well.

Discussion in groups.

ELSA Germany (Group 1): Regarding the alternative solutions for lowering the costs, we mainly talked about hosting and venues. If the accommodation would be on a camping ground, for example, that would be very hard logistically when collecting people and getting to the accommodation. One point was that resort hotels could be cheaper than conference hotels and have more options for food, but they are harder to reach. We mainly came up with the solution to lower parts of the Quality Standards to lower the Participants' expectations., maybe to hostels from five-star hotels.

ELSA Germany (Group 2): We agreed on a half-half model, moving more to an accommodation that meets the standards could help cut prices with a hotel without event rooms. There could be an option to stay in a five-star hotel for a higher participation fee. The fee could be lowered by having the workshops in university faculties. The workshops could happen in universities. That is a good half-half model, as you can either meet all standards or have the hotel without event rooms and workshops and plenaries for example in universities. The participation fee could also be broken down to a lower fee but having more stuff included as an additional fee. Some Participants skip breakfast and other parts of the program, such as the

socials. If we lower the participation fees like that, by having the food, socials, or better accommodation as optional, we will make the events more accessible.

ELSA Finland (Group 3): We talked about splitting the accommodation into different venues. Another thing we talked about is splitting the fee into two, one with accommodation included and one without but that could divide people; those who could afford accommodation and those who could not. We first thought of separating the participants over multiple hotels, because usually, the only hotels that are big enough for an IIM are the five-star hotels which just cost too much. The next point we talked about is the socials, as the standards for socials are too high.

ELSA Germany (Group 3): We also thought of organising a sponsors' fair, this way we could get sponsors more easily.

EIT: This is nice in theory, but in my experience, it does not work in praxis.

ELSA Croatia: It also does not look good in front of the sponsors if not many Participants attend.

Group work (SWOT analysis).

ELSA Croatia (Group 1): For the strengths regarding the sponsors' fairs, we added the opportunity to get sponsors but as a weakness, we added that you cannot invite national partners, hence, it is an international event. Lack of interest is a weakness as well, as something like this could come off as very off-topic. For the opportunities, we could get merch and goodie bags from sponsors at the fair. Such an event is great for the NB as well, as they could talk about potential traineeships or events together in the future. The biggest threat we saw is disappointing the sponsors, and not really showing the best side of ELSA. Such fairs also mess up the agenda.

ELSA Germany (Group 2): For us, the strengths of separate accommodations are that it would not fill up the rooms at the hotel, and that way they can receive more guests. The weakness is that it would split up people. The opportunity is that it would become cheaper in the end, as more Participants are willing to pay a lower fee for IIMs. However, the threat would be that it requires more planning and keeping track of the wishes of the Participants.

ELSA Croatia (Group 2): A strength is that this way we could potentially have more potential hosts for the IIMs and go more in the direction of the organisation of an ICE. It could also lower the costs for the OC.

ELSA Germany (Group 3): We think that the strengths of a half-half model are first and foremost lower expenses. Having plenaries and workshops held in university facilities would lower the costs. If prices get reduced, more people might be able to attend the meetings. The weakness is that many universities have different guidelines regarding the usage of their facilities for the weekend. We would also need more OC members for everything. This half-half system would lead to the Participants also seeing more of the city and strengthening the bond between the groups, as well as cultural exchange. Cutting the prices like this would make it possible to organise IIMs on the more Western side of Europe. The only threat we have is ELSA tourism, that is, people signing up just for the opportunity for a vacation and to see the different cities.

The Vice Chair opens the floor for discussions on the boundaries of the Quality Standards.

ELSA Croatia: The problems are as already mentioned not the Quality Standards but the high expectations.

ELSA Georgia: I really like the ICE model, so that everyone can decide whether they want to add accommodation or not. We are all adults and have internet, therefore it should not be a problem when not everyone is in the same hotel.

ELSA Czech Republic: We have to make the organisation of IIMs more attractive to hosts as we do not have any upcoming hosts at all. This issue could lead to having IIMs online. There could be spreadsheets and handbooks on the options available when hosting an IIMs that would make the organising more efficient.

ELSA Croatia: We have to really think about what ICMs are about. Cutting some of the standards could benefit the budget of hosts. Then it could create competition between potential hosts.

ELSA Germany: The problems stem from high expectations, not the Quality Standards. Cutting the Standards should not be an option. There might be a way to make the hosting cheaper within the existing Quality Standards. Spreading the Participants all over the city would, for example, not benefit the atmosphere of an IIM. It could be a threat to the entire network.

The Vice Chair closes the workshop at 12:04.

13:00 – 15:00

ELSA Math

Participants' list:

Adéla Chloupková (AC)	International Board
Sebastian Kowalski (Chair)	ELSA Poland
Sílvia Shulzhyk (Vice Chair)	ELSA Portugal
Meysam Khadivi (Secretary)	ELSA the Netherlands
Aníta Lind Hlynsdóttir (Secretary)	ELSA Iceland
Paula Bačić	ELSA Croatia
Niko Anzulović Mirošević	ELSA Croatia
Markéta Řezníčková	ELSA Czech Republic
Dario Schönbacher	ELSA International
Mikko Laitinen	ELSA Finland
Ketevan Makharashvili	ELSA Georgia
Ben Gödde	ELSA Germany
Johannes Däuwel	ELSA Germany
Jorun Jeß	ELSA Germany
Marcell Gerencsér	ELSA Hungary
Ignas Čiginskas	ELSA Lithuania
Julia Johnsen Halsebø	ELSA Norway
Anna Bonander	ELSA Sweden
Lirona Sadiku	ELSA Switzerland
Iris den Hartigh	ELSA the Netherlands
Karl Rødde Opseth	ELSA Norway

The Chair opens the workshop at 13:00.

AC presents ELSA Math.

Chair: Adéla is going to send you a form that consists of four questions now.

AC: You do not have to fill it out right now but please do it before the workshop ends. We want to know what you think.

Group work.

ELSA Germany (Group 1): The main problem is that the inflation is set by the European Central Bank so it doesn't fit any individual member. If we had the inflation of each country, that would be different since that would be individual calculations, easier to calculate the fees, and have a better overview. We think that such process cannot work with all the groups together, as inflation is just different in all of our countries. The conversion can be considered more.

AC: I have a question regarding the hotel price index, regarding what kind of hotels we would act as we try to be accessible to the members. Which quality should we choose to consider?

ELSA Germany: It's better to have low-quality and high-quality hotels there, a brief rate that calculates the developments in hotel accommodation.

AC: To conclude, you would look into both the rate of the European Central Bank and hotels? Should they be for law schools and IIMs together?

ELSA Croatia: I think both, that makes sense. Regarding the ELS, that is optional but for the IIMs it could be an option if you already know in advance the candidates for hosting accommodation. Hosts can, for example, decide what kind of hotels they decide to take.

AC: So you would wait for the host to apply and decide which hotel they choose?

ELSA Croatia: It depends on when the hosts choose the hotel.

ELSA Georgia: Such decisions can always change with the number of Participants. I'm just speaking from experience here.

EIT: It depends on the type of event. Having it for an ICE does not make any sense for example, as accommodation is not a part of it.

ELSA Georgia: Do we suggest that we break down the price for everything, e.g. for meals? Do we calculate the price for them separately?

ELSA Georgia (Group 2): We do not want any predictions. It would not be efficient and predictable. It might benefit the host, but at some point, it will crash with another event. So there will always be a side that will have a loss due to this. We thought of the possibility of multiple calculations as well for the two ICMs and the ISMs.

ELSA Germany: For me, the first of August would make more sense as a date, as the coming events happen after it and the fees will stay the same during the term.

ELSA Georgia: We thought about it as well, to have the calculations done on a term-by-term basis although, if the prices change drastically in the middle of the year, it might lead to host losses. In our case, the prices really change drastically in summer, but we do see the downsides.

AC: If we would consider the recalculations in August and January, would you be okay if the price you set at the beginning of the term for the spring ICM would change in January?

ELSA Croatia: I feel like this would be less of a problem, and it would benefit the hosts. The downsides of inflation are much worse. For the individual or the group, the price difference would not be that bad.

ELSA Germany: From the financial planning perspective, since the increase of fees would not change that much, it is not a big of a difference. It could be if the increase in the participation fee is higher. As the price difference would change that much, it is not a big of a difference anyway.

ELSA Finland: As changes for example for flights change drastically anyway, it would not be a big of a difference.

ELSA Finland (Group 3): We agreed that having one system is best for the events, as changing prices at every ICM just might get boring after a few times. Having such a fixed system would be beneficial. We agreed to limit profit for events as well.

AC: I have a question regarding the point that limits profit from events. How would you handle this?

ELSA Germany: Maybe by distributing the profit to students that attend the law schools.

EIT: This is not possible because of transaction fees. We cannot distribute that back.

ELSA Georgia: The policy of refunds has to be taken into consideration. We, also, even on a national level have to pay a lot for the transaction fees for refunds. I do not think that we should look at profit as a bad thing. Just because someone did good budgeting and profits, I do not think that is a problem.

ELSA Sweden: Our point was not that it is bad to profit, but the members should in the end get their money's worth, so they should not make a profit while not giving the best standard they can with their budget.

ELSA Croatia: What is the ratio of limiting the profits?

AC: I would not say that making profit is bad. It's wrong to make money out of the participants. Most of the groups that make profit make their profit with sponsors. They can then use this money to organise competitions or whatnot.

ELSA Georgia: If there would be a specific limit on profiting that does not seem like a good idea. We would not make money off the Participants if we have a good set of Quality Standards.

ELSA Georgia: Well in that sense we would have National Groups and Local Groups filling up the EDF willing to be hosts and not everyone will profit.

AC: I think it would be a good idea to put it into the EDF, but what I am skeptical about is that someone who puts much effort and work into fundraising would have to put their profit into the EDF. If someone knew that in the beginning, they probably would not put in the same effort.

ELSA Georgia: We used the profit we made from the law schools and HPMCC regional round for the ICM. It is not a profit if it gets used for other ELSA projects.

EIT: If they make good fundraising and use the profit for their events, but usually it always equals itself as no law schools that do not do fundraising do not make any profit.

Group work

ELSA Finland (Group 3): We agreed that it can always crash with something. In our opinion it's arbitrary to do the check; you just need to choose a date.

AC: Regarding the prediction, the question was more if we would be able to predict a change of, for example, 1€ of the participation fee.

ELSA Croatia: When said, no because any side can be at a disadvantage at one point. Problems will be connected to who will be responsible in the end if the prediction ends up wrong.

ELSA Georgia: What if we choose one date for the calculation of the data available and increase prices to that data?

ELSA Germany: Don't you think any host would turn to ELSA International anyway regarding such requests? That circles back to multiple calculations.

AC: I was already thinking about this calculation last year with the organisation of the ISM, where the increase was even higher than 1€. There will always be someone that will be affected. However, I see the issue if the calculations are done on the 1st of January. We still do not have a perfect way to go through with this, but the maximum price should not be changed throughout a term.

ELSA Germany: If any problems occur, the National Group could just turn to EIT for recalculations.

ELSA Germany (Group 1): With a limit for profit of events we disagree, because in the end they would have been audited and the process seems more complicated than it would benefit us.

ELSA Germany (Group 2): First of all, we were thinking which indexes would be used best to calculate the fees. We thought about the possibility of considering the food price index, and if the inflation rate would be a good factor for calculating. Food is only a fraction of what is involved though. The recalculation should be based on the inflation rate of the member country, and future recalculations should be based on the average inflation height.

AC: I have a question regarding recalculations, when would it be the exact time to limit the calculations? When the possible hosts are applying or when the application period opens?

ELSA Croatia: I think it is better to do it when the application period opens.

ELSA Germany: How are recalculations taking place currently, when they are raised or when the applicants apply? How are they connected to the average inflation rate?

AC: Right now it is done the way it is regulated in the Decision Book, when the application period opens. Everything is mentioned in the hosting agreement.

ELSA Germany: If you do not see a problem with the current system, maybe it is just better to keep the current one.

AC: You will now talk about the topic you have not talked about yet in your groups.

Group work.

ELSA Germany (Group 1): We would prefer one calculation for the autumn ICM and one for the spring ICM.

ELSA Georgia: Is it not the ISM the IIM mostly affected by this?

AC: No, it just depends on how the calculations are in the middle of the year.

ELSA Croatia (Group 2): We agree with group one.

ELSA Germany (Group 3): We believe that the food price index and hotel price index should definitely be considered.

Closing reflections by AC.

The Vice Chair closes the workshop at 15:00.

15:30 – 17:30

United we Stand, Divided we Pay

Participants' list:

Bjarki Fjalmar Guðjónsson (BFG)	International Board
Xanthi Agoraki (XA)	International Board
Sebastian Kowalski (Chair)	ELSA Poland
Sílvia Shulzhyk (Vice Chair)	ELSA Portugal
Meysam Khadivi (Secretary)	ELSA the Netherlands
Aníta Lind Hlynsdóttir (Secretary)	ELSA Iceland
Paula Bačić	ELSA Croatia
Niko Anzulović Mirošević	ELSA Croatia
Markéta Řezníčková	ELSA Czech Republic
Dario Schönbacher	ELSA International
Mikko Laitinen	ELSA Finland
Ketevan Makharashvili	ELSA Georgia
Ben Gödde	ELSA Germany
Johannes Däuwel	ELSA Germany
Jorun Jeß	ELSA Germany
Marcell Gerencsér	ELSA Hungary
Ignas Čiginskis	ELSA Lithuania
Karl Rødde Opseth	ELSA Norway
Julia Johnsen Halsebø	ELSA Norway
Anna Bonander	ELSA Sweden
Lirona Sadiku	ELSA Switzerland
Flavia Lehmann	ELSA Switzerland
Thibault Aktay	ELSA Belgium

The Chair opens the workshop at 15:33.

BFG and XA present United we Stand, Divided we Pay.

Does the division between the favoured and non-favoured countries represent the financial imbalance present in our network?

BFG opens the floor for discussion.

ELSA Norway: The operation of the favoured and non-favoured countries mostly depends on the Local Groups and the National Groups. S&C overlooks the operation of the SELS and WELS. Regarding the IIMs, it really depends on the economic state of the member country as well, and the situation is not great, as most of us have to cover more of the participation fee.

ELSA Germany: It is a bit hard to conclude from a financial perspective that a country is not performing well in comparison to other countries. If the economic situation in the country is not 100% well, it is not fitting to the organisation, but more to the individual members.

ELSA Germany: I'm not sure if I can answer this with the current knowledge I have but maybe adding to that, it is quite a hard time answering the question without actually knowing the data.

ELSA Czech Republic: I think it depends on the kind of event we are talking about. For ICMs it is effective. It helps the National Groups to represent themselves at the meeting. But for law schools members from non-favoured countries tend to be rather chosen than members from favoured countries. We need to find other solutions and a new way to help them.

ELSA Belgium: The first question we should ask ourselves is whether there should be any distinction to begin with.

ELSA Georgia: From what I have seen, there are not many members from favoured countries at IIMs, and in general, there are not many applications or rather good applications coming from them. There should also be a way to check the memberships of members from these countries, as many of these applicants are not ELSA members but only use this opportunity.

ELSA Czech Republic: To expand on that point, there are a lot of law school applicants from non-favoured countries who don't explicitly know whether they come from a favoured country or not. It can be confusing to know which countries are favoured and which are not.

EIT: The application form actually states which countries are favoured or not. You can see that in the application sheet. And to Kety, you cannot directly check the membership status of the applicants.

XA: You could easily get the hint in the applications if the applicants are members or not.

Does the fact for the past two years there's a need for groups to move to another category indicate anything about the way the division is calculated?

ELSA Germany: This is rather problematic in my opinion, because it is very unusual for such drastic changes to occur in such close timespans.

BFG: While that has not really been an issue. An example would be ELSA Türkiye who requested to be considered a favoured country even though they are not always under the limit. But such jumps usually do not happen.

ELSA Germany: Connecting to that, what is the trend you've been seeing for the past years with non-favoured and favoured countries moving from list to list?

XA: An example is Montenegro which came back to the non-favoured countries, but the situation with Türkiye makes us a bit concerned about the current process.

ELSA Germany: The question is more aimed towards if you have doubts that the system is working as it should be, especially when countries are proposing to move.

BFG: Think about why you think the division exists and the reasoning for the division for non-favoured and favoured countries comes from and how it can be rationalised.

ELSA Belgium: In my opinion, the division was created with a good intention, to provide opportunities to ELSA Members from countries where the financial situation might be a bit more complicated. But in practice, the result is the opposite and leads to discrimination. Law Schools are expensive, and when people from favored countries apply, the people who select will have a tendency to discriminate and take applicants from non-favored countries because they bring in a bigger cash flow. So, in the end, favored countries start with a pretty big disadvantage. In addition, if we have like 20 participants from favored countries who apply, and who have excellent profiles, we just cannot take them due to financial reasons. It would make us lose hundreds if not thousands of euros, whereas that could have been avoided by taking non-favored countries. The problem is less about money, but about the fact that, indirectly, they will be discriminated against, even though the initial intention was to give them a better opportunity. I also would like to highlight that this is what ELSA Belgium believes with regards to Law School only, not International Meetings. For IIMs, we want to keep the distinction. But for law schools, we want to remove it.

ELSA Georgia: The distinction is the only reason for more applicants applying to law schools. If there is no distinction, then they don't apply.

ELSA Germany: Rejecting applicants from favoured countries is not acceptable only for the amount of money that they pay for ELS. The distinction is one part of the accessibility of meetings in ELSA. It would be wrong to use this as an excuse for applicants to visit these ELS and then being rejected.

ELSA Belgium: What I am talking about is only about law schools, not the ICMs, and Ben I agree with you, but we just cannot select them because otherwise, it would just be bad for the budget and we don't have the financial means. For applicants who come from favored countries, if you add up the law school cost with the airplane tickets, it can easily amount to 700. It's already a luxurious opportunity, so people who pay for it have the means. For them, a 50 euro difference is still significant compared to other countries, but in the bigger picture, it is not. For us, if we take 20 people from favored countries, that's a loss of 50 euros times 20, so 1000euros.

ELSA Georgia: 50€ is a month's rent here, therefore it really is a factor that gets them to apply.

ELSA Georgia: I think that the fact that they are allowed to pay less could be what gets them to apply. We receive applications from favoured countries as well and some of them are neighbouring countries. They shouldn't be put in a position where they can't apply. Grants from the EDF could be an option to help these applicants.

ELSA Germany: For countries like ours 50€ does not seem like much but it can be much. Is there maybe a table with data which really states if the situation is the same for other law schools?

ELSA Croatia: This is a question for ELSA Belgium. Are they automatically accepting members from non-favoured countries and alumni that apply to the law schools?

ELSA Belgium: Of course not, we oversee all of the applications. We obviously look at the quality of profiles. But if two people have excellent profiles that are more or less the same in terms of quality, we are definitely going to take the one that pays more. And to answer to the comment “just don’t discriminate”: it’s a bit idealistic to answer that. You can tell that to the people in the room, and some of us might be like “okay fine we’ll stop”, but good luck telling that to all the head of participants from all law schools. They won’t even know we talked about this at the ISM. They will do what’s best for the local group, which is to not financially jeopardise themselves, and indirectly, it will lead to inevitable discrimination.

ELSA Switzerland: In general, the problem is not the division but the selection process.

BFG continues the presentation.

BFG passes the floor to XA.

XA continues the presentation.

Group work.

ELSA Georgia (Group A): We had to take a look at the issue budget-wise. Unlike law schools, you know how many participants you will have at IIMs and also a bigger budget to manage everything. For law schools it is much different, the budget is different, smaller, and differ from country to country. While on one hand, the law schools might have additional fees, such as speakers and academic programmes, some law schools even get sponsorships. For some groups, it might be easier to organise IIMs while it could be easier for other groups to organise ELS.

ELSA Germany (Group B): We dealt with the qualitative issues. We were against a strict quota as it could lead to too many good applications not being selected for a law school. Concerning other mechanisms, we thought about if the law schools could publish their criteria and then it will be easier to see whether a breach has occurred. We thought about the option of appealing and investigating so that measures could be taken.

ELSA Germany (Group C): We had a more lengthy discussion about which problem we should tackle and came to the conclusion that the favoured and non-favoured division is not the problem but rather the selection process where the discrimination is happening. There should be more control on the selection process. We had a discussion about which problem we should tackle. It is the selection phase where discrimination is happening, we do not have enough insights to make any more decisions.

Group work

ELSA Germany (Group A): The strengths of the anonymisation are that it would be easier for the applicants to get into the law schools. The weaknesses on the other hand are that it would take too much time and would not be practical. We did not find any opportunities. A threat is that the process could backfire right back at us, with GDPE issues and liabilities. For the non-discrimination agreement, there is a possibility of penalties but there is not much of a benefit coming from it. We could have punishments for discriminating, but there are no clear ways to check if they have been discriminating.

ELSA Germany (Group B): In terms of reporting breaches to the consul, we did not find any strengths. It would just bring a bad mood to the ICM and would make a new board be faced with consequences because of their predecessors., especially if it’s a single group that gets singled out from the others. It would also just be a report with no real consequences. In terms of the appeal process, the strengths are that it would bring diversity to the procedure. The weakness would be the bureaucracy. Opportunities with the appeal process could be better quality management for the law schools. On the other hand, there could be possible sabotaging.

ELSA Germany (Group C): For the quota, the strengths are that it is easy to understand and to handle. It fights against discrimination, but possibly less qualified applicants would be selected. It could also enhance the workload and therefore special attention needs to be paid to it. On the clarification of diversity, we didn't find any strengths or weaknesses but it makes the selection criteria more comprehensive.

Conclusion and results.

ELSA Georgia: No matter which solutions we apply we still can't call them solutions. Every solution we discussed creates more problems and it might be different from one group to another.

ELSA Germany: Regarding the solutions and this short period of time it's not feasible to have good solutions but it is a good start to have this discussion. I am happy and thankful that the vast majority of this group sees the problems and wants to protect members from discrimination. We all see that the financial accessibility with which we tried to assist is not the issue, but rather the discrimination in the selection process. It is just important to go further with it.

ELSA Croatia: I believe that we went through some better and some worse propositions to find a solution to this discrimination issue. Maybe we should look into how other companies or associations do quotas.

XA: To conclude this on my side, we know that the problems come from the practice that has been developed in the past years. We needed to know what your stance on this is; it takes time, and we will have to see how we deal with it. It's our duty to improve.

The Chair closes the workshop at 17:03.

Friday, 9th February 2024

10:00 – 12:00

For the Plot!

Participants' list:

Bjarki Fjalmar Guðjónsson (BFG)	International Board
Nadia Dourida (ND)	International Board
Sebastian Kowalski (Chair)	ELSA Poland
Sílvia Shulzhyk (Vice Chair)	ELSA Portugal
Meysam Khadivi (Secretary)	ELSA the Netherlands
Aníta Lind Hlynsdóttir (Secretary)	ELSA Iceland
Paula Bačić	ELSA Croatia
Niko Anzulović Mirošević	ELSA Croatia
Markéta Řezníčková	ELSA Czech Republic
Dario Schönbacher	ELSA International
Mikko Laitinen	ELSA Finland
Ketevan Makharashvili	ELSA Georgia
Ben Gödde	ELSA Germany
Johannes Däuwel	ELSA Germany
Jorun Jeß	ELSA Germany
Ignas Čiginskis	ELSA Lithuania
Karl Rødde Opseth	ELSA Norway
Julia Johnsen Halsebø	ELSA Norway
Anna Bonander	ELSA Sweden
Lirona Sadiku	ELSA Switzerland
Lydie Restauri	ELSA Switzerland

The Chair opens the workshop at 10:06.

ND and BFG present For the plot!

The Chair opens the floor for discussion.

No inputs.

Group work.

The groups present their results.

ELSA Germany (Group 1): The ISM can focus on possible proposals that would come up at ICMs. These meetings should include high-level discussions that are mainly for the network. Whatever we discuss should define topics on Strategic Planning. We should clarify the aim and goals of the discussions and have a beneficial overview of the progress of the Strategic Planning. Structural changes or board reforms should not be talked about at an ISM, but rather in pre-ICM calls. It would have been great if we had been informed about the detailed topics earlier and received a more detailed preparation. We also think that it could be

helpful to fill out a suggestion form about possible topics at the ISM, maybe after the autumn ICM. The discussions at the ISM should be around our strategy, as the name suggests.

ELSA Germany (Group 2): We should have more high-level discussions at ISMs and ICMs and should be informed about what the discussions should deal with. There should be more transparency at the ISM, where the Participants brainstorm for the next ICM or next Strategic Plans. The main focus should be on Strategic Planning and the implementation and evaluation of the Strategic Goals. Knowing what the discussions are about and helping the National Groups with their strategic plans would be great as well.

ELSA Germany (Group 3): Discussions at ISMs should lead to decisions at ICMs and as the other groups suggested, it would be great to be informed about detailed topics earlier, in order to have more fruitful discussions. There should be updates on the current Strategic Plan and the implementation of the Strategic Goals. It would be beneficial if the workshops would be more detailed. We suggested having a final debrief online after the ISM as well. That way non-attendees would be updated and informed about the results.

The Chair opens the floor for discussion.

ND: I see you all mostly agree with each other about us being more communicative regarding the ISMs. I have a question for group 2, Ben, when you spoke about implementing the Strategic Goals on a national level, what did you mean exactly by that?

ELSA Germany: Not implementing the whole Strategic Plan but parts of it. For example, financial accessibility goals can be transferred on a national level. There could be discussions about the main Goals of the international strategy on a national level.

ELSA Georgia: I have a question regarding the final debrief for group three. Wouldn't the National Groups get confused, as they do not know how exactly the workshops were? As the meeting is minuted, that should be enough.

ELSA Germany: I see the point here although looking at the daily debrief from yesterday, it is quite constrained.

ELSA Germany: I agree in the sense that if you know the Workshop Materials beforehand, you'll get a more detailed overview of what is being discussed. Then people will understand the final debrief better. It is a way to make the ISMs more accessible and more groups will be brainstorming, even though they didn't attend.

ND: I have a question regarding the Strategic Planning. What is the specific thing you would want from us at the ISM when it comes to updates on the Strategic Planning, how the planning is going, what steps the IB has taken, and the overview?

ELSA Croatia: It should remain with the spirit of brainstorming, but we should have more information to have more fruitful discussions.

ELSA Germany: I agree, that there should be discussions on possible implementations and steps for the future that the IB has in mind.

ELSA Georgia: We should talk about issues that we have that are relevant to the Strategic Plan or any topics connected to IIMs.

ND: One last question on the suggestion of a form prior to the ISM. Would you like to elaborate more on that? Do you think it will make the ISM more efficient? Do you think that getting involved in decisions is something you want for ISMs?

ELSA Georgia: I think it would make the IB's life easier to already know what exactly parts of the network think about potential ideas. There might be topics that are hidden, in the sense that there could be topics that everyone would like to discuss but are not mentioned in the Working Materials. Therefore I'd appreciate such a form.

The groups continue to present their results.

ELSA Germany (Group 1): We think that three guaranteed spots are enough for the ISM and groups can usually have bigger delegations in the end. The area-mixed workshops enable the IB to get resources, topics, and commitments from different perspectives. There should not be a lack of expertise. The National Groups can discuss the topics that will be brought up at the ISM before the event. Daily debriefs have proven to be very good as they connect everything that has been talked about in all of the workshops. The ISMs should correlate with the Strategic Planning cycle. The discussions could be on the implementation of certain Strategic Goals and also where the network or the IB stands on Strategic Planning.

ELSA Germany (Group 2): ISMs are better for fruitful discussions with all of the groups because of the atmosphere. The problem is not the three spots, but rather making the ISM more attractive to all of the National Groups, as 29 of these groups are not present here. The time span of the future ISMs could be about possible adjustments to the Strategic Plan, mid-recap on the achievements of the Strategic Plan, and finalisation on regulations from the previous plans.

ELSA Croatia (Group 3): Very similar to the previous groups, we think the workshop structure is great, but we think that the structure of the daily debrief should be changed. We don't think the time for the daily debrief is the best, and it should not be a long workshop. The discussions are very strict as we get a narrow topic to talk about, but we cannot really talk about other topics that might arise in discussions. The guaranteed three spots are not a problem since not that many groups are present here in comparison with the ICMs. Three IIMs could be too much for some groups. We think that the workshop preparation materials are very vague and they do not seem to be useful to the National Groups to prepare for them in contrast to the Working Materials for the ICMs. Sometimes officers could feel like they are inventing answers or opinions on the spot without the backing of other board members. The ISM should deal with the strategy of EI and possibly its implementation in the National Groups.

The Chair opens the floor for discussion.

BFG: I have a question regarding the goals of the discussions, could you elaborate on that point?

ELSA Germany: Sometimes we start discussions without knowing what they are supposed to lead to, it would be better if it would be communicated a bit more.

ELSA Georgia: We can do that by communicating in the workshop and therefore getting a general idea of the goals ourselves so that we know where the discussion should lead to.

ELSA Czech Republic: Sometimes I am not sure how big of an issue some discussion points are, therefore it would be better to be informed more about the situation.

ELSA Croatia: It is quite an issue that there is little to no time to discuss certain topics with the rest of the board. A simple solution would be to switch the daily debrief and reporting time in the agenda.

ELSA Georgia: I personally like how the agenda is as it is right now, that is reporting time and then the daily debrief. It is a good time for the National Groups to discuss and prepare for the daily debrief.

ND: Regarding the goals part you mentioned, I know what you mean. The issue is that it is not a problem that should be solved, sometimes we just want to leave it to the network now as to which direction we should go. Secondly, regarding the daily debrief, I see both sides of this discussion. We will consider the points.

ELSA Germany: Regarding the first part, it would also just tell us that something is not an issue and that you just want to brainstorm with us for example. Just knowing the direction would be great. That way we could work more concretely and effectively to the results if we actually know whether it is a pressing matter or not.

BFG: Just to elaborate, keep in mind that the discussions do not only deal with one thing, they are usually a list of topics we would touch upon. There is not always a set of problems that need to be solved. The discussions help us to get a holistic sense of what the network is thinking.

ELSA Georgia: We understand that we are not having any discussions about big issues all the time but what we are saying is that you could define the aim of the workshops. Leading us would be great to have more fruitful discussions.

The groups continue to present their results.

ELSA Germany (Group 1): The IB should be able to work out everything after hopefully getting the position of the network. We think that the five days are good but one of the days could be potentially cut off. The group work time could also be more efficient.

ELSA Germany (Group 2): Urgent matters that need to be dissolved should be talked about here, otherwise only strategical matters. For us five days is too much, we prefer four days. The workshops can be quite long, especially the last workshop of the day. Also, not every group has to go through each question. They could base their answers on the other ones that have already been brought forward.] Regulating that the workshop should be minuted is also something we agreed on. That way the IB and National Groups can look up what has already been discussed.

ELSA Croatia (Group 3): The outcome should be helping the IB with their proposals by presenting our positions on certain topics. By shortening the ISM, maybe more National Groups would join and we think that four days would be better. Even cutting the gala ball and the sightseeing is something we agreed on. That could also be beneficial regarding the financial aspects of hosting. It is logical that the IB will be able to work more efficiently if more National Groups come. Planning an ISM should be a step from the structure of the ICM. The event and the workshops could be a little more informal. We also agreed that pre-ISM calls would benefit upcoming discussions at ISMs. The Participants would be better prepared for the discussions at the workshops and it would benefit people who could not attend likewise. The topics and goals of the workshops could have a more specific outline. It could be feasible if the daily debriefs were held online so the entire network could be in the discussion.

The Chair opens the floor for discussion.

ELSA Georgia: About skipping some of the agenda items, I agree. We don't necessarily need to follow the typical agenda of the ICMs hence, they are two different events. However, such points could help the OCs with fundraising.

ELSA Finland: Regarding the length of the ISM, we need to remember that having a secure agenda with three full days of workshops could be better instead of having people travel from all over requiring to ask for more days off from Uni or work. This way, it is more of a practical meeting with more attendance.

ND: Regarding the group work and what groups one and two said, how do you think this session went? Was it approachable or would you change anything?

ELSA Norway: I think this session was very approachable and easy to deal with. Everyone got to discuss the points that were brought up and contribute with their answers.

BFG: I do see the merits of both the preparation calls and the approach to the reporting and the daily debriefs, I just want to mention that participation in pre-calls is very low. People tend to skip these calls. We need to make them more attractive and get them to participate.

The Chair closes the workshop at 12:01.

13:00 – 15:00

5 Days of Autumn, 7 Days of Spring

Participants' list:

Adéla Chloupková (AC)	International Board
Sebastian Kowalski (Chair)	ELSA Poland
Sílvia Shulzhyk (Vice Chair)	ELSA Portugal
Meysam Khadivi (Secretary)	ELSA Netherlands
Aníta Lind Hlynsdóttir (Secretary)	ELSA Iceland
Paula Bačić	ELSA Croatia
Niko Anzulović Mirošević	ELSA Croatia
Markéta Řezníčková	ELSA Czech Republic
Dario Schönbacher	ELSA International
Mikko Laitinen	ELSA Finland
Ketevan Makharashvili	ELSA Georgia
Ben Gödde	ELSA Germany
Johannes Däuwel	ELSA Germany
Jorun Jeß	ELSA Germany
Marcell Gerencsér	ELSA Hungary
Ignas Čiginskas	ELSA Lithuania
Julia Johnsen Halsebø	ELSA Norway
Lirona Sadiku	ELSA Switzerland
Lydie Restauri	ELSA Switzerland
Karl Rødde Opseth	ELSA Norway
Irina Mykhalkiv	ELSA Ukraine
Iris den Hartigh	ELSA the Netherlands

The Chair opens the workshop at 13:03.

AC presents 5 Days of Autumn, 7 Days of Spring.

The Chair opens the floor for discussion.

ELSA Georgia: I was wondering if there is similar feedback for the Spring ICM, and whether the ICM should be longer. At some point, seven days would be enough for the Spring ICM.

AC: I personally don't have access to the evaluation forms so I don't know how it was handled last year but I can definitely ask and mention it during the daily debrief.

ELSA Poland: We were talking about this in our board. In our opinion, two ICMs with one being shorter is not enough. We need more ICMs. At ICM Tbilisi we, for example, did not have enough time for discussions in the workshops. Even if it's only for the proposals, the Autumn ICM should be longer than 5 days.

ELSA Czech Republic: We see the same way because an ICM and the travelling connected to it takes up a whole week anyway. If it would be longer, we would have more time to discuss, more time to rest, and to network.

ELSA Georgia: I personally think that we need more than two ICMs, whether they are short or not. However, doing this would lead to the ICM not being as accessible for everyone, as these two extra nights could just be too much for some National Groups. Even if the Autumn ICM would be seven days or a month-long, we would never be able to solve the topics that need to be discussed. Certain topics are repeated several times, as the minutes show. There should be more room for discussion and the workshops and topics could be limited. Improving the current structure is better than elongating it.

EIT: They should get longer. The past two Autumn ICMs showed us that this system just cannot work. We don't have enough time to interact with each other. We don't really have time for icebreakers in general, as this is the first international meeting of the year. It also makes sense to include training sessions in the ICMs but then there would not be enough time for the workshops.

ELSA Georgia: The icebreaking part is covered by the ITM. Having the ICMs accessible should be the network's priority. However, there is a lack of interest in online meetings. For example, there are 15 NGs present at this ISM and that speaks for itself.

ELSA Germany: We should evaluate what should be discussed at the ICMs. We do not think that ICM is the correct place for knowledge management, as it is the network's main decision organ. The focus should be on decision-making and preparation for decisions at the Spring ICM. We should rather change the structure of the workshops rather than the whole system.

AC: First of all, I will follow up on the last point on the evaluation of the workshops. There are some workshops that are needed. Many of the workshops had to be shortened as there were mandatory workshops which did not leave any room for other discussions. Not everything fits in there correctly. Regarding the knowledge management discourse, I agree that the ICM should mainly be about decision-making and discussions about future decisions. However, it is needed to improve knowledge management as not all officers are on the same level. I would like to point out regarding the repeated topics, the topics mainly depend on you and your preparation. It is my sixth year in ELSA and there are always the same reoccurring topics, same arguments, same sides; we also add the pages you need to read for any topic in the Working Materials. The workshops of the ITM do not really have enough Participants which leads to some topics having to be talked about at the ICM.

ELSA Germany: Some knowledge management workshops just deal with discussions about events that could be outsourced to open calls. It's just about seeing what can be outsourced and what not. The discussions in the workshops should be about the changes that we could make in the network.

Group work

The groups present their results.

ELSA Georgia (Group 1): We kept going with 5 days, however starting earlier than usual. LoA is at 1 pm and correlates with lunchtime as LoA is usually only done in an online format. The mid-plenary starts in the early morning so that there is enough time for preparation and gala dinner. We did not want to have ELSA Vision before the gala dinner. Sightseeing is in the morning after the gala dinner. The sponsors' fair moves to the last day between two final plenary blocks as a surprise fair. Everything else stayed the same as ICM Tbilisi. The official days should be used to their maximum.

The Chair opens the floor for discussion.

AC: I have two questions. Firstly, what do you mean by surprise sponsors' fair? Secondly, sometimes the final plenary takes longer than planned because of discussions. Have you thought about moving some things from the final plenary to other days?

ELSA Georgia: With the surprise sponsors' fair, we thought that most of the people skip the sponsors' fair. It might be hard to convince the possible sponsors to sponsor the event if no one will show up for their presentations. Moving the agenda in the final plenary requires additional workshops the day before. In an ideal world, if we don't have as many proposals as we have in the mid-plenary, that could be the case for some of the presentations. Most of the things should stay in the final plenary.

ELSA Germany: Maybe surprise is the wrong word. We just wanted the sponsors' fair to be in a time frame where everyone is already there so that there are enough Participants present.

ELSA Croatia: I have a comment regarding moving the opening plenary to two. We would have a problem with accessibility here, as some National Groups would have to book an extra night in order to get there in time.

ELSA Georgia: We all agreed on the fact that many already skipped the opening plenary, therefore we thought that starting at 2 pm would at least benefit the timetable. People usually have the night already booked if they are arriving for the opening plenary.

ELSA Sweden: Those who are determined to go to the opening plenary use the night before to travel. We actually spend the night before travelling anyway, so I think it is a nice idea.

The groups continue with their presentations.

ELSA Germany (Group 2): We left Wednesday as it is. Adding another day adds a lot more work for the OC and then it would be more cost intensive. The Participation fees are already high so that's why we were reluctant to do that. The workshops start at 9 am instead of 10 am. We put the closing workshop on Sunday morning, right before the final plenary, which starts an hour later as people are usually present at the closing workshop.

ELSA Georgia: The idea for switching the gala with the Vision is that otherwise, we would just have one working block between two social blocks.

ELSA Finland (Group 3): Our ICM starts on Tuesday instead of Wednesday, as many have to get home on Sunday as they have work or university on Monday. The sponsors' fair is on the first day. Our sightseeing is on Thursday in the morning [and the gala is on Friday. We do not have a mid-plenary and would put everything in the final plenary which is longer this time. At the Autumn ICMs, there are generally fewer proposals so it might be possible to fit everything in the final plenary.

ELSA Georgia: I think we would have to have lunch on Sunday as the plenary is very lengthy. ICMs are for decision-making, so dropping the mid-plenary altogether leads to a lot having to be done for the final plenary. When starting on Tuesday, everyone would have to take four vacation days instead of three.

ELSA Croatia: I think putting the open plenary for 1 pm would be logistically very hard. Check-ins at hotels are usually at 3 pm. You wouldn't have a place to change before the opening plenary. That would be very inconvenient.

AC: I have two concerns, first regarding the first day with the freshers in officers workshops. Some officers are nowhere to be found before the opening workshop. Secondly, about the mid-plenary. The mid-plenary was really long this time and took 7 hours. Fitting this in the final plenary would not be feasible.

ELSA Finland: We did not look at the timetables specifically. But we could move some of the topics to the opening plenary, for example, the sponsors' fair.

Group work

The groups present their results.

ELSA Norway (Group 1): We talked about our experience, mostly about the overwhelming experience at first. As for the help from the IB, we feel like the IB really wants to help, but people are not attending the pre-ICM calls.

ELSA Croatia: If we want to cut off some knowledge management stuff, we agreed that we would need more open calls.

ELSA Georgia (Group 2): We mostly discussed how we prepare for the ICM. For example, we usually discuss with Local Groups what they think about the proposals and have meetings within the National Group. We attend open calls and read the Working Materials over together. We appreciate the support from the IB but ITM is not really a place for preparation for the ICM.

ELSA Germany (Group 3): For us, the officers go through their parts of the Working Materials and after the ICM we send a report to the German network. We have meetings within the delegation where we discuss possible amendments and have a general briefing. Open calls depend on the area.

The Chair opens the floor for discussion.

AC: In the ITM, one of the workshops could have been a preparation for discussions in an ICM. Open calls differ always from area to area, for example in PD they have planned out open calls until the end of the term, but I do not think this is feasible for FMers.

ELSA Germany: The point is regarding having open calls for later due to the preparation for the ICM, I know that there was an open call for the proposals.

AC: It depends on the previous board if they are willing to prepare open calls before the ICM.

Closing and reflections.

The Chair closes the workshop at 15:07.

15:30 – 17:30

How to Train Your Officer

Participants' list:

Yordan Kyurkchiyski (YK)	International Board
Xanthi Agoraki (XA)	International Board
Sebastian Kowalski (Chair)	ELSA Poland
Sílvia Shulzhyk (Vice Chair)	ELSA Portugal
Meysam Khadivi (Secretary)	ELSA the Netherlands
Aníta Lind Hlynisdóttir (Secretary)	ELSA Iceland
Paula Bačić	ELSA Croatia
Niko Anzulović Mirošević	ELSA Croatia
Markéta Řezníčková	ELSA Czech Republic
Dario Schönbacher	ELSA International
Mikko Laitinen	ELSA Finland
Ketevan Makharashvili	ELSA Georgia
Ben Gödde	ELSA Germany
Johannes Däuwel	ELSA Germany
Jorun Jeß	ELSA Germany
Ignas Čiginskas	ELSA Lithuania
Julia Johnsen Halsebø	ELSA Norway
Karl Rødde Opseth	ELSA Norway
Lydie Restauri	ELSA Switzerland
Iryna Mykhalkiv	ELSA Ukraine

The Chair opens the workshop at 15:32.

YK and XA present How to Train Your Officer and the history of the ITM.

YK opens the floor for discussion.

ELSA Georgia: In our National Group, we often talk about the ITM and who would participate from the national board and we also do open calls for our local officers. One of the biggest topics is the topics chosen and the attractiveness of some topics always depends on the National Group. For those who have attended ITM, it was too much of an introductory nature since they already have the transition period covered. The biggest problems of the ITM are the topics, they are too introductory and focus a lot on knowledge management. On an international level, there should not be an introduction to the association but instead high-topics that lack knowledge, for example, ROLE. When you hear the name 'International Training Meeting', you expect more trainings and fewer workshops. The lack of attendance stems from the fact that it's an online meeting.

ELSA Germany: You would like the topics to be more in-depth? How would you find the balance there?

ELSA Georgia: $\frac{2}{3}$ of the event should be allocated to the trainings and the rest to workshops. The workshops should be an introduction to the areas and a more detailed discussion on knowledge management.

ELSA Czech Republic: From the PD standing point, we have regular monthly open calls with Nadia to know what is happening in the PD section. The workshops in the ITM are very basic knowledge. I however liked the training since I gained soft skills.

ELSA the Netherlands: The attendance at the ITM was very low last year. The biggest problem is that it is seen as a transition meeting. The topics should be more in-depth and should not correlate with topics that are talked about in the ICM anyway.

ELSA Croatia: We have a different take on attendance problems as we include penalties if members of the delegation do not visit the workshops. The current approach to the ITM is the problem of low attendance. The freshers may not have the drive yet and are not ready to sit through five days of online meetings. More trained officers see ITM as too introductory. The current approach is not targeted to either of the two demographic groups.

ELSA Czech Republic: We should maybe do a survey next term to see which countries are going to attend in order to tailor the workshops to them.

ELSA Georgia: I have a direct comment to Nico (ELSA Croatia). The idea is to encourage more in-depth workshops. Every National Group of course has a different stage of knowledge about ELSA, it is still needed to add more in-depth knowledge management workshops. The national officers are supposed to take care of the knowledge management of the local officers and in most cases, the national officers are a part of the delegation in the ITM.

YK: I have a direct comment to Marketa (ELSA Czech Republic). As of this year, we have the statistics, so we exactly know how many from which groups participated.

ELSA Croatia: ITM is less than an IIM because of its purpose. The topic is about ELSA but you are trying to teach a subject. When we do a project like this, we have to keep in mind who the project is intended for.

YK and XA continue the presentation.

Group work.

The groups present their results.

ELSA Croatia (Group 1): Regarding the lack of participation, ITM is happening at the beginning of the term or exam season. It takes a big commitment to attend at the worst timing. It's either the start of Uni or exam season, takes more dedication. There is no official target group so it can be confusing for some. It is less motivating to attend since it is an online meeting.

ELSA Germany (Group 2): We had similar reasons for the lack of participation. It is quite early in the semester so participation is less attractive to some people. It takes up a weekend for an online meeting and it has quite a basic level of knowledge. Many boards do not profit from the workshops. There is no marketing coming from ELSA International as well. It could be beneficial to distribute content to the National Groups so that they can create more hype for ITM as they do for the other meetings.

ELSA Germany (Group 3): For the first question, we saw the lack of attendance stemming from the fact that the ITM is an online meeting. It is not as attractive as an in-person format kind of event and there is a lack of knowledge that the ITM even exists. Since it is an online meeting, it is easily forgettable and people could collectively decide not to attend. A symbolic participation fee, like 5€, would not hurt anybody in order to feel obliged to take part in the event.

The Chair opens the floor for discussion.

ELSA Georgia: A lot of things are happening around the timing of the ITM. It is at the beginning of the semester so it is not the perfect timing. If it should not stay at this basic level, it can easily be organised after the first ICM.

ELSA Croatia: We think it should target national officers, and it should be less than a weekend and before but close to the Autumn ICM.

ELSA Georgia: I do not see the ITM as a kind of introduction but rather as something that requires a higher level of ELSA knowledge. As a result of COVID-19, some projects were forgotten because of a lack of knowledge.

YK: It affects how the training session goes if the participation is low.

ELSA Georgia: The National Groups have more power to pressure officers to attend. The idea was to have more control over the attendance of the officers.

ELSA Croatia: I did not want to say that meeting each other would be the main purpose but rather a motivation to participate.

YK: Whether or not the application format should be centralised is a point that was a discussion point, and we wanted to know what your opinion on this topic is. Of course, we would first have to decide whether we would want to include national officers.

ELSA Croatia: If we do it individually, maybe there could be many who apply but do not participate.

ELSA Germany: Would that be a problem?

YK: The concern is that this would really affect the training sessions but the workshops are most likely not going to be affected by this.

ELSA Croatia: I do not think having decentralised application forms is a good idea. As we would steer away from what we actually want to achieve.

The groups continue with their presentations.

ELSA Croatia (Group 1): We decided to target national officers clearly, but still there will be a high disparity of knowledge. We should not have it too strict, local officers should also be allowed to participate. We need to get everyone on the same level, the workshops should try to achieve it. We had ideas of having two levels to the meeting, having some workshops that are introductory and then others that are more complicated to assess their level of knowledge. We had the idea of employing quizzes to identify the knowledge levels. The entire concept seems to be very lost therefore we do not have a definitive solution.

ELSA Georgia (Group 2): We believe that the structure of the content should be more in-depth. Those officers who are starting their work can stick to the introductory workshops. We need to discuss possibilities of linking knowledge levels without dividing everyone in advanced/non-advanced workshops. Maybe if the workshops were more in-depth and extensive, they would be more engaging.

ELSA Germany (Group 3): Concerning the structure and content, it would benefit to differentiate the workshops between beginners and advanced levels. We have to find a way to make the workshops as interactive as possible so that advanced officers would pull non-advanced officers with them and support them. Those who are more advanced are usually more willing to engage in the workshops and take action.

ITM can also be seen as a social unit, where Participants are able to engage with each other and create connections.

The Chair opens the floor for discussion.

YK: Is there anything you would be interested in area-wise?

ELSA Czech Republic: We talked about the concept of checklists on how to plan specific projects for example. Those could be easy steps on how to make an application, organise the event and information on possible mistakes that could be made. The checklists should introduce the officer like a child to projects.

ELSA the Netherlands: For us in the PD workshops it was like a transition meeting on how to do student and job hunting.

ELSA Georgia: Some local groups of ours are really concentrating on study visits but unfortunately do not have any experience. So it is really dependent on the local board, the national board, and the individual officer. In-depth topics could be for example knowledge management on the EDF for treasurers or data protection and Code of Conduct workshops for IM, and similar direction for other areas.

ELSA Germany: I agree with most of the things said, especially with having to go more in-depth with the topics and the skills to acquire. Basic knowledge of each area is presented in our transition meetings so new officers know what to do in general.

The groups continue with their presentations.

ELSA Germany (Group 3): We talked about having the ITM in the form as it is right now, but lengthen it to a month-long event. There would be open calls and trainings and it would be easier for officers to attend the workshops since not a whole weekend is blocked for an online meeting. Meetings would take place in the evenings but not in the duration as they are right now. So the solution could be making an "International Training Month", spread everything over a duration of a month, and then it will be easier to get everyone on the same level and add social settings after the sessions.

YK: The reason we smiled was that I am actually talking with my Director for Trainings to turn the month of September into an International Training month.

ELSA Germany (Group 2): Regarding the agenda of the current ITM, there could be sessions in the mornings to have more action from the officers. Altogether the idea is to have the ITM stretched over several days so the whole weekend wouldn't be taken away.

ELSA Georgia (Group 2): Knowing the dates much sooner would also help us very much.

ELSA Croatia (Group 1): We already explained what we think is wrong. The schedule is fine, the structure of the workshops just has to change.

The Chair opens the floor for discussion.

ELSA Portugal: I think the "International Training Month" is a better option. If it splits into a whole month, you can have for example six trainings in a month. It would be less painful than sitting in front of the computer the whole weekend.

ELSA Georgia: It takes dedication to do this. In our opinion doing the month is perfect as our local boards have also already started working that time. But of course, it's not perfect for everyone.

ELSA Portugal: Yes it would be more difficult, but training just has a definitive time, and not your whole would be taken away.

ELSA Georgia: I personally like the month idea but then it would no longer be an IIM but instead like a shorter version of ELSA Skills Academy. Do we really need the ITM as an IIM or not?

YK and XA present the reflections and results.

The Chair closes the workshop at 17:31.

Saturday, 10th February 2024

10:00 – 13:00

(Knowledge) Sharing is Caring

Participants' list:

Nadia Dourida (ND)	International Board
Xanthi Agoraki (XA)	International Board
Sebastian Kowalski (Chair)	ELSA Poland
Sílvia Shulzhyk (Vice Chair)	ELSA Portugal
Meysam Khadivi (Secretary)	ELSA the Netherlands
Aníta Lind Hlynisdóttir (Secretary)	ELSA Iceland
Paula Bačić	ELSA Croatia
Niko Anzulović Mirošević	ELSA Croatia
Markéta Řezníčková	ELSA Czech Republic
Dario Schönbacher	ELSA International
Mikko Laitinen	ELSA Finland
Ketevan Makharashvili	ELSA Georgia
Ben Gödde	ELSA Germany
Johannes Däuwel	ELSA Germany
Jorun Jeß	ELSA Germany
Ignas Čiginskas	ELSA Lithuania
Julia Johnsen Halsebø	ELSA Norway
Karl Rødde Opseth	ELSA Norway
Lydie Restauri	ELSA Switzerland
Iryna Mykhalkiv	ELSA Ukraine

The Chair opens the workshop at 10:03.

XA and ND present (Knowledge) Sharing is Caring.

The Chair opens the floor for discussion.

ELSA Georgia: The approach we have right now is that our local officers translate the documents into our own language. These guidelines in the end are just guidelines, therefore it is to some extent just something that is used until the group itself makes its own guidelines. Checklists are better than the typical guidelines. We try not to spend too much time or resources on updating them unless there are serious changes that need to be made.

ELSA Germany: The materials that contribute best are the handbooks even though after some time they always get translated into our language. But maybe one could make them more in unison when it is about cooperation between areas, for example, the key areas.

ELSA Croatia: Regarding the second and third bullet points, there is information for different materials for different approaches. Some areas miss some key documents which has to be changed, this way there should be more unison in a way that the relevant key documents are there for every area. This list should not be difficult to make and it should apply everywhere, with respect to relevant regulations. You can only

find the regulations in the IM folder, which makes sense, but having it in one place for everyone would be easier and useful for everyone.

ELSA Germany: Speaking from a key area perspective, step-by-step checklists about what needs to be done, and the handbooks are not always fully functional. As Ben already said, there cannot be unified documents for all of the areas as they are all different, therefore they cannot be the same. Therefore, every area needs a corresponding checklist. It is needed to find out what every area needs. It is good to have an informational overview of issues but helpful materials are needed that are not found in the Officers' Portal.

ELSA Germany: The content of a transition kit cannot be the same, of course, as the areas are different, but many key aspects are the same for every area, therefore such checklists can be made in a unified manner.

ELSA Czech Republic: I absolutely agree with everything that has been said. Speaking from a PD viewpoint, we have a lot of handbooks that describe the purpose of the projects. It would be good to have checklists as well.

ELSA Switzerland: I think the most important thing is the marketing kits as they are very useful!

The Chair splits the Participants into groups.

Group work.

The groups present their results.

ELSA Georgia (Group A): BEE: Presentations, external relations, and materials for strategic planning have not been updated since Thessaloniki 2019, and almost no documents about expansion. Concentration should be on National Groups and Local Groups, as the materials are all catered to the international level. MKT: Handbooks, marketing kits, and presentations. The materials are not utilised on a local level, but more or less on international projects. Marketing is not about teaching, but some additional tools and documents would be great. There have been some changes to the platform that is used by marketing since Photoshop is not used anymore but Canva is.

PD: Handbooks are rather abstract, sometimes PDs have to look into the marketing sections. The media card was updated on marketing but not on the PD side, to avoid confusion. STEP documents should be archived.

ELSA Germany (Group B): AA and HR: With the current structures, some things need to be updated. Career Launch should go to PD, the general handbook and transition checklist are shallow and should be updated. The checklists about different projects lead to officers having an overview of them but not knowing how to start their work. The templates are great but should be more user-friendly. The explanation is not really good on how to organise events and the links to the presentations are not working at all. The HR handbook should be updated, and ELSA day materials randomly compiled, though the documents fit, they should be updated and tailored to the current structure. More checklists and approachable materials would be beneficial.

ELSA Germany (Group C): IM: The general IM guide should be updated, as well as the SotN and ELSA Trainings. The materials generally fit the need but are outdated. GDPR guidelines would be great, and presentations from workshops as well. The order of the materials could be different, for example, the OYOPs could be in a folder for all of the areas since they are followed by them.

FM: The presentations are out of date, as well as the grants database. EDF documents, EDF checklist, and presentations should be up to date and a new webinar on EDF should be uploaded.

S&C: Documents for all of the projects are needed. The presentations and the hosting agreement are outdated. Adding more templates to support OCs would be great.

The Chair opens the floor for discussion.

XA: About the FM materials, group C, you spoke about practical cases not working anymore. Are they not used as a concept anymore or not applicable?

ELSA Germany: They do not work when opening the links. It doesn't show up and it is like the documents have been removed.

ELSA Georgia: Have you considered moving to Google Workspace?

ELSA Poland: We did that a few years ago and it got so much better! It is also more convenient from an administrative point of view.

XA: Maybe talk about content now, because we will get to structure later.

ELSA Germany: What do you think led to the materials not being up to date, is it somehow from the workload? Do you have an internal list of what needs to be updated?

ND: The reason why we focused so much on the OYOP is that it was not prioritised in the previous years but rather on how to communicate to the network. We think this has not been working well in the past years. IBs rather focus on developing the projects and do not really work on knowledge management. We do not have an overview of what needs to be updated and what does not.

XA: The biggest problem is that you have no track, it is not necessarily difficult to update the materials. This is me speaking on behalf of my team, as I am preparing for the last part of the term right now. You do not have an overview of what got updated and when and you do not know what to prioritise. Danny and his team have written down all of the documents of the Officers' Portal and are working on improving the portal.

Group work

The groups present their results.

ELSA Georgia (Group A): We identified that there is unison in most cases but not necessary and leads to confusion. The structure should be rather user-friendly. What should be unified are the IIM presentations, and divided between Autumn and Spring ICMs and NCMs. What is missing in the Officers' Portal is consistency, not every area materials are updated.

ELSA Croatia (Group B): We have a slightly different opinion. Unification is necessary but only up to a basic degree, like regulations and transition handbooks. Every area should have a way finder that says what is included in each section with a hyperlink to the regulations. We should have the IIM minutes and hyperlinks to them for all of the areas.

ELSA Germany (Group B): We thought that a separate folder for the IIMs would be a good idea and would make all of the documents about them more accessible.

ELSA Germany (Group C): We agree that they are not really unified as the areas are all different anyway. In our opinion, splitting projects per section would make information regarding them more accessible. We also agreed that by seeing how the materials are updated now, having them under two folders at the same time could lead to confusion. It is best to leave them under the IM section.

ELSA Germany (Group B): Clarification, what we meant by having a general folder was having the same document under a certain folder with a link to the relevant regulation, not the document itself.

The Chair opens the floor for discussion.

No inputs.

XA and ND continue their presentation.

XA: Does using a shared Drive have potential? And will they work if we use them?

ELSA Finland: How would it work for them to be used by the National Groups if they are not in the Drive system?

XA: Now all IMers have access to it, and if we do decide to proceed, everyone would get access.

ELSA Germany: In Germany, using a shared Drive has proven to be a great practice. We can make the Working Materials and presentations more accessible for archiving. The knowledge management can get a bit too much in time and a bit messy though.

ELSA Germany: Adding to that, when using a shared Drive, only people from the same mailing list will have access to the document and you can password-protect them. A shared Drive is more user-friendly.

ELSA Poland: That is what we do in Poland. Our NB members make the shared Drive for their locals and it works really well. It is a very useful exchange tool and well organised. It also has to be taken care of all the time as well.

ELSA Germany: A really important aspect of this is that knowledge management should not be split too much. It could be confusing to have different documents on the Officers' Portal and on a shared Drive. We need a unified approach to have a sufficient overview of the materials that are easily updated.

ELSA Germany: Would it be feasible to make an overall system with an overall password in order to not have individual passwords for individual documents?

ELSA Poland: I agree. If there should be documents that would be password protected on the Officers' Portal, then there should be like a "premium" Officers' Portal.

XA: The only documents which are password protected are the minutes. The problem is we ourselves do not know how the password system got put on in the first place, so we really are not sure how to implement such a system. The most beneficial way of sharing documents that should be secure is to share them internally.

ELSA Georgia: Is it possible to have an account system for the Officers' Portal?

XA: That would be complicated. We should not overcomplicate things too much.

ELSA Croatia: Maybe we could add a document with a link in the password-protected area of the Officers' Portal to give access to a shared Drive.

ELSA Croatia: The password system we have is, to be honest, not very protective as the password is very simple. It is quite hard to maintain and honestly impossible for our technical knowledge. The authorisation that is needed does not have to be some insane security measures, but just a simple password that is intended to keep the documents private. This can be implemented with the existing system with Google since they have a system of authorisation.

ELSA Finland: From the point of view of our network, it is kind of tricky as we do not use the IB mailing account but our own Gmail accounts, so there could be a few issues. That would require a lot of work from the IB to update everything.

The Chair closes the workshop at 12:00.

13:00 – 15:00

Houston, we have a Plan!

Participants' list:

Bjarki Fjalar Guðjónsson (BFG)	International Board
Adéla Chloupková (AC)	International Board
Nathalie Labar (NL)	ELSA International
Sebastian Kowalski (Chair)	ELSA Poland
Sílvia Shulzhyk (Vice Chair)	ELSA Portugal
Meysam Khadivi (Secretary)	ELSA Netherlands
Aníta Lind Hlynisdóttir (Secretary)	ELSA Iceland
Paula Bačić	ELSA Croatia
Niko Anzulović Mirošević	ELSA Croatia
Markéta Řezníčková	ELSA Czech Republic
Dario Schönbacher	ELSA International
Mikko Laitinen	ELSA Finland
Ketevan Makharashvili	ELSA Georgia
Ben Gödde	ELSA Germany
Johannes Däuwel	ELSA Germany
Jorun Jeß	ELSA Germany
Ignas Čiginskas	ELSA Lithuania
Julia Johnsen Halsebø	ELSA Norway
Karl Rødde Opseth	ELSA Norway
Lydie Restauri	ELSA Switzerland
Iryna Mykhalkiv	ELSA Ukraine

The Chair opens the workshop at 13:02.

BFG and AC present Houston, we have a Plan! and the current Strategic Goals.

NL presents the Implementation Handbook.

The Chair opens the floor for discussion.

BFG: Just an elaboration, on the screen we have prompt questions, you do not need to answer them one by one. We were wondering what you want to get out of these questions and the network's involvement, by looking at the future of both the drafting of the Strategic Plan and the Handbook.

ELSA Croatia: We do not have our own Strategic Plan yet, it is in discussion as the concept is a bit further away for us and it takes more time.

ELSA Georgia: I agree with Nico, as we just recently implemented our first Strategic Plan.

ELSA Germany: If I remember correctly the call for a drafting team was only in connection with the first BEE call. Maybe by making it more known to the network, there would be more interested officers and that would tackle the lack of engagement.

BFG: There was an idea from the previous group that one way of doing it would be that the Presidents would be informed on the general process and then be responsible that it's known within their Boards.

AC: I know that from our side, when we were planning calls and the communication with the network, we asked the Presidents to inform their other board members about this. From our side, it was not timely feasible to talk about the details with all of the area. But if we try it out now, it could be beneficial to know about the opinions of the other areas.

ELSA Czech Republic: I agree with what has been said. The lack of engagement could be due to the fact that officers thought the implementation of the Strategic Goals would not affect their area. There could be not enough information within the boards to decide to concentrate on more pressing issues.

ELSA Germany: Maybe it would be a good idea to ask the predecessors for ideas and their input on the implementation process.

AC: Only our predecessors or also nationals?

ELSA Germany: In general, from the IB and the National Groups.

AC: So just to clarify, from our side, we asked our predecessors.

BFG and AC continue their presentation.

BFG opens the floor for discussion.

ELSA Georgia: Before sending out the Working Materials, there could be discussions about the future implementation of Strategic Plans.

BFG: Before the ISM or at the ISM?

ELSA Georgia: Preferably before the ISM.

BFG: This would essentially be an evaluation point at the ISM or explaining what we have been doing.

ELSA Georgia: The OYOP should be updated throughout the term.

BFG: We are on the same page then.

ELSA Germany: Welcome open calls at the beginning of the term could also just include a slide mentioning the main points in the beginning.

AC: Would you imagine the open calls each having the slide on their own or a call with the whole IB welcoming the network?

ELSA Germany: The first one.

ELSA Georgia: I think the second option would be better. The OYOP is done in the matter with the IB.

BFG and AC continue their presentation.

BFG opens the floor for discussion.

ELSA Germany: You could here as well either include this in open calls surveys or the SotN inquiry, as National Groups that want to vote at the ICM use that as a medium to get broad views of the network who would want to vote have to fill it out anyway.

ELSA Germany: Did you feel like the results from the questionnaire were enough to get input from the network?

BFG: The results we got were very helpful, but because the groups were geographically very clustered, we realised that the results might not count for the whole network.

ELSA Georgia: Don't you think that some countries might have a higher priority regarding advocacy? And there is a need to show how to advocate correctly.

BFG: Very brief response here. There is a need for some groups to prioritise advocacy or would like to prioritise advocacy but not every group does that. It might indicate that the groups that didn't answer don't prioritise it or are not engaging in it.

ELSA Georgia: Such questions can be a part of subquestions that are linked to the voting rights at ICM. That would be a good way to get the National Groups to answer the questions.

ELSA Georgia: Should both the network and the IB be included in identifying the Goals? Should the Strategic Plan reflect the Goals that the National Groups deem the most important?

AC: I think there is a priority ranking in some cases and this is already setting expectations for the next term, and when talking about the OYOP, we basically set our focus points at the beginning of the term. It is important to inform the network what is happening behind the scenes. It would be beneficial to have input from the entire network but you see, the main priorities differ from each National Group. Some are more urgent than others and on the other hand, it requires the National Groups to be more engaging.

BFG: The way in which the network could inform the IB of their pressing matters, could be in the form of a non-binding input on the Goals and their progressions. We already have a lack of engagement in the Strategic Planning process. It's the mandate of the IB to identify what is happening, it is important to have a non-binding input from the network. The issue could be that we already have problems with interest regarding the strategic plan. The final decision stays with the IB as we have the mandate with our election.

BFG and AC continue their presentation.

Group work.

The groups present their results.

EIT (Group 1): We discussed that the outgoing and incoming IB should be working together during the transition. It makes a lot of sense for the incoming officers to ask the outgoing board what Goals should be selected for the next Strategic Plan. It is not beneficial to ask incoming national officers for their opinions as they are still in their transition phase. IB should explain to the network in the open calls what they are

focusing on during the year. It would be a good idea to inform the network of the implementation of the Strategic Goals in the International Monthly Update. It is beneficial if it's not only the President who updates the network but the entire IB. Making the strategic plan more visible to the network.

ELSA Georgia (Group 2): The National Groups take care of the knowledge transfer of the implementation of the Goals within their network on a national level. That could be active members or someone from IM. It must not always be the President. The OYOP should be updated every six months and open calls held concerning the implementation process. It could be done through the SotN as well. Another good platform to update the network on the process is through the IIMs, especially the ISM.

ELSA Germany (Group 3): Some National Groups might feel distant from EI's Strategic Plan. Trickle-down effect to get the nationals involved so they can get the locals involved in the Strategic Planning. We had the idea of adding newsletters for the areas regarding the Strategic Goals and by that, having everyone on the same page, as well as having open calls at the beginning of the term.

ELSA Germany (Group 4): We discussed how to get the network involved, not more than we already tackled during the open discussion, open calls, the ITM, OYOP, and the OYOP report. There could be a section added in the IB report every three months about strategic planning.

EIT (Group 1): We agreed that the Strategic Goals should be aligned. It makes sense to have a general Strategic Plan and other Strategic Plans based on that general one that would be implemented one term after, for example, the Financial Strategy. Drafting all of the Strategic Plans in the same year would be too much and could endanger the implementations afterwards. Having two strategies implemented in a year would be too much. Five years for the update seems good to us.

ELSA Germany (Group 2): We think that the Strategic Plans should be aligned, with a five-year Strategic Plan as the main strategy and others as supporting ones. After the main strategy, there would be the Financial Strategy that would be financing the main Strategic Plan. Five years is a good timespan. It is not too long for an organisation like ELSA. A time span of 10 years would be too long and three years too less. There would not be much time for implementation of the Goals.

ELSA Germany (Group 3): We agree that the Strategic Plan should be aligned and harmonised, if not they could contradict each other. We couldn't really agree on one point which one is the most important, we couldn't agree on a good time frame as well.

ELSA Germany (Group 4): The Strategic Plans should align and support each other. That would prevent useless discussion. Other strategies could act as a backbone for the five-year Strategic Plan. The general Strategic Plan should be drafted first and the Financial Strategy one year after. Would it hinder the flexibility if we change the time frame for the Financial Strategy? What do you think about prolonging its time? We came up with a solution to have the option to adapt the Financial Strategy when the Strategic Plan has reached its middle ground so sufficient changes could be made.

AC: I agree that they should align with each other and there would not be any issues if we change the three years to five years. We never really discussed Financial Strategies, this one for example was not even a topic at the ISM, so didn't really include opinions of the network. You mentioned having an option to adapt the Financial Strategy if something happens financially wise, like inconveniences. There is a part of the Financial Strategy that allows you to change it in unexpected circumstances.

Presentation on the implementation of the Strategic Goals on a national level.

The chair closes the workshop at 15:06.

15:30 – 17:30

More Energy, More Passion, More People

Participants' list:

Yordan Kyurkchiyski (YK)	International Board
Benita Steger (BS)	ELSA International
Sebastian Kowalski (Chair)	ELSA Poland
Sílvia Shulzhyk (Vice Chair)	ELSA Portugal
Meysam Khadivi (Secretary)	ELSA Netherlands
Aníta Lind Hlynsdóttir (Secretary)	ELSA Iceland
Paula Bačić	ELSA Croatia
Niko Anzulović Mirošević	ELSA Croatia
Markéta Řezníčková	ELSA Czech Republic
Dario Schönbacher	ELSA International
Mikko Laitinen	ELSA Finland
Ketevan Makharashvili	ELSA Georgia
Ben Gödde	ELSA Germany
Johannes Däuwel	ELSA Germany
Jorun Jeß	ELSA Germany
Ignas Čiginskas	ELSA Lithuania
Julia Johnsen Halsebø	ELSA Norway
Karl Rødde Opseth	ELSA Norway
Lydie Restauri	ELSA Switzerland
Iryna Mykhalkiv	ELSA Ukraine

The Chair opens the workshop at 15:37.

YK presents More Energy, More Passion, More People.

BS presents the current situation of HR in ELSA International.

The Chair opens the floor for discussion.

ELSA Georgia: I was in the EIT in my first year as a board member and this year as well. My EIT transition was not the best one, I had to try my best and learn most of the stuff, and navigate on my own. The problem is how the transitions are managed. It's one thing that they do not do what they should be doing and one thing if they do what they should be doing but do not care about the transition. Some people are just more dedicated than others who neglect their duties.

ELSA Czech Republic: One of the biggest problems is that it seems intimidating to join the EIT team. I have to know how the other countries operate if I decide to join the EIT. There could be different skills necessary as well as more in-depth knowledge. Honestly, intimidating is good as it represents something new.

ELSA Germany: The IB not finding successors is a problem as well. The past two boards included two deputies.

ELSA Georgia: One thing I would like to add is that some positions are more appealing to people than other positions so that could be why not all the positions are filled. For locals, it could seem very intimidating, like a very big responsibility, and thus, not seem accessible for them. Locals are rather inclined to work in the EIT than on national boards.

ELSA Croatia: I think that there is a lack of knowledge of the EIT on a local level. Even some NB officers do not understand the jobs and actions of EIT members. The EIT is not visible enough. It's my third EIT year, but before applying I did not even know what the EIT was.

ELSA Georgia: We as NB officers have more possibilities to promote the EIT positions to the network than the IB.

YK: Regarding what you mentioned about the attractiveness and visibility of the EIT, would there be any other reasons not to apply for the EIT?

ELSA Germany: For me personally, preparing for finals and studying takes up most of my time. You have to find the balance between your personal life and ELSA. For me personally, it is that I will have to study for my finals.

ELSA Georgia: Some people just think that they have been active for long enough and decide not to re-apply. They want to give the floor to other generations.

ELSA Portugal: I think it is mostly fear of commitment if you for example do not have enough interaction with the network. Before visiting the ICM I did not think about joining the EIT, but all the contacts and possibilities to network convinced me.

ELSA Georgia: Based on what you said, that raises the potential for possible candidates for the EIT so these two might be linked.

ELSA Czech Republic: People could be intimidated because they think they could be isolated working in front of the computer without really getting to know others.

ELSA Germany: Some of the tasks in the German team are connected to the work of EIT officers. Some National Groups don't really comply with the tasks on a local level so to say, different tasks in the same area could also be a problem of the lack of applications.

Group work.

The groups present their results.

ELSA Germany (Group 1): For the structure of the strategy, we took a look at the HR handbook, where the HR model is divided into four chapters; attraction and recruitment, training and development, engagement and retention, and transition and exit. We decided to have a structure similar to the chapters and allocate problems to the phases of the HR handbook. The strategy should include broader goals with more detailed subgoals.

ELSA Germany (Group 2): We had the exact same structure, we also added alumni. We discussed splitting it into the phases of the HR handbook. People who use it for the first time should have everything in one place.

ELSA Germany (Group 3): We decided to have the sections EIT, IB, and the network. The strategy states how to do HR. It should be an upward stream, the better the NGs the better in HR general. It might lead

to increased numbers of potential EIT and IB candidates but we don't have concrete suggestions for implementation.

The Chair opens the floor for discussion.

No inputs.

The groups continue their presentations.

ELSA Germany (Group 1): Concerning the change of the EIT for the current year, the current structure offers a smooth transition. The successors already have experienced EIT members who help them and make the transition more feasible. Regarding the number of EIT members, we do not have a sufficient overview of how the system works right now, so it really depends on the positions. Some teams have enough work to do and some don't. Then about the attractiveness of running for the EIT and IB, we mainly issued problems that it is too time-consuming and tough application processes. There could be created job profiles for the IB positions, which would be very helpful and would give more insight into the work.

ELSA Germany (Group 2): We assumed that provisions regarding the term of the EIT members would be in the Decision Book but that is not the case.

YK: There is a provision that allows the board to extend the EIT term to the 31st of August however, it is not established in the Decision Book. As it is not in the decision book it was only a board decision.

ELSA Georgia: It depends, it is more of a case-by-case situation. Not all positions require that time since some positions require further time.

ELSA Germany (Group 2): We talked much about if it makes sense extending their work period, starting in September made sense to us. We decided that extending the term might be important based on the EIT position, the IB members should decide. Regarding IB candidacy, the problems are mainly that people need the drive and interest to run for the IB. Information about the IB positions have to be more open, maybe by using social media to show the members what it means to be an IB member. A way to get more people interested in applying is having more remote group options maybe, or at least being able to work part of the term remotely.

ELSA Germany (Group 3): It's beneficial that EIT accompanies the newly elected board for one month, that is, stays until the first of September, and gives the IB insights from the last term. We discussed that the ELSA Skills Academy could support the candidature by giving more information, with for example public speaking training. We talked about getting more information about life in the IB and insights behind that so that more people would apply. There could be IB open calls where candidates connect with old IBs. There could be sessions during IIMs with current IB members to talk about the attractiveness of running for candidacy.

BS: What exactly would you prefer regarding improving the knowledge management issues regarding EIT and IB candidacies?

ELSA Germany: Audiovisual input and directing them to past IB members for chats are the best options, in my opinion.

ELSA Germany: I agree. Written information would be great. It was really nice for me to have contact with our old board members during my candidacy time.

ELSA Czech Republic: Allocate a half-hour time slot at the ICM with the IB for a Q&A session to talk about the IB life.

ELSA Croatia: Maybe the Q&A sessions at the ICM would not be the best solution, since we talked about not having enough time at ICM yesterday. Something that is visually attractive to the eye. Some people are readers, others like to watch videos to get better impressions. I think it is best to have it in different formats.

ELSA the Netherlands: Regarding the Q&A session, it doesn't need to be adding extra workshop time. The idea is rather put a 30 minute time-slot during dinner time if people are interested, or even during the gala ball preparation time.

ELSA Sweden: I agree with Germany, but we should also do some relaxed content, like a day in the life of an IB member.

The groups continue their presentations.

ELSA Germany (Group 1): We sort of addressed the first two questions in the same answer. If you would publish the report prior to the IIMs, the Council being at ICM or just National Groups could also act in control in a non-formal way but rather giving input. Respective positions in the HR Section should ensure the HR Strategy is implemented in the network. The first two questions, the IB preparing the report before an ICM and the network being a control mechanism in a non-formal way, rather than giving feedback. A working group that would work in drafting a new Strategy, is not necessary. We felt it should not be an obligation but be the choice of ELSA International. People outside the EIT do not usually have an insight into the building of the team, therefore it is hard to have the expertise to have a valuable contribution than the transition of knowledge.

ELSA Germany (Group 2): Regarding the control mechanism, the Director for HR should evaluate and report if the Strategic Goals are met, halfway through the term and at the end of the term. The Director could give out a yearly report on the implementation of the Goals that would be sent out in mailing lists to the whole network. There could be short reports at ICMs as well. We were thinking about the presentation about the EIT in Tbilisi, maybe one could post something like that as a yearly social media post.

ELSA Germany (Group 3): We see an HR report as beneficial and could be sent out either by the Director for HR or the SecGen. We said that working groups are not efficient but there could be inputs from the network.

BS: Thank you for your participation and good work. I started a new project called the HR Newsletter which gives the EIT and the SecGens insights about everything that is currently happening in the area. Should it be sent to every list?

ELSA Germany: So it's not about how to do HR, but rather how the EIT is?

BS: Usually there are highlights on National and Local Groups.

General consent.

BS: It includes both parts.

ELSA Georgia: It's a really good overview, I would encourage sending it to all the areas.

ELSA Germany: My concerns are that the newsletter could have content that is not relevant for everyone, which would lead to the newsletter not getting the effect it is supposed to have.

Closing and reflections.

The Chair closes the workshop at 17:37.

COMMON SESSIONS WORKSHOP MINUTES

Wednesday, 7th February 2024

18:00 – 20:00

Opening Workshop (Joint)

Participants' list:

Bjarki Fjalar Guðjónsson (BFG) (Chair)	International Board
Yordan Kyurkchyski (YK) (Secretary)	International Board
Adéla Chloupková (AC)	International Board
Nadia Dourida (ND)	International Board
Xanthi Agoraki (XA)	International Board
Helena Jeske	ELSA Austria
Philipp Strasser	ELSA Austria
Arthur Tondeur	ELSA Belgium
Lovro Saraf	ELSA Croatia
Leona Rosandić	ELSA Croatia
Chiara Nikšić	ELSA Croatia
Patricija Čeović	ELSA Croatia
Paula Bačić	ELSA Croatia
Niko Anzulović Mirošević	ELSA Croatia
Markéta Řezníčková	ELSA Czech Republic
Lucie Nováková	ELSA Czech Republic
Eva Šimková	ELSA Czech Republic
Freja Moos Wagner	ELSA Denmark
Johanne Rasmussen	ELSA Denmark
Nathalie Labar	ELSA International
Dario Schönbächler	ELSA International
Ketevan Makharashvili	ELSA Georgia
Ana Koiava	ELSA Georgia
Louis Flindt	ELSA Germany
Jorun Jeß	ELSA Germany
Michelle Henning	ELSA Germany
Jenny Schilpp	ELSA Germany
Ben Gödde	ELSA Germany
Ignas Čiginskas	ELSA Lithuania
Ieva Sinevičiūtė	ELSA Lithuania
Jørn Ruiz Foss	ELSA Norway
Mie Tveit	ELSA Norway
Karl Rødde Opseth	ELSA Norway
Julia Johnsen Halsebø	ELSA Norway
Sebastian Kowalski	ELSA Poland
Maksymilian Baumgart	ELSA Poland
Julia Kraska	ELSA Poland
Rodrigo Prelhaz	ELSA Portugal
Anna Bonander	ELSA Sweden
Roman Szuter	ELSA Sweden

Eila Karlsson	ELSA Sweden
Nives Edler	ELSA Switzerland
Aliena Trefny	ELSA Switzerland
Mira Woelfert	ELSA Switzerland
Mike van der Schors	ELSA the Netherlands
Alice Bigot	ELSA the Netherlands
Puck Scheggetman	ELSA the Netherlands
Bronte Collins	ELSA the Netherlands
Iris den Hartigh	ELSA the Netherlands
Meysam (Sam) Khadivi	ELSA the Netherlands
Bára Líbal	ELSA the Netherlands

ELSA Brno welcomes participants.

BFG opens the Workshop and IV International Strategy Meeting at 18:07.

BFG: I am officially opening the Workshop and the IV International Strategy Meeting at 18:07.

BFG delivers an opening speech.

BFG: I would now like to pass the floor to YK, who will present the Structure and Agenda of the ISM.

YK presents the ISM Structure.

YK: Are there any questions up to now? I see none. We will therefore proceed to the presentation of the roles of the Workshop Officers. As we have a rotating system of Workshops, there is going to be one set of Workshop Officers appointed for each Group, which will follow their Group and respectively be Officers for all sessions of that specific Group.

The Workshop Officers are Chair, Vice Chair and two to four Secretaries. The Chair and Vice Chair of the Workshop shall ensure that discussions on the points of the agenda take place in a correct and orderly manner. The Chair and Vice Chair are responsible for the consistent supervision of the minutes as well as the duly submission of the final version to the Secretary General of the International Board of ELSA at the latest one week after the official end of the International Strategy Meeting. The Secretaries shall keep the minutes of the Workshops of their Group, which will form a part of the Official Minutes of the International Strategy Meeting. The Secretaries shall finalise the minutes together with the Chair and Vice Chair of the respective Workshop at the latest one week after the official end of the last Workshop.

Before we start with the election of the Officers for each of the Groups, we need to count the votes in the room. I will go through the list of National Groups of ELSA. When you hear your National Group I will ask you to raise your hand and say “ELSA X Present and Voting”.

Revision of the list of votes:

ELSA Albania	not present
ELSA Armenia	not present
ELSA Austria	present and voting
ELSA Azerbaijan	not present
ELSA Belarus	not present
ELSA Belgium	present and voting
ELSA Bosnia and Herzegovina	not present
ELSA Bulgaria	not present

ELSA Croatia	present and voting
ELSA Cyprus	not present
ELSA Czech Republic	present and voting
ELSA Denmark	present and voting
ELSA Estonia	not present
ELSA Finland	not present
ELSA France	not present
ELSA Georgia	present and voting
ELSA Germany	present and voting
ELSA Greece	not present
ELSA Hungary	not present
ELSA Iceland	not present
ELSA Ireland	not present
ELSA Italy	not present
ELSA Latvia	not present
ELSA Lithuania	present and voting
ELSA Luxembourg	not present
ELSA Malta	not present
ELSA Montenegro	not present
ELSA the Netherlands	present and voting
ELSA North Macedonia	not present
ELSA Norway	present and voting
ELSA Poland	present and voting
ELSA Portugal	present and voting
ELSA Republic of Moldova	not present
ELSA Romania	not present
ELSA Serbia	not present
ELSA Slovak Republic	not present
ELSA Slovenia	not present
ELSA Spain	not present
ELSA Sweden	present and voting
ELSA Switzerland	present and voting
ELSA Turkey	not present
ELSA Ukraine	not present
ELSA United Kingdom	not present

Total amount of votes: 14

YK: We have 14 amount of votes in the room. Now, we will proceed with the election of the Chairs of the Workshops for each Group. ELSA International would like to nominate:

Mie Tveit from ELSA Norway
Michelle Henning from ELSA Germany
Sebastian Kowalski from ELSA Poland

as Chairs of the Workshop for respectively Groups 1, 2 and 3. Are there any further nominations? I see none.

Mie, do you accept the nomination?

Mie Tveit accepts the nomination.

YK: Any National Group seconding this nomination?

ELSA Belgium seconds.

YK: Michelle, do you accept the nomination?

Michelle Henning accepts the nomination.

YK: Any National Group seconding this nomination?

ELSA Germany seconds.

YK: Sebastian, do you accept the nomination?

Sebastian Kowalski accepts the nomination.

YK: Any National Group seconding this nomination?

ELSA the Netherlands seconds.

YK: I am once again verifying if there are any other nominations? I see none. So we will proceed with the voting on Mie Tveit, Michelle Henning and Sebastian Kowalski as Chairs of the Workshops for their Groups during the IV ISM Brno.

Voting on Mie Tveit, Michelle Henning and Sebastian Kowalski as Chairs of the Workshops for respectively Groups 1, 2 and 3:

In favour: 14

Against: 0

Abstentions: 0

Total number of votes:

Mie Tveit, Michelle Henning and Sebastian Kowalski are elected as Chairs of the Workshops.

YK: With 14 votes in favour, 0 votes against and 0 abstentions, Mie Tveit, Michelle Henning and Sebastian Kowalski have been elected as Chairs of the Workshops for their Groups during the IV ISM Brno. Now, we will proceed with the election of the Vice Chairs of the Workshops for each Group. ELSA International would like to nominate:

Eva Šimková from ELSA Czech Republic

Nives Edler from ELSA Switzerland

Sílvia Shulzhyk from ELSA Portugal

as Vice Chairs of the Workshop for respectively Groups 1, 2 and 3.

Eva, do you accept the nomination?

Eva Šimková accepts the nomination.

YK: Any National Group seconding this nomination?

ELSA Belgium seconds.

YK: Nives, do you accept the nomination?

Nives Edler accepts the nomination.

YK: Any National Group seconding this nomination?

ELSA Germany seconds.

YK: Sílvia, do you accept the nomination?

ELSA Portugal accepts the nomination on behalf of Sílvia Shulzhyk.

YK: Any National Group seconding this nomination?

ELSA Denmark seconds.

YK: I am once again verifying if there are any other nominations. I see none. So we will proceed with the voting on Eva Šimková, Nives Edler and Sílvia Shulzhyk as Vice Chairs of the Workshops for their Groups during the IV ISM Brno

Voting on Eva Šimková, Nives Edler and Sílvia Shulzhyk as Vice Chairs of the Workshops for respectively Groups 1, 2 and 3:

In favour: 14

Against: 0

Abstentions: 0

Total number of votes: 14

Eva Šimková, Nives Edler and Sílvia Shulzhyk are elected as Vice Chairs of the Workshops.

YK: With 14 votes in favour, 0 votes against and 0 abstentions, Eva Šimková, Nives Edler and Sílvia Shulzhyk have been elected as Vice Chairs of the Workshops for their Groups during the IV ISM Brno. Now, we will proceed with the election of the Secretaries of the Workshops for each Group. ELSA International would like to nominate:

Gabriel Marti
Eila Karlsson

as Secretaries of Group 1;

Rodrigo Prelhaz
Bára Libal

as Secretaries of Group 2; and:

Meysam Khadivi
Aníta Lind Hlynsdóttir

as Secretaries of Group 3. Are there any further nominations? I see none.

Gabriel, do you accept the nomination?

ELSA Switzerland accepts the nomination on behalf of Gabriel Marti.

YK: Any National Group seconding this nomination?

ELSA Denmark seconds.

YK: Eila, do you accept the nomination?

Eila Karlsson accepts the nomination.

YK: Any National Group seconding this nomination?

ELSA Norway seconds.

Voting on Gabriel Marti and Eila Karlsson as Secretaries of Group 1:

In favour: 14

Against: 0

Abstentions: 0

Total number of votes: 14

Gabriel Marti, and Eila Karlsson are elected as Secretaries of the Group 1 Workshops.

YK: With 14 votes in favour, 0 votes against and 0 abstentions, Gabriel Marti and Eila Karlsson have been elected as Secretaries of the Workshops of Group 1 during the IV ISM Brno. Continuing with the Secretaries of Group 2; Rodrigo, do you accept the nomination?

Rodrigo Prelbáz accepts the nomination.

YK: Any National Group seconding this nomination?

ELSA Georgia seconds.

YK: Bára, do you accept the nomination?

Bára Libal accepts the nomination.

YK: Any National Group seconding this nomination?

ELSA the Netherlands seconds.

Voting on Rodrigo Prelbáz and Bára Libal as Secretaries of Group 2:

In favour: 14

Against: 0

Abstentions: 0

Total number of votes: 14

Rodrigo Prelhaz and Bára Libal are elected as Secretaries of the Group 2 Workshops.

YK: With 14 votes in favour, 0 votes against and 0 abstentions, Rodrigo Prelhaz and Bára Libal have been elected as Secretaries of the Workshops of Group 2 during the IV ISM Brno. Continuing with the Secretaries of Group 3; Meysam, do you accept the nomination?

Meysam Khadivi accepts the nomination.

YK: Any National Group seconding this nomination?

ELSA Germany seconds.

YK: Aníta, do you accept the nomination?

ELSA Sweden accepts the nomination on behalf of Aníta Lind Hlynsdóttir.

YK: Any National Group seconding this nomination?

ELSA Poland seconds.

Voting on Meysam Khadivi and Aníta Lind Hlynsdóttir as Secretaries of Group 3:

In favour: 14

Against: 0

Abstentions: 0

Total number of votes: 14

Meysam Khadivi and Aníta Lind Hlynsdóttir are elected as Secretaries of the Group 3 Workshops.

YK: With 14 votes in favour, 0 votes against and 0 abstentions, Meysam Khadivi and Aníta Lind Hlynsdóttir have been elected as Secretaries of the Workshops of Group 3 during the IV ISM Brno.

YK: We can now proceed with the Approval of the Agenda and I pass the floor back to BFG.

BFG presents the Draft Workshop Agenda.

BFG: This is the Draft Workshop Agenda as set by ELSA International and as sent out to all of you beforehand. I am asking for amendments for any amendments? I see none, we will now proceed with approving the Draft Workshop Agenda.

Voting on the approval of the Draft Workshop Agenda:

In favour: 14

Against: 0

Abstentions: 0

Total number of votes: 14

The Draft Workshop Agenda has been approved.

BFG: Thank you everyone. I will now briefly present the finger rules applicable in this meeting.

BFG presents the finger rules.

BFG: I will also give the floor to YK to present the Code of Conduct of ELSA.

YK presents the Code of Conduct of ELSA.

YK: Are there any questions? I see none. Therefore we can proceed with the presentation of the results of the Advocacy Questionnaire.

BFG and ND present the results of the Advocacy Questionnaire.

BFG: Thank you, everyone. Are there any questions? I see none, so with this, the Opening Workshop is concluded. I am officially closing the Workshop at 18:59.

BFG closes the Workshop at 18:59.

Thursday, 8th February 2024

19:00 – 20:00

Daily Debrief (Joint)

Participants' list:

Bjarki Fjalar Guðjónsson (BFG) (Chair)	International Board
Yordan Kyurkchiyski (YK) (Secretary)	International Board
Nadia Dourida (ND)	International Board
Adéla Chloupková (AC)	International Board
Xanthi Agoraki (XA)	International Board
Philipp Strasser	ELSA Austria
Ibrahim Diallo	ELSA Belgium
Paula Bačić	ELSA Croatia
Niko Anzulović Mirošević	ELSA Croatia
Lucie Nováková	ELSA Czech Republic
Eva Šimková	ELSA Czech Republic
Markéta Řezníčková	ELSA Czech Republic
Johanne Rasmussen	ELSA Denmark
Dario Schönbacher	ELSA International
Nathalie Labar	ELSA International
Benita Steger	ELSA International
Iina Rynnänen	ELSA International
Mikko Laitinen	ELSA Finland
Laura Merisaari	ELSA Finland
Ketevan Makharashvili	ELSA Georgia
Ana Koiava	ELSA Georgia
Louis Flindt	ELSA Germany
Luca Cecere	ELSA Germany
Michelle Henning	ELSA Germany
Jenny Schilpp	ELSA Germany
Charlotte Magez	ELSA Germany
Ben Gödde	ELSA Germany
Johannes Däuwel	ELSA Germany
Jorun Jeß	ELSA Germany
Aníta Lind Hlynsdóttir	ELSA Iceland
Sverrir Páll Einarsson	ELSA Iceland
Ieva Sinevičiūtė	ELSA Lithuania
Ignas Čiginskas	ELSA Lithuania
Karl Rødde Opseth	ELSA Norway
Julia Johnsen Halsebø	ELSA Norway
Mie Tveit	ELSA Norway

Maksymilian Baumgart	ELSA Poland
Julia Kraska	ELSA Poland
Sebastian Kowalski	ELSA Poland
Rodrigo Prelhaz	ELSA Portugal
Sílvia Shulzhyk	ELSA Portugal
Eila Karlsson	ELSA Sweden
Anna Bonander	ELSA Sweden
Lydie Restauri	ELSA Switzerland
Lirona Sadiku	ELSA Switzerland
Nives Edler	ELSA Switzerland
Aliena Trefny	ELSA Switzerland
Flavia Lehmann	ELSA Switzerland
Mira Woelfert	ELSA Switzerland
Gabriel Marti	ELSA Switzerland
Puck Scheggetman	ELSA the Netherlands
Iris den Hartigh	ELSA the Netherlands
Meysam (Sam) Khadivi	ELSA the Netherlands
Bronte Collins	ELSA the Netherlands
Alice Bigot	ELSA the Netherlands

BFG opens the workshop at 19:06.

XA and BFG present the Daily Debrief of the Workshop “United We Stand, Divided We Pay”.

Key Findings

Mixed to negative responses on whether the division between the favoured and non-favoured countries represent the financial imbalance present in our Network.

Need for more concrete data on the calculation of the division between favoured and non-favoured countries.

The division between favoured and non-favoured countries ensures financial accessibility and inclusivity. “Discrimination” in S&C events can be tackled by internal measures (especially concerning the selection process) rather than by eliminating the distinction itself.

General agreement on representation quotas limiting the ability of Organisers when it comes to the selection process.

Concrete Outcomes

Implementing Selection Criteria for ELS.

- Will increase transparency.
- Acts as Guidelines for Organisers when it comes to the selection of participants.
- Provides a concrete basis for ELSA International to take action in cases of discrimination.

Increased oversight from ELSA International.

- Introduction of an Appeals System, based on Selection Criteria.
- General agreement on the merits of the concept, however, it was acknowledged that its implementation would be hindered by HR issues and increased administrative load.

General agreement on the need to safeguard the financial accessibility of IIMs and S&C events, while remaining mindful of the financial implications this may entail.

Position of the International Board

The division of Favoured and Non-favoured Countries should not be eliminated, as there are still Groups in the Network that benefit from it.

The calculation should not be changed, however, there is a need to look into the rationale behind the initial threshold of 21.000 International Dollars.

The anonymization of applications is a prospective solution but has severe limitations in terms of implementation.

- Number of applications, timeframe of the verification process, nature of the supplementary documents.

The ELS team has taken steps to increase the accuracy of data collected about the diversity of the ELS participants' lists.

- In the following months, they will examine the applicability of the solutions discussed.

BFG: I now open the floor for any questions. I see none. Therefore we can proceed to the next debrief.

YK and ND present the Daily Debrief of the Workshop "Standards High, Pockets Empty".

Key Findings

Main Drivers of International Internal Meetings Expenses:

- Higher expectations which lead to higher costs.
- Lack of Sponsorships.
- Logistics (Public Transportation, Food, etc.).
- Organisation of the IIMs in central locations which tend to be more expensive.

The underlying issue does not lie in Quality Standards themselves per se.

- The problem lies in the Network's mindset and expectations.
- Some participants found that the Quality Standards could be more detailed to give clearer guidance to Organising Committees.

Concrete Outcomes

The Network should be educated and encouraged to organise IIMs within the Quality Standards but potentially in the following alternative ways:

- Through the Half-Half Model;
- Through organising a better-planned Sponsors' Fair for fundraising;
- Through introducing accommodation tiers and/or a no-accommodation option;
- Through spreading out participants amongst multiple accommodations;
- By breaking down the participation fee further.

Ideas discussed:

- Developing a long-lasting partnership / commercial contract with a Hotel Chain.
- Creating a Handbook with the different options that Organising Committees have

- Publishing the Quality Standards with each Call for Hosts.
- Educating the Network on the Quality Standards.
- Creating a Shared Drive for past and prospective Hosts.
- Presenting the budget realisation of IIMs in a subsequent ICM.
- Organising in-person sessions on organising IIMs during ICMs.

Position of the International Board

Based on comparative research of other students' associations, as well as the feedback from IIMs, we have noticed a pattern of continuous growth of expectations towards the comforts provided during IIMs.

Thus:

- We should revisit the features of our IIMs with a view towards what is necessary in contrast to excessive.
- We should encourage the Organising Committees to follow a feasible financial plan.
- We should create a common understanding amongst the Network of organising affordable and accessible events.
- We should focus on the long-term sustainability of the association.

BFG: I now open the floor for any questions. I see none. Therefore we can proceed to the next debrief.

AC presents the Daily Debrief of the Workshop "ELSA Math".

Key Findings

What can have an impact on the higher prices:

Different seasons during the year can affect the price of accommodation

The calculation is based on the European Central Bank and data provided for EU countries, which can have a negative effect on the National Groups who are not in the EU.

Changing the maximum fee more often than two times could cause unpredictable financial planning.

Concrete Outcomes

The formula for the calculation of the maximum fee (Annex 2):

- Leaving it how it is vs.
- Including other indexes, such as food price index, hotel price index, and transportation price index.
- Calculating with the GNI.
- Including “force major clause”.
- At the request of the organising group, recalculate and increase it for the hosting group. However, the yearly update would be based on the original regulations in the Decision Book.

Recalculation of the maximum fee (Annex 2)

- Mostly recalculate only once per year (however, there were some arguments in favour of making the calculation twice).
- Recommendation for making the recalculation on the 1st of August.

Differences between calculation systems

- Leave it different for ELSA Law Schools and the International Internal Meetings.
- Possible mandatory recalculation every second year for ELSA Law Schools.

Based on the answers to the Questionnaire:

- How much money would you pay for the participation in ELSA Law Schools:
The average answer was 365 euros.
- What maximum fee is in your opinion needed to organise the ELSA Law School:
The average answer was 358 euros.
- How much money would you pay for participation in the International Internal Meeting:
The average answer was 357 (for a 7-day event).
- What maximum fee is in your opinion needed to organise the International Internal Meeting:
The average answer was 380 (for a 7-day event).

Position of the International Board

The current maximum fees do not cover the expenses of the projects

The new calculation would be based on more factors than just inflation, and increased based on the average costs for the events with the focus on not negatively affecting the accessibility of the events

Recalculation of the new maximum fees under ANNEX 2 should be made on a different date than the 1st of January.

BFG: I now open the floor for any questions either on the Daily Debrief or generally. I see none.

BFG closes the Workshop at 19:37.

Friday, 9th February 2024

19:00 – 20:00

Daily Debrief (Joint)

Participants' list:

Bjarki Fjalar Guðjónsson (BFG) (Chair)	International Board
Yordan Kyurkchiyski (YK) (Secretary)	International Board
Nadia Dourida (ND)	International Board
Adéla Chloupková (AC)	International Board
Xanthi Agoraki (XA)	International Board
Philipp Strasser	ELSA Austria
Ibrahim Diallo	ELSA Belgium
Paula Bačić	ELSA Croatia
Niko Anzulović Mirošević	ELSA Croatia
Lucie Nováková	ELSA Czech Republic
Eva Šimková	ELSA Czech Republic
Markéta Řezníčková	ELSA Czech Republic
Johanne Rasmussen	ELSA Denmark
Dario Schönbacher	ELSA International
Nathalie Labar	ELSA International
Benita Steger	ELSA International
Iina Rynnänen	ELSA International
Mikko Laitinen	ELSA Finland
Laura Merisaari	ELSA Finland
Ketevan Makharashvili	ELSA Georgia
Ana Koiava	ELSA Georgia
Louis Flindt	ELSA Germany
Luca Cecere	ELSA Germany
Michelle Henning	ELSA Germany
Jenny Schilpp	ELSA Germany
Charlotte Magez	ELSA Germany
Ben Gödde	ELSA Germany
Johannes Däuwel	ELSA Germany
Jorun Jeß	ELSA Germany
Aníta Lind Hlynsdóttir	ELSA Iceland
Sverrir Páll Einarsson	ELSA Iceland
Ieva Sinevičiūtė	ELSA Lithuania
Ignas Čiginskas	ELSA Lithuania
Karl Rødde Opseth	ELSA Norway
Julia Johnsen Halsebø	ELSA Norway
Mie Tveit	ELSA Norway

Maksymilian Baumgart	ELSA Poland
Julia Kraska	ELSA Poland
Sebastian Kowalski	ELSA Poland
Rodrigo Prelhaz	ELSA Portugal
Sílvia Shulzhyk	ELSA Portugal
Eila Karlsson	ELSA Sweden
Anna Bonander	ELSA Sweden
Lydie Restauri	ELSA Switzerland
Lirona Sadiku	ELSA Switzerland
Nives Edler	ELSA Switzerland
Aliena Trefny	ELSA Switzerland
Flavia Lehmann	ELSA Switzerland
Mira Woelfert	ELSA Switzerland
Gabriel Marti	ELSA Switzerland
Puck Scheggetman	ELSA the Netherlands
Iris den Hartigh	ELSA the Netherlands
Meysam (Sam) Khadivi	ELSA the Netherlands
Bronte Collins	ELSA the Netherlands
Alice Bigot	ELSA the Netherlands

BFG opens the workshop at 19:05.

XA and YK present the Daily Debrief of the Workshop "How to Train Your Officer".

Key Findings

There are a number of factors leading to the existing problems of the International Training Meeting:

- Taking place relatively early in the term, which often overlaps with other existing commitments (ELSA and personal ones).
- The Online format.
- Unclear purpose - Area Knowledge Development? Training? ICM Preparation?
- Lower level of complexity of the Workshops than expected - a feeling of them being too introductory to the extent of overlapping with Transitions.

Concrete Outcomes

Lack of Participation

- Clarifying the purpose and target audience of the ITM will lead to higher participation. Participants predominantly agreed that the target audience should be National Officers, but still not excluding Local Officers.
- Looking into alternative timings for the ITM and announcement of the dates well in advance.
- Promotion of the ITM on social media and providing template marketing materials to National Groups.

Content

Regarding the Training

- Focusing more on trainings, and updating their content.
- Adding area-related trainings.

Regarding the Workshops

- Passing the knowledge that National Officers can further pass to their Locals.
- Implementing a knowledge/experience evaluation system (e.g. surveys, questionnaires) pre-ITM to be able to adjust the content of the ITM.
- ITM shouldn't be a Transition Meeting.

Structure:

- General desire to shorten the duration of the ITM into either a two or three-day event.
- Maintaining the inclusion of both Area Workshops and Training sessions, but potentially dividing the programme into different strings.
- Idea to reform into an International Training Month.
- Idea to reform into a portfolio of materials provided to National Groups who organise an NOM/NTM.

Position of the International Board

- The current format of the International Training Meeting does not work for the Network and for the International Board.
- A physical iteration of the ITM - while potentially beneficial - is not feasible at this stage.
- We do not have a specific stance on the Target Group for the ITM - either experienced or inexperienced Officers. However, it needs to be specific and clear.

BFG: I now open the floor for any questions. I see none. Therefore, we can proceed to the next debrief.

BFG and ND present the Daily Debrief of the Workshop "For the Plot!".

Key Findings**Purpose & Content of the ISM**

- ISM should be focused around strategy and guidance/high-level discussions and more tangible; conclusions/connection with a specific Strategic Goal;
- National Groups should be involved in choosing the topic;
- Different perspectives on different topics because there are multiple areas represented;

Structure and Effectiveness of the ISM

- Significant improvement from last year's structure;
- Daily debriefs are very effective BUT there were discussions regarding their place in the agenda;
- Underrepresentation of the Network which affects the effectiveness;
- Group Work is appreciated, especially rotating discussions;
- The WS descriptions should be more specific, especially when the subject is technical;

Duration and outcome of the ISM

- Split opinions on the length of the event itself as well as the length of the WS;
- Groundwork for more concrete proposals during ICMs.

Concrete Outcomes

- National Group involvement in choosing the topic of the ISM through a questionnaire or an open call;
- Regulate that the workshops get minuted (knowledge management);
- Pre-calls on important topics that will be discussed (ICM model);
- Report of the daily debriefs that is published to the Network afterwards;
- The daily debriefs could be moved to the next morning, or after the reporting;
- The topics raised during the ISM should be mostly based on the OYOP of the current IB;
- Platform to provide National Groups with tools to implement their own Strategic Plans on the National level;
- The next ISMs should be focused on evaluating the Strategic Plan, the IBs work on the matter.

Position of the International Board

- The 5-day duration is the only feasible structure right now if we want to keep the variety of topics and the depth of the discussions;
- The purpose of the ISM lies between strategic planning, so the subjects should be tied to the SP goals themselves;
- Goals of each ISM should be based on the individual focus and priorities of each IB, by taking into consideration the opinion of the Network as well;
- Division of five ISMs (within an SP): First one to set the tone for implementation of the SP. The three in-between to set plans for specific goals and evaluate them. The last one is about drafting the new SP.

BFG: I now open the floor for any questions. I see none. Therefore, we can proceed to the next debrief.

AC presents the Daily Debrief of the Workshop "5 Days of Autumn, 7 Days of Spring".

Key Findings

Structure and Effectiveness of the ICM

- There is not enough time to properly discuss everything;
- International Council Meetings should be decision-making and developing ideas; therefore, there should not be that many workshops on knowledge management;
- Including recommendations for decisions in the working materials so the National Groups can already prepare before the International Council Meeting;
- Having more than five days long Autumn ICM could be a substantial financial burden for participants and, therefore, less accessible;
- With experiencing only two International Council Meetings, maybe it's too soon to evaluate the length, and it would be beneficial to wait a bit longer before we change it.

Preparation

- Preparation for the International Council Meeting should be mainly on the National Board and how they prepare themselves and the delegation;
- Having the pre-ICM calls about the proposals is highly appreciated.

Concrete Outcomes

Structure and Effectiveness of the ICM

- 6 groups in favour of five days long Autumn International Council Meeting;
- 3 groups in favour of six days long Autumn International Council Meeting;
- Including specific times for networking;
- Rather having fewer workshops but, making them longer;
- If there is an extensive discussion which needs to be cut short, provide the option to finish the discussion after the International Council Meeting (through an open call).

Preparation

- Monthly calls on knowledge management so that we don't have them during the International Council Meeting;
- Having called for freshers and heads of Delegation already before the International Council Meeting.

Position of the International Board

We believe the Autumn International Council Meeting should be seven days long; however, after your input, we will look more concretely at how feasible it is before proposing the change.

BFG: I now open the floor for any questions.

ELSA Georgia: Will you be sharing the presentations of the Daily Debriefs?

YK: Yes, all the contents of the Daily Debriefs will be part of the Official Minutes.

BFG: Are there any questions? I see none. Therefore, this concludes the Daily Debrief for today.

BFG closes the Workshop at 19:33.

Sunday, 11th February 2024

19:00 – 20:00

Final Debrief & Closing (Joint)

Participants' list:

Bjarki Fjalar Guðjónsson (BFG) (Chair)	International Board
Yordan Kyurkchiyski (YK) (Secretary)	International Board
Nadia Dourida (ND)	International Board
Adéla Chloupková (AC)	International Board
Xanthi Agoraki (XA)	International Board
Philipp Strasser	ELSA Austria
Ibrahim Diallo	ELSA Belgium
Leona Rosandić	ELSA Croatia
Niko Anzulović Mirošević	ELSA Croatia
Eva Šimková	ELSA Czech Republic
Lucie Nováková	ELSA Czech Republic
Markéta Řezníčková	ELSA Czech Republic
Dario Schönbacher	ELSA International
Freja Moos Wagner	ELSA Denmark
Johanne Rasmussen	ELSA Denmark
Michelle Henning	ELSA Germany
Jenny Schilpp	ELSA Germany
Charlotte Magez	ELSA Germany
Louis Flindt	ELSA Germany
Luca Cecere	ELSA Germany
Ben Gödde	ELSA Germany
Johannes Däuwel	ELSA Germany
Sverrir Páll Einarsson	ELSA Iceland
Ieva Sinevičiūtė	ELSA Lithuania
Ignas Čiginskas	ELSA Lithuania
Jørn Ruiz Foss	ELSA Norway
Mie Tveit	ELSA Norway
Sebastian Kowalski	ELSA Poland
Rodrigo Prelhaz	ELSA Portugal
Roman Szuter	ELSA Sweden
Nives Edler	ELSA Switzerland
Aliena Trefny	ELSA Switzerland
Mira Woelfert	ELSA Switzerland
Bára Líbal	ELSA the Netherlands
Iris den Hartigh	ELSA the Netherlands

Meysam (Sam) Khadivi	ELSA the Netherlands
Alice Bigot	ELSA the Netherlands
Iryna Mykhalkiv	ELSA Ukraine
Daria Shylova	ELSA Ukraine

BFG opens the workshop at 13:20.

Partner Presentation by Allen & Overy and ELSA Brno.

YK presents the Daily Debrief of the Workshop “More Energy, More Passion, More People”.

Key Findings:

The key HR problems of ELSA International are:

- A lack of communication and decreasing knowledge management.
- Decreasing the number of ELSA Officers.

Financial accessibility continues to be the main factor discouraging people from running for the International Board of ELSA, alongside a lack of insight into the role and the big-time commitment.

The main reasons behind not applying to the ELSA International Team lie in:

- A lack of awareness of what being in the EIT involves and how to join/ what the requirements are.
- A lack of time.
- Focus on the National Network.
- Bad experience in previous years and lack of supervision.
- A lack of transition.

Concrete Outcomes - Structure

Broad consensus on the need for the Strategy to be with concrete and short goals, practical and accessible also to Officers not working in HR (especially Key Areas who are central to implementation).

Should either be complemented by a guideline or include implementation suggestions.

Potentially including points for national and local implementation.

Structured around:

- Specific limited number of prioritised problems.
- Around the HR Model of ELSA.
- Around three sections - IB, EIT & Network.

Concrete Outcomes - Solutions

ELSA International Team

- Emphasising the integration and social aspects of the EIT.
- Ensuring transitions and creating a transition system.

- Readjustment of the term of the EIT and broad agreement with the decision to extend this year.
- Transparency regarding the expectations, workload and priorities for EIT positions - written, audiovisual and in-person (e.g., Fireside chats during IIMs).
- EIT size and structure should be flexible and meet the needs of the IB.

International Board

- Guideline on the Candidacy Procedure.
- Job Profiles for the IB and showcase of day-to-day work,
- Need for closer proximity to the IB.
- Opportunities for communication with former IBs.
- Availability of Training and Preparation for IB candidates.

Concrete Outcomes - Implementation

Broad consensus on having a shorter implementation period than the Strategic Plan of ELSA - with a duration of 2.5-3 years.

The idea is to involve professionals in the drafting and implementation process.

Evaluation and implementation mechanisms discussed:

- Satisfaction surveys for the EIT.
- Working Group or Audit Team as a control mechanism.
- HR Team in charge of implementation.
- Updates in HR Newsletter.
- Reporting on progress during ICMs.

Differing opinions on the obligated HR Report. But broad agreement on it being concise and to the point.

Position of the International Board

The size of the ELSA International Team has significantly expanded between 2016 and now, multiplying the number of EIT members between 4-6 times. This has raised concerns about the ability of the International Board to effectively:

- Manage the EIT;
- Distribute tasks and responsibilities; and
- Facilitate its transition.

Therefore a part of the Human Resources Strategy may need to focus not only on the increasing quality of EIT management but also on the consolidation of the positions in the team and the rethinking of its term in office.

The HR Strategy should focus on ELSA International. The control organism should be effective for the Network.

BFG: I now open the floor for any questions. I see none. Therefore, we can proceed to the next debrief.

ND and XA present the Daily Debrief of the Workshop “(Knowledge) Sharing is Caring”.

Key Findings

Discussions regarding the Officers Portal being the main platform of Knowledge Management / Sharing.

Having different materials goes hand in hand with our structure.

A big part of the content of the Officers Portal is outdated.

There are certain materials that are important in order to meet each area's needs.

- Specific topics (e.g. BEE for expansion).
- Practical implementation (e.g. new tutorials for MKT, checklists).

There's no unified approach in both the content and structure of the Officers Portal.

Concrete Outcomes - Content

- There's a need for materials that focus on implementation practices rather than general information about them.
- There's a need for new materials that address general knowledge.
- There's a need for an update of the existing materials.
- Very outdated or non-applicable materials should better be archived/removed from the Officers Portal rather than remain available and confuse Officers.
- ELSA International can consider creating an "archive" section for outdated materials that can be used for "historical references".

Concrete Outcomes - Structure

There is a need for a unification of each area page:

- General headings common for each area, subheadings tailored to the area's needs.
- Key Areas' documents can be separated by project rather than by Area.
- Unified way of naming files based on their content.
- Idea for a feedback form at the end of each area page (space to leave comments on materials that are needed).
- Separating the pages of AA/C and merging AA with Human Rights fits more the current structure of our Areas.

Other ideas discussed:

- Creation of a general "ELSA Knowledge" page for freshers.
- Short introduction of each area at the top of each page.
- Introduction of a feedback form related to each area's needs.

Concrete Outcomes - Knowledge Sharing

Having shared drives is a very successful practice followed by many NGOs:

- Concerns regarding its efficiency (it overlaps with the Officers Portal) and the access to it.
- Having the Officers Portal as the main knowledge-sharing/management platform.
- Need for documents to be password-protected.
- Extended discussion on shifting from the Officers Portal to Google Workspace.
- Beneficial since we're using Google Drive already.
- It could allow exchange between National Officers.

- More efficient and already utilised by some NGs (e.g. Poland, Georgia).

Position of the International Board

- A unified “archiving method” can make knowledge management/sharing more efficient.
- The Officers Portal needs to be restructured and updated, but this is a long process. Therefore, certain things need to be prioritised.
- The Officers Portal is and should remain the main knowledge-sharing/management platform.
- It’s better to have everything in the Officers Portal with even weak password protection.
- Until this becomes the reality, shared drives can serve this purpose (for presentations, templates etc).

BFG: I now open the floor for any questions. I see none. Therefore, we can proceed to the next debrief.

AC and BFG present the Daily Debrief of the Workshop “Houston, We have a Plan!”.

Key Findings

Prioritisation and evaluation of the Strategic Goals

- The main reason for the lack of engagement when it came to creating the Implementation Handbook was that it was still too early in the term.
- National Officers might not feel comfortable providing commentary on the Goals selected by the IB at the beginning of their term.
- Need for more knowledge transfer to the Network on the Strategic Goals.
- General agreement that National Officers should receive information on Goals that are particularly relevant to their Area.
- The “trickle-down effect”.
- General agreement on the importance of the Network being aligned with the Strategic Plan in their own strategic planning.

Harmonisation of the Strategic Goals and other strategies

- The Strategies should be harmonised so that they are not contradictory.
- Aligned strategies lower the risk of contradicting Goals.
- Specific Strategies complement the general ones.
- Strategic Planning as a generational effort.

Concrete Outcomes

Prioritisation and evaluation of the Strategic Goals

- Start the term with an open call for each area to give the Network an overview of what the International Board of ELSA wants to focus on during the term.
- The International Board of ELSA should, at the end of the term, ask the Network for their input for the next term's main focus points and inform about these inputs incoming International Board of ELSA.
- Include concrete questions on the Strategic Goals in the State of the Network Inquiry.
- Creation of a survey.
- Present the priorities during the International Training Meeting (one general but also for each area).

- Regular updates on Strategic Planning milestones (for example through the Monthly Report).

Harmonisation of the Strategic Goals and other strategies

- The President should oversee all strategies.
- Creation of all Strategic Plans and Financial Strategy in the same year for five years/ Creating Financial Strategy one year after the Strategic Plan / Create Strategic Plan and Financial Strategy separately
- Working Groups overlapping terms to ensure continuity.

Position of the International Board

- The Network should be engaged with the Strategic Plan - and also with the Implementation Handbook.
- The IB shall choose the goals to prioritise in any given term, but the Network shall be informed and kept involved in the process in order to give input on the IB's plans.

BFG: I now open the floor for any questions. I see none. Therefore, we can proceed to the Final Debrief.

BFG presents the Final Debrief of the IV International Strategy Meeting as a whole.

BFG: We will now then move to the feedback part of this debrief. Therefore, I am opening the floor for any feedback you may want to share.

ELSA Germany: We would like to thank the International Board for improving this ISM against the background of the previous III ISM - for using our time well and structuring it well. We would also to point out how useful the Daily Debriefs were; we are very grateful for that.

BFG: Thank you very much. I will now pass the floor to YK to present the Evaluation Form for the IV International Strategy Meeting.

YK presents the Evaluation Form for the IV International Strategy Meeting.

Closing remarks and thank you's.

BFG closes the Workshop and the IV International Strategy Meeting at 14:12.