

# LI International Presidents' Meeting

## MINUTES

Thessaloniki, Greece  
26th - 30th August 2015



Corporate Partner of ELSA



General Partners of ELSA



Human Rights Partner of ELSA



International Summer School  
Partner of ELSA



Auditing Partner of ELSA



LL.M. Partners of ELSA

English Language Partner of ELSA



The European Law Students' Association

12:05 – 12:57

## Opening Workshop

List of participants:

Anna HAIPOLA ( <i>AH</i> )	ELSA International
Hector TSAMIS ( <i>TS</i> )	ELSA International
Vedran STANKOVIĆ ( <i>VS</i> )	ELSA International
Antonia MARKOVITI ( <i>AM</i> )	ELSA International
Robert VIERLING (Chair)	ELSA Germany
William ANTOINE (Secretary)	ELSA Luxembourg
Christine BECK	ELSA Switzerland
Julien DONZEL	ELSA Switzerland
Christian KROGH	ELSA Denmark
Mads LORENTZEN	ELSA Denmark (Alumni)
Matej BENDA	ELSA Czech Republic
Nikola KRATKA	ELSA Czech Republic
Tatu KÄRHÄ	ELSA Finland
Jarl-Johan HÉDE	ELSA Finland (LG)
Milos PUPIK	ELSA Czech Republic
Mikko TERVAHAUTA	ELSA Finland
Birgitta OTS	ELSA Estonia
Breeze VAN ECK	ELSA Luxembourg
Luca GOMES	ELSA Luxembourg
Isabella ROSMAN	ELSA Sweden
Krzysztof STEPKOWSKI	ELSA Poland
Michal LACHECKI	ELSA Poland (LG)
Marialena KARANTINO	ELSA Greece
Christina BALSTAVIA	ELSA Greece
Petros Orestis KATSOULAS	ELSA Greece (LG)
Erlend SERENDAHL	ELSA Norway
Oda ERIKSEN REOENNING	ELSA Norway (LG)
Ferdinand HNATKOW	ELSA Germany
Maximilian LABUDEK	ELSA Germany (LG)
Gabrielle LENFANT PIERRE	ELSA France (Alumni)
Mihaela ANGELOVA	ELSA UK (LG)
Rob VAN BERGEN	ELSA The Netherlands
Nadege SANGO ALFONSO	ELSA The Netherlands (LG)
Faiq OMAROV	ELSA Azerbaijan
Daan WILLEMS	ELSA Belgium (LG)
Ketevan MCHEDLISHVILI	ELSA Georgia
Ani MIKIASHVILI	ELSA Georgia
Michaela MAJROVÁ	ELSA Slovak Republic
Petra LAŠOVÁ	ELSA Slovak Republic (LG)
Lambrini XENOU	ELSA Cyprus
Jan DOHNAL	ELSA Slovak Republic

Raphael KARLISCH  
Jacqueline MELZER  
Verena BASNER

ELSA Germany (LG)  
ELSA Germany (LG)  
ELSA Germany (LG)

*AH opens the International Presidents' Meeting. Roundtable of introductions and expectations.*

*Election of the workshop officers:*

**AH** Nominations for the Chair of the meeting? I see none. ELSA International nominates Robert Vierling from ELSA Germany.

*XX seconds the nomination.*

*Robert Vierling accepts the nomination.*

Voting on the election of Robert Vierling as the Chair of the IPM:

In Favour:	17
Against:	1
Abstentions:	0

Total amount of votes: 18

**AH** I give the floor to the Chair to proceed with the election of other workshop officers.

**Chair** Nominations for secretaries?

**ELSA UK** We nominate Anastasia Kalinina from ELSA UK. She will arrive later today.

*XX seconds the nomination.*

**Chair** Other nominations?

**ELSA Luxembourg** We nominate William Antoine from ELSA Luxembourg.

*XX seconds the nomination.*

*William Antoine accepts the nomination.*

Voting on the election of Anastasia Kalinina as a secretary of the IPM:

In Favour:	18
Against:	0
Abstentions:	0

Total amount of votes: 18

Voting on the election of William Antoine as a secretary of the IPM:

In Favour:	18
------------	----

Against: 0  
Abstentions: 0

Total amount of votes: 18

**Chair** Nominations for Director for ELSA Spirit?

**AH** ELSA International nominates Mads Lorentzen from ELSA Denmark.

*XX seconds the nomination.*

*Mads Lorentzen accepts the nomination.*

Voting on the election of Mads Lorentzen as a Director for ELSA Spirit of the IPM:

In Favour: 18  
Against: 0  
Abstentions: 0

Total amount of votes: 18

*Presentation of workshop rules.*

*Presentation of the agenda.*

**Chair** Any questions?

**ELSA Denmark** We would like to discuss changes on regulations for an hour preferably before the miscellaneous on Saturday.

**ELSA Switzerland** More time on legal background, take time out of the OYOP.

*Introduction of attending ELSA International follows.*

*Presentation of other IB members leading other meetings.*

*Explanation of ice-breaker game and presentation of Director for ELSA Spirit.*

Voting on approving the changes to the agenda:

In Favour: 18  
Against: 0  
Abstentions: 0

Total amount of votes: 18

**Chair** Any other questions? None noted.

*OC welcoming and announcements follow.*

15.04 – 15:56

## International Update

Participants list:

Anna HAIPOLA ( <i>AH</i> )	ELSA International
Hector TSAMIS ( <i>TS</i> )	ELSA International
Vedran STANKOVIĆ ( <i>VS</i> )	ELSA International
Antonia MARKOVITI ( <i>AM</i> )	ELSA International
Robert VIERLING (Chair)	ELSA Germany
William ANTOINE (Secretary)	ELSA Luxembourg
Anastasia KALININA (Secretary)	ELSA UK (LG)
Christine BECK	ELSA Switzerland
Julien DONZEL	ELSA Switzerland (LG)
Matěj BENDA	ELSA Czech Republic
Nikola KRATKA	ELSA Czech Republic
Tatu KARHA	ELSA Finland
Milos PUPIK	ELSA Czech Republic
Mikko TERVAHAUTA	ELSA Finland
Birgitta OTS	ELSA Estonia
Breeze VAN ECK	ELSA Luxembourg
Luca GOMES	ELSA Luxembourg
Isabella ROSMAN	ELSA Sweden
Krzysztof STEPKOWSKI	ELSA Poland
Michal LACHECKI	ELSA Poland (LG)
Marialena KARANTINO	ELSA Greece
Petros Orestis KATSOULAS	ELSA Greece (LG)
Erlend SERENDAHL	ELSA Norway
Oda ERIKSEN REOENNING	ELSA Norway (LG)
Ferdinand HNATKOW	ELSA Germany
Maximilian LABUDEK	ELSA Germany (LG)
Gabrielle LENFANT PIERRE	ELSA France (Alumni)
Ipshita SINGH	ELSA France
Mihaela ANGELOVA	ELSA UK (LG)
Rob VAN BERGEN	ELSA the Netherlands
Nadege SANGO ALFONSO	ELSA the Netherlands (LG)
Faiq OMAROV	ELSA Azerbaidjan
Daan WILLEMS	ELSA Belgium (LG)
Ketevan MCHEDLISHVILI	ELSA Georgia
Ani MIKIASHVILI	ELSA Georgia
Michaela MAJROVÁ	ELSA Slovak Republic
Petra LAŠOVÁ	ELSA Slovak Republic (LG)
Lambrini XENOU	ELSA Cyprus
Jan DOHNAL	ELSA Slovak Republic
Raphael KARLISCH	ELSA Germany (LG)

Jacqueline MELZER  
Verena BASNER  
Christian KROGH  
Mads LORENTZEN

ELSA Germany (LG)  
ELSA Germany (LG)  
ELSA Denmark  
ELSA Denmark (Alumni)

*Newcomers' introductions.*

**Chair** We will proceed with the presentation on the update of ELSA International.

*AH, HT and AM give presentations.*

**ELSA UK (LG)** What are the specific topics and form of the IBA-ELSA Conference?

**AH** Mostly lectures and panel discussions on Banking & Finance with the participation of prominent speakers, more information will follow later on in the presentation.

*Newcomers' introductions.*

*AH continues with the presentation.*

**AH** Any questions?

**ELSA Denmark** One of the proposals from the ICM in Cluj-Napoca is not included in the recent Decision Book. Although I know that this not the responsibility of the current board, I feel I must highlight this. Please note also that neither the issue regarding the number of days announcing an extraordinary meeting included either, any comments on that?

**HT** We are still waiting for the notarial deed for the statutes and so for time-being we are legally bound by the existing ones. As far as the decision book goes, Alina inserted all changes as far as I know but we will definitely check to make sure it is updated and accurate before the next ICM.

**Chair** If there are no further questions, we will have a break before we are continuing.

Wednesday, 26nd of August 2015

---

## **Partner Opportunities**

16:07 – 17: 26

Participants list:

Anna HAIPOLA (*AH*)

ELSA International

Hector TSAMIS ( <i>TS</i> )	ELSA International
Vedran STANKOVIĆ ( <i>VJ</i> )	ELSA International
Antonia MARKOVITI ( <i>AM</i> )	ELSA International
Robert VIERLING (Chair)	ELSA Germany
William ANTOINE (Secretary)	ELSA Luxembourg
Anastasia KALININA (Secretary)	ELSA UK (LG)
Christine BECK	ELSA Switzerland
Julien DONZEL	ELSA Switzerland
Matěj BENDA	ELSA Czech Republic
Nikola KRATKA	ELSA Czech Republic
Tatu KARHA	ELSA Finland
Milos PUPIK	ELSA Czech Republic
Mikko TERVAHAUTA	ELSA Finland
Birgitta OTS	ELSA Estonia
Breeze VAN ECK	ELSA Luxembourg
Luca GOMES	ELSA Luxembourg
Isabella ROSMAN	ELSA Sweden
Krzysztof STEPKOWSKI	ELSA Poland
Michal LACHECKI	ELSA Poland (LG)
Marialena KARANTINOY	ELSA Greece
Petros Orestis KATSOULAS	ELSA Greece (LG)
Erlend SERENDAHL	ELSA Norway
Oda ERIKSEN REOENNING	ELSA Norway (LG)
Ferdinand HNATKOW	ELSA Germany
Maximilian LABUDEK	ELSA Germany (LG)
Gabrielle LENFANT PIERRE	ELSA France (Alumni)
Ipshita SINGH	ELSA France
Mihaela ANGELOVA	ELSA UK (LG)
Rob VAN BERGEN	ELSA the Netherlands
Nadege SANGO ALFONSO	ELSA the Netherlands (LG)
Faiq OMAROV	ELSA Azerbaijan
Daan WILLEMS	ELSA Belgium (LG)
Ketevan MCHEDLISHVILI	ELSA Georgia
Ani MIKIASHVILI	ELSA Georgia
Michaela MAJOROVÁ	ELSA Slovak Republic
Petra LAŠOVÁ	ELSA Slovak Republic (LG)
Lambrini XENOU	ELSA Cyprus
Jan DOHNAL	ELSA Slovak Republic
Raphael KARLISCH	ELSA Germany (LG)
Jacqueline MELZER	ELSA Germany (LG)
Verena BASNER	ELSA Germany (LG)
Christian KROGH	ELSA Denmark
Mads LORENTZEN	ELSA Denmark (Alumni)
Claudia Barbarano	External

**Chair** We proceed with the presentation by ELSA International on Partner Opportunities.

*AH gives presentation.*

**Chair** Does anybody cooperate with CMS in their home countries?

**ELSA Germany** Yes, we work closely with CMS on some of our projects. I am meeting them in a couple of weeks to discuss what we will be doing for the coming year.

**Chair** The representative of DLA Piper will now give her presentation.

*Claudia Barbarano from DLA Piper gives presentation on the DLA Piper - ELSA collaboration.*

**Claudia Barbarano** Who are those who cannot get legal aid and require pro bono in your own countries?

**ELSA UK (LG)** Under-represented groups within the UK, especially immigrant and disabled people as evidenced by the majority of the work of our partner, the University Legal Advice Centre, which works mostly with these groups as part of their pro bono activity.

*Announcements.*

*Coffee Break at 16.41.*

*Workshop resumes at 17:04.*

**Chair** If there are no additional questions in regards to the previous part of the presentation we will continue with the partnership opportunities given by EI.

*AH proceeds with the presentation on partner institutions, projects and organisations.*

**Chair** If there are no questions regarding that presentation, we will have an energizer now and close the workshop.

Wednesday, 26nd of August 2015

---

17:28 – 18:59

## **Recruitment**

Participants list:

Anna HAIPOLA ( <i>AH</i> )	ELSA International
Hector TSAMIS ( <i>TS</i> )	ELSA International
Vedran STANKOVIĆ ( <i>VS</i> )	ELSA International
Robert VIERLING (Chair)	ELSA Germany
William ANTOINE (Secretary)	ELSA Luxembourg
Anastasia KALININA (Secretary)	ELSA UK (LG)
Christine BECK	ELSA Switzerland
Julien DONZEL	ELSA Switzerland
Matěj BENDA	ELSA Czech Republic
Nikola KRATKA	ELSA Czech Republic
Tatu KÄRHÄ	ELSA Finland



Jarl-Johan HÉDE	ELSA Finland (LG)
Milos PUPIK	ELSA Czech Republic
Mikko TERVAHAUTA	ELSA Finland
Birgitta OTS	ELSA Estonia
Breeze VAN ECK	ELSA Luxembourg
Luca GOMES	ELSA Luxembourg
Isabella ROSMAN	ELSA Sweden
Lisa HENRIKSSON	ELSA Sweden (LG)
Krzysztof STEPKOWSKI	ELSA Poland
Michal LACHECKI	ELSA Poland (LG)
Marialena KARANTINO	ELSA Greece
Petros Orestis KATSOU	ELSA Greece (LG)
Erlend SERENDAHL	ELSA Norway
Oda ERIKSEN REOENNING	ELSA Norway (LG)
Ferdinand HNATKOW	ELSA Germany
Maximilian LABUDEK	ELSA Germany (LG)
Gabrielle LENFANT PIERRE	ELSA France (Alumni)
Mihaela ANGELOVA	ELSA UK (LG)
Rob VAN BERGEN	ELSA the Netherlands
Nadege SANGO ALFONSO	ELSA the Netherlands (LG)
Faiq OMAROV	ELSA Azerbaijan
Daan WILLEMS	ELSA Belgium (LG)
Ketevan MCHEDLISHVILI	ELSA Georgia
Ani MIKIASHVILI	ELSA Georgia
Michaela MAJOROVÁ	ELSA Slovak Republic
Petra LAŠOVÁ	ELSA Slovak Republic (LG)
Lambrini XENOU	ELSA Cyprus
Jan DOHNAL	ELSA Slovak Republic
Raphael KARLISCH	ELSA Germany (LG)
Jacqueline MELZER	ELSA Germany (LG)
Verena BASNER	ELSA Germany (LG)
Christian KROGH	ELSA Denmark
Mads LORENTZEN	ELSA Denmark (Alumni)

**Chair** We will now proceed with the workshop on recruitment delivered by Hector Tsamis.

*HT presentation follows, including explanation of new Human Resources strategy (DB, IM, HR Art.3).*

**HT** Any questions or further suggestions?

**ELSA Switzerland** ELSA Spirit can sometimes scare people off, so one piece of advice is to stay away from that, at least at the start. This includes certain energizers as well.

**HT** This is definitely good to keep in mind.

**ELSA Cyprus** Something that you said sparked an idea that maybe you could make a promotional video as a board presenting what you do within ELSA and how you feel about it.

**HT** This is a good example of the importance of co-operation between the areas of IM and Marketing – it is perhaps more plausible for local boards to do this rather than the international board, but we definitely encourage it.

**ELSA Azerbaijan** We actually created such a video at the start of our year and have it available on Youtube.

**ELSA Finland (LG)** I would encourage groups to change it up a bit with making the initial meeting in another location or context which provides a sort of ice-breaker.

*HT continues with the presentation.*

**ELSA Germany** Please repeat where I can access this presentation?

**HT** It is uploaded on the Officers' Portal under the Internal Management section.

**Chair** I should also note here that this applies to all other presentations as well.

*Newcomers' introductions.*

*HT explains exercise on Recruitment – division of groups to discuss personal experiences of recruitment.*

*Presentations from group work as follows:*

### **Group 1**

#### Positives

- Recruitment through unofficial or social events makes it easier to bridge the gap between the board and members
- The amount of opportunities means there is something for everyone
- Social side brings people together providing an immediate way of getting involved

#### Negatives

- Barrier in communicating between the board and member with there being a general lack of focus on recruitment
- Difficulty with having to show such a large scope of everything that is on offer by the organisation at large
- Imbalance by having either too many socials or being too academically or professionally-focused

### **Group 2**

#### Positives

- Reaching people as soon as possible
- Promoting more international events
- Keeping a good balance between social and professional side

#### Negatives

- Quality of events could be greatly improved by using all the available resources that we have which are very beneficial

- Need for being more approachable by ensuring you maintain contact

### **Group 3**

#### Positives

- Visible effort made with putting on the event, making it a more pleasant experience
- Experience within Key Areas is important to bring in
- Promoting the organisation and its events on social media

#### Negatives

- Too much focus on board positions and internal matters; would be better to focus on opportunities
- Too much pressure on freshers to attend international conferences, such as ICMs, IPMs, etc and it sounds overwhelming
- Lack of follow-up events

### **Group 4**

#### Positives

- Being open-minded
- Making the contact informal
- Ensuring there is a variety of activities

#### Negatives

- Use of ELSA language is off-putting to those who are new to the organisation
- Structure of ELSA is too complex so it is important to keep it brief when explaining
- Lack of Alumni involvement

### **Group 5**

#### Positives

- Using creative approaches varying between an informal approach, such as preparing a breakfast altogether or formal approaches, such as distributing a magazine through the law faculty
- Ensuring there is a structured recruitment process with clear application forms and that interviews
- Most positions open are for fresher's, so can get actively involved without having any previous ELSA experience

#### Negatives

- Lack of communication with regard to providing further information after the initial correspondence
- Lack of insight of the inner workings of the society when announcing recruitment and introducing people into the team
- Lack of integration after the recruitment process

### **Group 6**

#### Positives

- Using a personal approach and giving an immediate call back
- Presenting concrete plans within the Key Areas
- Having an open group meeting by including everyone and making it interactive

#### Negatives

- No contact after the first approach or only after a long period of time
- Using ELSA jargon which is confusing
- Having a hierarchy between new members and officers, so important to be inclusive

**AH** Just to add to Group 5; the law faculty can also promote ELSA directly, e.g. in my local group they send the fresher's edition of the local ELSA magazine to all students accepted to the faculty with the official acceptance letter so practically every student knows about ELSA and its activities already before entering the faculty.

**ELSA Luxembourg** Regarding the online applications – how do other groups do their own? As Google forms? We would like to simplify our own method.

**ELSA Azerbaijan** We use google forms requesting their details and then do a follow-up meeting to discuss it.

**ELSA Norway** Which software do you use? WordPress? If so then there is something similar to a Google form which can be easier to use.

**ELSA Finland (LG)** Concerning use of google forms, in Finland it is against the law to collect personal information in this way. The matter came up a few weeks ago so we just wanted to highlight this for anyone who might have similar problems.

**ELSA Greece** Another question - in Greece we have a whole month around September when we are busy with exams so we cannot organise any such meetings or events and I was wondering what solutions others might have for this? Is there a way of eliminating the resulting imbalance between having a high level of activity in one period and almost none in another?

**Chair** I propose that we move the discussion on this matter to the Miscellaneous section of the agenda which will be on the last day because this is a problem many people face, so it would be best to discuss it in full.

*General thumbs-up.*

*HT Gives thanks for input and finalises presentation.*

Friday, 28nd of August 2015

---

10:03 – 13:28

## One Year Operational Plan

Participants list:

Anna HAIPOLA ( <i>AH</i> )	ELSA International
Hector TSAMIS ( <i>TS</i> )	ELSA International
Vedran STANKOVIĆ ( <i>VS</i> )	ELSA International
Robert VIERLING (Chair)	ELSA Germany
William ANTOINE (Secretary)	ELSA Luxembourg
Anastasia KALININA (Secretary)	ELSA UK (LG)
Christine BECK	ELSA Switzerland
Julien DONZEL	ELSA Switzerland
Matěj BENDA	ELSA Czech Republic
Nikola KRATKA	ELSA Czech Republic
Tatu KÄRHÄ	ELSA Finland
Jarl-Johan HÉDE	ELSA Finland (LG)
Milos PUPIK	ELSA Czech Republic
Mikko TERVAHAUTA	ELSA Finland
Birgitta OTS	ELSA Estonia
Breeze VAN ECK	ELSA Luxembourg
Luca GOMES	ELSA Luxembourg
Isabella ROSMAN	ELSA Sweden
Lisa HENRIKSSON	ELSA Sweden (LG)
Krzysztof STEPKOWSKI	ELSA Poland
Michal LACHECKI	ELSA Poland (LG)
Marialena KARANTINO	ELSA Greece
Petros Orestis KATSOULAS	ELSA Greece (LG)
Erlend SERENDAHL	ELSA Norway
Oda ERIKSEN REOENNING	ELSA Norway (LG)
Ferdinand HNATKOW	ELSA Germany
Maximilian LABUDEK	ELSA Germany (LG)
Gabrielle LENFANT PIERRE	ELSA France (Alumni)
Mihaela ANGELOVA	ELSA UK (LG)
Rob VAN BERGEN	ELSA the Netherlands
Nadege SANGO ALFONSO	ELSA the Netherlands (LG)
Faiq OMAROV	ELSA Azerbaidjan
Daan WILLEMS	ELSA Belgium (LG)
Ketevan MCHEDLISHVILI	ELSA Georgia
Ani MIKASHVILI	ELSA Georgia
Michaela MAJEROVÁ	ELSA Slovak Republic
Petra LAŠOVÁ	ELSA Slovak Republic (LG)
Lambrini XENOU	ELSA Cyprus
Jan DOHNAL	ELSA Slovak Republic
Raphael KARLISCH	ELSA Germany (LG)
Jacqueline MELZER	ELSA Germany (LG)
Verena BASNER	ELSA Germany (LG)
Christian KROGH	ELSA Denmark
Mads LORENTZEN	ELSA Denmark (Alumni)

**Chair** First question, has anyone already filled out the Evaluation Sheet? Please do this by tomorrow morning. I will hand these out now for those of you who do not have any. Next question, who is new?

*Newcomer's introductions follow.*

**Chair** We will now proceed with the workshop.

**AH** Reminding everyone that this workshop was cut down from three hours to two.

*AH gives presentation.*

*Belbin Test exercise follows.*

**AH** Did you find this useful?

*General thumbs-up.*

**AH** How many of you think of doing this within your own team?

*General thumbs-up.*

**ELSA Switzerland** Will this be on the Officers' Portal?

**AH** I would rather send it through the mailing list.

**Chair** We will continue for 45 minutes and then have a break. Presentation on the One Year Operational Plan will follow for around 25 minutes with a Q&A section in the end.

*AH presentation follows.*

**ELSA Austria** How did you deal with storming with regards to the OYOP? How difficult was it to create it?

**AH** We had some trouble, I believe all wanted the same things but the means were different so there was confrontation but we did reach consensus. We left some things out because we will not include what some board members may not be comfortable with or are not certain about inserting. This was what the storming phase was for us.

**Chair** Any more questions? I see none.

*AH proceeds with presentation.*

**Chair** Any questions in regards to the presentation or the OYOP itself?

**ELSA Azerbaijan** How was the OYOP shared? Is on the mailing list?

**AH** Yes, it was sent yesterday.

**ELSA Czech Republic** Why was it not sent before the IPM? We did not have time to prepare questions for it.

**AH** We were not prioritising it, so we only compiled it last weekend. How do you feel about covering the OYOP at the ICM?

*General thumbs-down.*

**Chair** There is a majority of thumbs down, so that means it will not be covered at ICM Batumi.

**ELSA Belgium** The problem is that evaluating the OYOP midway may create a shift in the goals that were already set and cannot be changed.

**ELSA Sweden** I had a look through it and noticed you used a different structure, is there a reason for that?

**AH** There are two methods – we used the common one because we felt that everything we do is connected, as in practice little is done individually. You always need someone to help you. Even with Moot Courts, it seems like another area but is actually a ‘multi-area’ which is complex to structure and this is why teamwork is also very important. It is not useful to think in separate areas. Better to share and ask for help from others and sometimes this co-operation is even required. At the KAM and SAM there will be OYOP sessions so you can tell your board members to address questions there as well.

**Chair** Any more questions? I see none. Since we have another 10 minutes we will quickly go through the OYOP.

*AH presents.*

**ELSA Switzerland** You mentioned that OYOP was not a priority previously and that there are flagship projects you wanted to focus on, for example partner structure, but are there any other projects with regards to members and partners or anything else on your list that you are not just planning on doing but are prioritising.

*Clarifications.*

**ELSA Switzerland** The question is what are you really focusing on?

**AH** We are focusing on IT because we are working with it every day and yet the systems currently in place are not effective. A lot of work is now spent on something that could be automatised and now that we have focused on this from the beginning we can follow through with it. For example, with delegations there is a lot of repetitive copy-pasting. Some other goals, for example the partner structure is not as high in priority because it is something that potentially requires a change in the current partnerships and we might not be able to implement those changes, which would mean that we have to stick to the current structure. Another priority with regards to information management: Most members are not subscribed to the mailing list, which is a concern because, for instance, the network is not aware that there is a conference happening in London or any other international event for that matter organised by active local groups.

**Chair** We are done with the workshop.

*Workshop paused for coffee break at 11:55.*

*Resumed at 12:05.*

**Chair** I remind you how to present – It is normal that we are consistently seeking for approval or some reaction from the audience while we are presenting, such as nodding etc. Please be aware that this will not always happen in ELSA discussions since the other parties will have their opinion, which they want to state. So please be precise and do not repeat yourself, if you start doing this, I will interrupt you. I will open speakers' list now.

**ELSA Denmark** There was a proposal in Cluj-Napoca regarding contacting certain types of companies as potential sponsors and it was decided that it will not be implemented. If you read the minutes, you would be aware of this, but basically it was regarding certain criteria as to who you would be permitted to contact, especially where product-based organisations are concerned. I am afraid I do not have the amendments that were proposed, but examples include excluding companies related to tobacco, oil, gas, etc.

*Clarifications.*

**ELSA Denmark** The reason why we were in favour of it in Cluj-Napoca was that there was a lot of confusion with most thinking that the voting was for the amendments, rather than the entire section. We would now like to make this a proposal again for the upcoming ICM.

**Chair** Any comments or statements? Is clarification needed?

**ELSA Czech Republic** Not clear.

**Chair** To clarify - there was an amendment in the decision book as to what kind of sponsors can be contacted, now they want remove the amendment. The IPM has the right to propose something to the ICM and that is what we are discussing now.

**ELSA France** Could you repeat the list of the types of companies?

**ELSA Austria** Could we have the proposal on the screen?

**AH** Easier to view the original version prior to amendments. It was amended, but not drastically. This is the original proposal.

**ELSA Denmark** I will clarify for those countries who were not in Cluj-Napoca - the idea behind this is that we bring it up now and if you believe that you need time then we can vote on it in the Miscellaneous. However, I believe it would be too late to discuss it then, so we suggest to cover it now. It remains up to you.

**Chair** There appear to be no comments, but I think that is because it is confusing. I suggest we organise the new version to be able to show it to you and then you may discuss it with ELSA Denmark or us in your spare time. We will get back to it in the miscellaneous session.

**ELSA Sweden** Can we please do that in the first hour of the Miscellaneous? Some delegations will be leaving after.

**Chair** Do you all agree?

*General thumbs-up.*



**ELSA Denmark** Continuing with further topics, the first one is more theoretical rather than practical and so might appear a dry but the purpose is to have statutes that we are complying to. In the previous ICM there was a change on how early EI summons the ICM. Now it is 28 days, but the problem is that we have 35 days to send in proposals, so we cannot have that. We propose to change the dates from 28 to 42. It was previously not approved because it is apparently not in accordance with Dutch law, so we inserted a sentence making the change of 28 to 42 only with ordinary meetings. The next sentence says that with extraordinary meetings, it would be remains as 28 days, which is in accordance with Dutch law as far I know.

**Chair** Does everybody understand? Thumbs up, thumbs down?

*General thumbs-up.*

**ELSA Denmark** It is not a problem now but at some point this will be relevant.

**Chair** So are you saying that we should have this as a proposal for the ICM?

**ELSA Denmark** Yes.

**Chair** Personally I think that it is easy and can be voted on now. Is that fine?

*General thumbs-up.*

**ELSA the Netherlands** Not aware of the regulations on that, so I would have to find out about this before we vote on it for the ICM.

*Clarifications.*

**Chair** So do you suggest we go over this on Sunday instead?

**ELSA the Netherlands** We can vote now.

**Chair** Anyone wish to discuss this? If not we shall proceed with voting after the next proposal is presented.

**ELSA Denmark** Next one – again for those who were in Cluj-Napoca. We have a proposal for the change in the dates for the IPM making it the relevant weekday that fits in the time we usually have the meetings rather than a specific date. The proposal is to unify what we already do with what is written, the aim is not to change the spectre of when we are having it. Again, if you wish to discuss it another time then we can do that too.

**Chair** Is this clear to everyone, any questions? We will then proceed with the voting.

*Clarifications.*

**Chair** Also I remind you that one-third majority is needed for the proposal to go to the ICM. We have 20 voting countries.

## Statutes amendment concerning article 11

The International Presidents' Meeting is proposing the following to the Council:

# Organs

## Article 11 – Council

### 11.2 Summoning of Council

The Council shall meet twice a year, in spring and in autumn, at a time fixed by the International Board. Extraordinary meetings can be requested by the International Board or by at least one-third of all the Members.

The Council shall be summoned by means of written invitations sent by the International Board to all Members, Observers, Auditors, and any person appointed by the International Board or Council to carry out a specific task at least ~~twenty-eight~~ forty-two days before the opening of the Council Meeting in question. In the case of an extraordinary meeting, the deadline for the summoning is only twenty-eight days.

Voting on taking proposal for change to ICM Batumi regarding the number of days required summoning Council:

In Favour:	17
Against:	0
Abstentions:	3

Total amount of votes: 20

*The change is proposed to the ICM by the required majority.*

## Standing Orders amendment concerning article 17

The International Presidents' Meeting is proposing the following to the Council:

# The International Presidents' Meeting

## Article 17 – Procedure of the International Presidents' Meeting

17.1 The International Board in cooperation with the elected host is responsible for choosing the date and for the organisation of each Presidents' Meeting. The Council shall however elect a Presidents' Meeting host responsible for the practical organisation of the Presidents' Meeting. Dates of the Presidents' Meeting shall be between ~~January 15<sup>th</sup> and February 15<sup>th</sup>~~ the third Wednesday of January and the third Sunday of February for winter Presidents' Meeting and between ~~August 1<sup>st</sup> and August 31<sup>st</sup>~~ the first Wednesday of August and the last Sunday of August for summer Presidents' Meeting.

Voting on taking proposal to ICM Batumi regarding the change of the expression for when to hold IPMs:

In Favour:	20
Against:	0
Abstentions:	0

Total amount of votes: 20

*The change is unanimously proposed to the ICM.*

**ELSA Denmark** We have another one, but we will cover that later.

**ELSA Switzerland** Question about the tax situation, which of the three approaches will you be taking after all? Did you take any steps or there is no progress on that yet?

**AH** We did not hire anyone yet, also the previous board did not use the 5,000 euros allocated in tax consultancy in the budget.

**ELSA Switzerland** But did you choose one approach out of the three? And if not when can we expect more information about that?

**AH** There will be a workshop on it at the Treasurers' workshop in SAM.

**ELSA Czech Republic** As far as I know, Marek had this as one of his personal goals, so I believe he will definitely deal with it.

**Chair** Any further questions?

**ELSA Denmark** Last topic to be presented is controversial. We already discussed in Baku. We are not presenting this as an ICM proposal yet. It is something that can be interpreted in different ways, but as I see it, currently only one representative of any country can be present at the IPM. So, as we are now, we are technically going against our own statutes. We could change it, but we are merely proposing it as a topic to discuss in Batumi whether as a general ELSA topic or only within BEE. It is a matter of raising awareness and discussion as what the IPM should be and how many can attend it. Hopefully by the end, we can hopefully produce a concrete proposal as to how to amend the statutes so that we make sure we are not violating them.

**ELSA Austria** Thank you Mads. The IPM it is an international meeting, so it is a matter of motivation, if we only have the president there, right now we would only be 20 people because there are 20 countries currently present. Maybe it is best to have a limit of participants per country, maybe two or three spots, so that we have more people that can come and witness how it all happens. This is especially good if they wish to continue as an officer within BEE.

**ELSA Czech Republic** It should not just be a discussion on BEE and we would be happy with no limit. There should be more participants, not necessarily unlimited, but not too many people allowed either. For active countries, however, it is important for motivation purposes to attend. If we apply the same logic to KAMs and SAMs it might end up being 10 people at the event.

**ELSA Switzerland** I do not like that idea. At the IPM you should only talk about topics that relate to BEE. There are other events for other areas. It is better to keep it to a few people, since that way there is more participation. Otherwise there would be a lot of time wasted and there is a risk that opening it up like this would make it more like an ICM.

**ELSA Greece** For the purposes of motivation, there should be at least three or four members present, since this is beneficial for other areas, in particular the supporting ones. For example, the presidents cooperate with the Secretary General a lot and so it is important for them to be present as well. The areas are, after all, inter-related.

**ELSA Switzerland** Direct comment – this is what we mean about the risk of have potentially a third or fourth annual ICM, because this is exactly how it works during those international events with joint workshops for situations where there is that inter-relation present.

**ELSA Greece** Direct comment – I give as an example the workshop about recruitment that we had earlier. This is a supporting area that does not belong in BEE or the one about databases which also concerns another area and yet it is closely tied to BEE.

**ELSA Norway** With regards to people carrying other positions being present in these meetings, I think it is helpful to have them as well because it keeps our focus and inspiration. It can also be beneficial for key areas as well.

**ELSA Austria** Who is coming is irrelevant – if there are two spots open, anyone else can come.

**ELSA Finland** If there will be too many participants at the IPM, we may lose track of what we should be talking about. If some of the KAMers come instead to the IPM, it becomes quite problematic.

**ELSA Switzerland** I am of the opinion that since it is a Presidents' meeting, it slows us down if we have to repeat or explain what we are saying, it then becomes inefficient and repetitive and allows for no progress.

**ELSA Poland** I see the positive side, but I think that having one spot only could cause conflicts within the national group itself as there may be a large interest in just a single position. That way someone would have to choose and there could be problems arising from that.

**ELSA UK (LG)** We started to discuss whether only BEE areas should be covered, but I want to stress out something that needs to be taken into consideration – there is ambiguity in the phrasing and if EI were to apply it strictly, then half the people in the room would not be here. Also if we consider the second sentence – it is not clear where the outgoing presidents fit in.

**ELSA Denmark** Clarification – they can still go as substitutes if the current president cannot come.

**ELSA Switzerland** Direct comment – concerning all presidents, maybe we could have something covering the presence of alumni since a former president is an alumni.

**ELSA UK (LG)** The question is then whether the former president would count as a substitute, as per the second paragraph, or an extra participant altogether.

**Chair** I think everyone gave his or her general opinion right now. OC announcements to prolong discussion until 13:30. Is that fine with everyone?

*General thumbs-up.*

**ELSA Denmark** We would like to reconsider the structure of the discussion and clarify what we want to achieve. We want workshops only on BEE-related topics and the question is whether you think that having other areas present and discussed is appropriate given that the purpose of an IPM as we think of it. Is general discussion on ELSA part of this as well? So what is the purpose of the IPM and the outcome that needs to be reached from it according to everyone here? Then we may continue with the discussion on how many people it can be.

**Chair** The discussion previously was on the background to this so that we may have a general idea of what everyone's view is. Now we can proceed.

**ELSA France** In my opinion, having other areas covered as well does not mean that we will not discuss BEE. You can have another role at the moment, but planning on running for candidacy as president and so it is important for you to start getting involved in order to get acquainted with the ongoing issues and general topics.

**ELSA Denmark** As presidents we have a chance to meet at the ICM and we spend a lot of time on proposals regarding the Statutes and Standing Order and the Decision Book. The IPM, as I see it, is a chance to discuss new ideas because there is usually no time for that in ICMs. Bringing in hot topics and looking at the bigger picture is essential so that we get back to this being an actual IPM. We mean that workshops should have the theme of BEE specifically from the presidents' perspective – not that other areas cannot be present. I would like to remind you that, at first, the IPMs were small and there was a lot of input with the focus largely on presidential work – we wish to get back to that.

**ELSA Finland** IPM should remain largely about BEE.

**ELSA Norway** It should be focused and the number of participants may help with that, but I fail to see what BEE topic does not overlap with other areas and so someone who carries another position might bring valuable input to it.

**ELSA Switzerland** Direct comment - inputs can be given during the preparation for the IPM by discussing the working materials in advance within our groups.

**ELSA Poland** We also have National Presidents' Meetings and I cannot imagine having other areas present for that.

**ELSA Austria** The bottom line is that IPMs should be attended primarily by presidents and cover the BEE area. If there are more spots available, then people from other areas can be present, but no more than that.

**ELSA Greece** I am in favour of placing a limitation on the number of participants, but in the IPM there are topics relating to all areas, examples include discussions on partners or presentation skills training which is under all areas, so everyone can find these useful.

**ELSA Switzerland** I think there is a general misunderstanding, as a president you work with other areas and so, of course, you end up talking about them. The point thing is that sometimes

the topics are in themselves irrelevant, for example, in Baku there was a talk on the history of STEP which, in my opinion, was unnecessary.

**ELSA UK (LG)** We are going in a vicious circle and ultimately running out of time. It is better if we first talk about the general theme the workshops should cover, then go into who is to attend and finally what the limit of the participants should be. Otherwise we will not come to a concrete outcome.

**ELSA Denmark** This is exactly what we are doing right now; discussing in the hopes of reaching an outcome. It is difficult, but it is important to see what the thoughts on the topic generally are. Everybody has the right to speak.

**ELSA Sweden** It is important to keep the IPM BEE-related, it is important in order to remain focused.

**AH** Some people are confusing the issues. I would like remind you that it is you who will give me input as to what you want discussed at the IPM and then ELSA International creates the agenda based on that, which is not to be covered in the statutes. At this IPM does someone feel that there is something that is not BEE-related?

**ELSA Denmark** In my view, the Alumni Anniversary is an example.

**AH** Yes, that is usually more IM-related, but it was not intended to be so here. Alumni is often seen as one form of external relations and the presidents are involved with them.

**ELSA Denmark** We are not saying that the whole idea behind this discussion is not needed but we want to focus more on the BEE side to it.

**AH** I think that the reason for this whole discussion is simply because at the last IPM there were topics that were not as relevant and so debating this in the context of this IPM is unnecessary.

**ELSA UK (LG)** I must stress out that I do not find Alumni outside the BEE area - they are lawyers and professionals, so you may wish to contact them as a president for the purpose of securing partnerships and sponsorships.

**ELSA Belgium** Maybe keep it simple and short – discuss the topics, who should attending and what be the number of spots should be, so that then we can go forward.

**Chair** I open the speakers' list.

**ELSA Germany** We have 42 local groups and we have six presidents here; there are no other areas present from Germany. For example, ELSA Austria has in total six local groups and it has two presidents here, so that is already one-third of all presidents for them, but for us this kind of limitation does not work considering the size of the German network.

**Chair** The topic that we are discussing is what the general theme of the IPM should be.

**ELSA Switzerland** I would want to see a thumbs-up/thumbs-down on that.

**Chair** Ok, thumbs-up for who thinks it should focus mostly on BEE.

*General thumbs-up.*

**Chair** So the majority think that it should be mainly or completely within the BEE area. This is important to know as a background for the decision-making afterwards. Now whether only the presidents should be attending or other areas can as well. So on a show of hands, should others be given the chance to attend as well?

*General thumbs-up.*

**Chair:** Now moving on to the limit of participants.

**ELSA Denmark** With regards to numbers it is one or that person's substitute, so for us it is clear.

**Chair** Do you agree or disagree? And please express yourself with general comments.

**ELSA Czech Republic** I am in favour of bringing more people to the IPM. There should be more participants, I do not mind who. I would not want to demotivate a local president by rejecting their opportunity to attend. Same happened to me last IPM where, due to the small capacity, I was not accepted as the participant even I was running for the National Board. That was really demotivating.

**ELSA Denmark** The issue is the balance between how efficient it is and how much experience can be shared, so it is best not to have just one person per country. The compromise would be having the president and one more. This means that efficiency is retained and the extra participants can add to the experience and knowledge-sharing. Who exactly will be coming is an internal matter for the group, but for the purposes of the IPM, we need to focus on efficiency.

**ELSA Norway** Maybe we could have a thumbs-up and thumbs-down to see how people feel about limiting the number of participants?

**ELSA Austria** I feel we have to discuss it some more first.

**ELSA Greece** It is not a matter of whether it will be two or three per country. Efficiency comes from having the right kind of agenda with the right topics.

**ELSA Switzerland** All is about the amount of people, because if we have three people from each country, imagine that amount of people discussing this now, in the other scenario we would be just 20.

**ELSA Austria** The efficiency is important at an IPM so we should limit the spots and then leave it up to the national board to decide who will come.

**ELSA UK (LG)** On setting a limit I would like to consider Germany's situation. If we think about the EU Parliament for example, they have a system of representatives in proportion to the population of the individual country. In our context, this would mean that the number of representatives at the IPM would be proportionate to the amount of local groups the country has. This can then also act as an incentive to expand and have more local groups nationally in order to be able to participate more actively at the IPM. I suggest this instead of setting a strict requirement of two or three people.

**ELSA Denmark** I hear what you are saying, but the structure of ELSA is such that the national president is there to represent the country, they are elected for that reason within their own countries.

**ELSA UK (LG)** I completely disagree. My participation at one of the previous IPMs as a local president was very beneficial for my own local work.

**ELSA the Netherlands** I agree with you Mads if you mean that whether it is a local officer is a matter for the nationals to decide.

**ELSA Denmark** We do recognise that other people can get a lot out of it, so I say we need a balance.

**ELSA UK (LG)** I feel I must give an extreme example – I experienced the situation of having problems with our National Board with there being no link between the international board and the local one because of their inactivity, especially in terms of communication. This structural chain can be problem. If I had not received training on the international level I would not have known what is to be expected. I realise that most boards are not like that, but the risk is there because the boards change each year.

**ELSA Germany** Mads, I agree with you on what concerns efficiency but observing the discussion now I see that it is the same five to ten people who are contributing, the others are not harming the discussion. However they can learn a lot by just listening and observing. The IPM is a great chance for them to get to know the international level of ELSA and to experience the discussions about the current hot topics. They will be highly motivated when they come back to their local groups.

**ELSA Sweden** There should be some limitation, but surely locals can attend IPMs as they are allowed to do so at other international events.

**AH** The challenge for the IPM is that it is almost 50 people and this is getting overwhelming. For example, the training that we had earlier could have been a lot easier with less people, so the separation of workshops helps with that and at the end the outcomes can always be shared afterwards.

**ELSA Switzerland** If we split up the workshops, we could always use reporting time for the purpose of discussing the issues and exchanging opinions.

**AH** The summary of what had happened could be gathered from the minutes of the other workshops as well.

**ELSA Norway** It might be a good idea, to have another round of thumbs up and thumbs down to see if limiting the number of participants would make it more efficient.

**Chair** We will do this but first thumbs up if you want more people than what is written already in the Statutes.

**ELSA Norway** What I mean is whether the limitation would be a good tool to increase efficiency or whether it does not matter at all?



*Clarifications.*

**Chair** So show thumbs up for lowering the number of participants.

*Result unclear.*

**Chair** Should we have another workshop on this?

*General thumbs up.*

**Chair** So you may now go and discuss this and come up with concrete suggestions as to how to solve it.

**ELSA Denmark** Just a quick remark – this is the exact point we are trying to convey; that is that smaller groups are better able to come to a conclusion.

**Chair** And I point out that we have a speakers' lists for that very reason.

Friday, 28nd of August 2015

---

15:05 – 16: 35

## **External Relations Database**

Participants list:

Anna HAIPOLA ( <i>AH</i> )	ELSA International
Hector TSAMIS ( <i>TS</i> )	ELSA International
Vedran STANKOVIĆ ( <i>VS</i> )	ELSA International
Antonia MARKOVITI ( <i>AM</i> )	ELSA International
Robert VIERLING (Chair)	ELSA Germany
William ANTOINE (Secretary)	ELSA Luxembourg
Anastasia KALININA (Secretary)	ELSA UK (LG)
Christine BECK	ELSA Switzerland
Julien DONZEL	ELSA Switzerland
Matěj BENDA	ELSA Czech Republic
Nikola KRATKA	ELSA Czech Republic
Tatu KARHA	ELSA Finland
Milos PUPIK	ELSA Czech Republic
Mikko TERVAHAUTA	ELSA Finland
Birgitta OTS	ELSA Estonia
Breeze VAN ECK	ELSA Luxembourg
Luca GOMES	ELSA Luxembourg
Isabella ROSMAN	ELSA Sweden
Lisa HENRIKSSON	ELSA Sweden (LG)
Krzysztof STEPKOWSKI	ELSA Poland
Michal LACHECKI	ELSA Poland (LG)

Marialena KARANTINO	ELSA Greece
Petros Orestis KATSOULAS	ELSA Greece (LG)
Erlend SERENDAHL	ELSA Norway
Oda ERIKSEN REOENNING	ELSA Norway (LG)
Ferdinand HNATKOW	ELSA Germany (LG)
Maximilian LABUDEK	ELSA Germany (LG)
Gabrielle LENFANT PIERRE	ELSA France (Alumni)
Mihaela ANGELOVA	ELSA UK (LG)
Rob VAN BERGEN	ELSA the Netherlands
Nadege SANGO ALFONSO	ELSA the Netherlands
Faiq OMAROV	ELSA Azerbaidjan
Daan WILLEMS	ELSA Belgium (LG)
Ketevan MCHEDLISHVILI	ELSA Georgia
Ani MIKIASHVILI	ELSA Georgia
Michaela MAJOROVĀ	ELSA Slovak Republic
Petra LAŠOVĀ	ELSA Slovak Republic (LG)
Lambrini XENOU	ELSA Cyprus
Jan DOHNAL	ELSA Slovak Republic
Raphael KARLISCH	ELSA Germany (LG)
Jacqueline MELZER	ELSA Germany (LG)
Verena BASNER	ELSA Germany (LG)
Federica SIMONELLI	ELSA Italy (Alumni)
Christian KROGH	ELSA Denmark
Mads LORENTZEN	ELSA Denmark (Alumni)

*Presentation for the next IPM in Brno, Czech Republic, given by Miloš Pupík.*

*Punishments.*

**Chair** We will begin with the presentation of ELSA International for External Databases.

*AH gives presentation.*

**AH** Who has an external database within their own groups?

**ELSA Poland** We do. For us it is a form of knowledge management for the current board while the succeeding boards can also benefit by getting in contact with them for their own projects.

**ELSA Greece** We also have a list of all our externals that the board members can use to contact in order to organise an activity or event without any difficulties.

**ELSA Azerbaijan** We have a similar method taken from our social network system; since we have so many accounts we contain it all within one document and during transition we pass it on.

**ELSA Switzerland** We have one simply because it would be difficult to recall all their contact details by heart.

**ELSA Estonia** It is an important way of ensuring the new board works more efficiently.

*AH continues with presentation of IB externals database.*

*Coffee break.*

*Workshop resumes at 16:06.*

**Chair** How many here have a database they can show?

*Show of hands.*

*Announcements.*

*Group exercise on exchanging experience of using of databases:*

### **Group 1**

In our group there were two different systems mentioned, one with emails to inform the local groups of the existing partners and the other is a document where every contact is listed and what the state of the relationship with them is. Everyone in the group also had a system on how to control local groups contacting externals as well. Some criteria include the size of the company and its location.

### **Group 2**

Most use a database in Google Drive where it is listed which local group has which partner and they are controlled because they must first be given permission before being placed on it.

### **Group 3**

Swedish system controlled because there were difficulties in the past with overlap and the firms were contacted simultaneously by many groups whilst being unaware of the fact that we are divided between local and national levels. In terms of the type of database, a google form document is used with questions such as who you want to contact and why, etc.

### **Group 4**

Finland uses Google drive database, whilst Luxembourg does not have a database yet.

### **Group 5**

Czech Republic uses Asana. It is used as an online database where every local group can log into and where they can see all the partners listed. Generally, national groups felt like they needed a unified databases so that every group can see the partners. Emails between locals and national groups were seen to be time-consuming and outdated. However, those who did use that method had a system in place to ensure that emails were answered in time. The downside to databases, on the other hand, was that they are sometimes complicated to use and so this deters people from using it.

**ELSA Azerbaijan** With regards to Asana, so can we now supersede the restricted number for free?

**AH** Not the case yet, but will be soon.

**ELSA Azerbaijan** Is it about making lists or does it have other features as well?

**AH** You can also add attachments to the lists of tasks.

### **Group 6**

Different countries had different methods. Cyprus and Greece do not have a database but instead just use a spreadsheet with details filled in. With Norway we are small group so we act quite independently. If I need to contact a potential partner, I would first ask for support from the national president and then we would proceed together.

### **Group 7**

Our database is similar to IB's model with each sponsor listed along with their contact details and notes so that everyone knows how to contact their partners, whilst Italy has an excel file as a database containing basic information on all partners. Meanwhile, the local groups in Estonia is small and so all is done quickly through the national board because the partners are fewer and therefore it is easier to get hold of who they are.

**ELSA Azerbaijan** Question to ELSA Germany – at the previous ICM one of your directors talked about a specific system you were using, can you talk more about that?

**ELSA Germany** It is an IT system similar to Facebook where you can create your own groups, both national and local and stay in touch with your team. It is a good platform for communicating and retaining knowledge management.

**ELSA Azerbaijan** Does it have a system for uploading files?

**ELSA Germany** Yes it does.

**ELSA Azerbaijan** Cost?

*Clarifications.*

**Chair** As far as I know it does not cost anything to use.

**ELSA Azerbaijan** But I assume it costs to create it.

**Chair** If no more questions, we will go for a coffee break and resume at the hour.

Friday, 28nd of August 2015

---

17:00 – 18:54

## International Contacts

Participants list:

Anna HAIPOLA ( <i>AH</i> )	ELSA International
Hector TSAMIS ( <i>HT</i> )	ELSA International
Vedran STANKOVIĆ ( <i>VS</i> )	ELSA International
Robert VIERLING (Chair)	ELSA Germany
William ANTOINE (Secretary)	ELSA Luxembourg
Anastasia KALININA (Secretary)	ELSA UK (LG)
Christine BECK	ELSA Switzerland
Christian KROGH	ELSA Denmark
Mads LORENTZEN	ELSA Denmark (Alumni)
Matěj BENDA	ELSA Czech Republic
Tatu KÄRHÄ	ELSA Finland
Jarl-Johan HÉDE	ELSA Finland (LG)
Milos PUPIK	ELSA Czech Republic
Mikko TERVAHAUTA	ELSA Finland
Birgitta OTS	ELSA Estonia
Breeze VAN ECK	ELSA Luxembourg
Luca GOMES	ELSA Luxembourg
Isabella ROSMAN	ELSA Sweden
Lisa HENRIKSSON	ELSA Sweden (LG)
Krzysztof STEPKOWSKI	ELSA Poland
Michal LACHECKI	ELSA Poland (LG)
Mariakona KARANTINOVA	ELSA Greece
Petros Orestis KATSOULAS	ELSA Greece (LG)
Erlend SERENDAHL	ELSA Norway
Oda ERIKSEN REOENNING	ELSA Norway (LG)
Ferdinand HNATKOW	ELSA Germany
Maximilian LABUDEK	ELSA Germany (LG)
Ipshita SINGH	ELSA France
Rob VAN BERGEN	ELSA the Netherlands
Erik MUCHENSCHNABEL	ELSA Austria
Mattias ZECHA	ELSA Austria (LG)
Faiq OMAROV	ELSA Azerbaijan
Daan WILLEMS	ELSA Belgium (LG)
Ketevan MCHEDLISHVILI	ELSA Georgia
Ani MIKIASHVILI	ELSA Georgia
Michaela MAJEROVÁ	ELSA Slovak Republic
Petra LAŠOVÁ	ELSA Slovak Republic (LG)
Lambrini XENOU	ELSA Cyprus
Jan DOHNAL	ELSA Slovak Republic
Raphael KARLISCH	ELSA Germany (LG)
Jacqueline MELZER	ELSA Germany (LG)
Verena BASNER	ELSA Germany (LG)
Christian KROGH	ELSA Denmark
Mads LORENTZEN	ELSA Denmark (Alumni)

Federica SIMONELLI

ELSA Italy (Alumni)

*Group exercise.*

*Workshop resumed at 18:03.*

*Announcements and energizer follows.*

*Section on External Relations from Decision Book presented.*

**AH** How many people are aware of this regulation and comply with it?

*Show of hands.*

**AH** What exactly would you do to ensure its implementation? How would you practically control this?

**ELSA Switzerland** I suppose check whether there is someone else in contact with an international external by using whatever database you keep to track that.

**Chair** Questions? None.

*AH presents current system of tracking.*

**AH** The options would be for me to fill this document in each time there is contact made; otherwise I can share this with you and you, as national presidents, can update it as you make contact – but the idea is also for you to see how you can make your own system to reduce this problem overall.

**ELSA Czech Republic** Thank you for doing all this, but the administrative side to it seems tedious and unnecessary; it might be different for local groups that have to ask the national board whenever they want to address NB's partners, but for the national board who contact many large law firms through the whole year it might not be as useful.

**ELSA Switzerland** Whether you go with one option or the other does not change anything for us, because this is entirely your decision. But is there any reason why you brought it up now? I am asking because as far as I know it was working before.

**ELSA UK (LG)** I see how this might work on the national level. I should, however, mention what from the local groups' perspective there is an even greater administrative burden. If our local group were to contact an international firm we would have to first surpass the extra hurdle of informing the National Board and previously we had the problem of there being a delay with that, but then there may be an additional delay from the International Board for whatever reason. That means that the process for us is even longer, so we need have system in place to make it faster. I do not know whether the option of you uploading it will work either because, once more, as a local group you do not know whether the National Board is updating it.

**ELSA Sweden** Maybe law firms should be regulated separately at particular times or locations. For example, when a group does a study visit to Brussels many of the same firms might be contacted so perhaps that is what needs to be regulated.

**ELSA Czech Republic** I have a general question - I do not understand why I, as a national officer, need to ask for permission to contact the firm of Allen & Overy of Prague when it is separate from all other Allen & Overy offices around the world. They might not even know that they were contacted elsewhere. Besides we are in touch usually with office managers rather than partners, so they especially are unlikely to interact with other offices on such matters.

**AH** I will not proceed then with this database, if the two week time period for you is fine.

**ELSA Germany** Two questions - last year we discussed the idea of exchanging letters of recommendation. If there is another country, which has a partnership with the international contact in question, this letter could then be used as a type of referral. How has that been working? My other question is if everyone thinks this is difficult why not just take it out of the Decision Book?

**ELSA Czech Republic** I do not think we should take it out of the regulations, because that would be difficult and take too much time and anyway would be a matter for the ICM, for now I think it is better to keep it. With regards to recommendation letters, I think only Anna was sharing hers. Generally, I do not think it useful because of the administrative work involved and anyway we explain to the partners what our structure is directly, there is no need to have additional materials from another group that they are very unlikely to consult anyway.

**ELSA Austria** I don't think we should strike it out, because something like this should be regulated.

**AH** We can just keep it this way for now with me replying to emails when needed within two weeks.

**ELSA Czech Republic** I do not think it is a problem.

**Chair** We will continue with the presentation for the next 30 minutes and then have another Q&A.

*AH continues with presentation.*

**ELSA Czech Republic** What about multi-partnership agreements? For example where a certain percentage of the partnership fee will go to the Czech Republic.

**AH** We discussed this and the partners are in favour. I would like to know now from you how you feel about a company approaching us offering this kind of a partnership. We are essentially interested in widening the partnership with Deloitte negotiating for this type of an agreement where they would hopefully be willing to give more money, so that a proportion of that could go to the national groups.

**ELSA Azerbaijan** Wouldn't this put extra responsibilities on the National Boards?

**AH** There would be some conditions, perhaps sharing their logos on your social media and websites.

**ELSA Sweden** National groups include local ones and this would be a problem in Sweden as some of them have exclusive agreements.

**ELSA Switzerland** We would face the same problem, so this would be in breach of their agreements.

*Clarifications.*

**AH** Well if it is not possible within some countries, this is no longer a possibility. I will present to the DLA programme for you in further detail now.

*AH presents the DLA Piper 'Break into Law' programme.*

**ELSA France** We visited their offices and had workshops and trainings which very interactive and practical. This is also excellent for networking.

**AH** Do you think they will co-operate more with you?

**ELSA France** Yes, we are in touch with them at the moment in hopes to diversify the partnership. Ozgur was happy to talk about the alternatives, which we suggested that were not listed in her earlier presentation.

**AH** Any questions?

**ELSA Czech Republic** The people who are providing these talks? Are they given in English or in French?

**ELSA France** In the offices in Paris we had both with most of it in French. However, we also invited international participants and so we asked for their presentations to be in English which was provided. We found this to be beneficial also for the French-speaking audience.

**ELSA Czech Republic** Do you think that the relationship between DLA Piper and ELSA Prague will improve once we present them the international partnership? Do you think this will force them to co-operate with us?

**AH** Of course it would not be a matter of forcing but yes it is a possibility that they would be more interested this time round, especially since they focus primarily on promoting social responsibility and we share that aim with them. After this is clearly established, there could be a warmer approach.

Also there were some questions about whether you need to contact me first in order to get in touch with DLA Piper and the answer is no. That was the purpose of the presentation, so you are more able to see exactly how it works and then contact Claudia who will direct you to the person who is local to you.

Another partnership worth noting is with CBL. There was confusion last year with some people never receiving a reply to queries and therefore opted out of applying altogether which meant there was a very low number of applicants. This is why we will be changing the application system now.

*AH presents the new application system.*



**AH** So basically it will be a matter of having a promotional code which will be distributed to the network and then entered with the application form. Administratively it would eliminate a big burden.

*Announcements.*

Saturday, 29th of August 2015

---

10:08 – 11:40

## **Legal Background**

Participants list:

Anna HAIPOLA ( <i>AH</i> )	ELSA International
Hector TSAMIS ( <i>HT</i> )	ELSA International
Vedran STANKOVIĆ ( <i>VS</i> )	ELSA International
Robert VIERLING (Chair)	ELSA Germany
William ANTOINE (Secretary)	ELSA Luxembourg
Anastasia KALININA (Secretary)	ELSA UK (LG)
Christine BECK	ELSA Switzerland
Julien DONZEL	ELSA Switerland
Christian KROGH	ELSA Denmark
Mads LORENTZEN	ELSA Denmark
Matěj BENDA	ELSA Czech Republic
Tatu KÄRHÄ	ELSA Finland
Mikko TERVAHAUTA	ELSA Finland
Jarl-Johan HÉDE	ELSA Finland (LG)
Birgitta OTS	ELSA Estonia
Breeze VAN ECK	ELSA Luxembourg
Luca GOMES	ELSA Luxembourg
Isabella ROSMAN	ELSA Sweden
Lisa HENRIKSSON	ELSA Sweden (LG)
Krzysztof STEPKOWSKI	ELSA Poland
Michal LACHECKI	ELSA Poland (LG)
Marialena KARANTINO	ELSA Greece
Petros Orestis KATSOULAS	ELSA Greece (LG)
Erlend SERENDAHL	ELSA Norway
Oda ERIKSEN REOENNING	ELSA Norway (LG)
Ferdinand HNATKOW	ELSA Germany
Maximilian LABUDEK	ELSA Germany (LG)
Gabrielle LENFANT PIERRE	ELSA France (Alumni)
Ipshita SINGH	ELSA France
Rob VAN BERGEN	ELSA the Netherlands
Erik MUCHENSCHNABEL	ELSA Austria
Mattias ZECHA	ELSA Austria (LG)

Faiq OMAROV  
Daan WILLEMS  
Ketevan MCHEDLISHVILI  
Ani MIKIASHVILI  
Michaela MAJOROVÁ  
Petra LAŠOVÁ  
Lambrini XENOU  
Raphael KARLISCH  
Jacqueline MELZER  
Verena BASNER

ELSA Azerbaidjan  
ELSA Belgium (LG)  
ELSA Georgia  
ELSA Georgia  
ELSA Slovak Republic  
ELSA Slovak Republic (LG)  
ELSA Cyprus  
ELSA Germany (LG)  
ELSA Germany (LG)  
ELSA Germany (LG)

**Chair** We will start with the presentation for the upcoming ICM Batumi.

*Ketevan Mchedlishvili presents.*

**ELSA Austria** Usual question – will there be any wifi?

**ELSA Georgia** That is of course important and we will do the best we can to satisfy the participants.

**Chair** We will proceed with the following topic, which affects presidents greatly. Vedran will give the presentation regarding legal issues.

*VS gives presentation.*

**Chair** We shall have the discussion on this now.

**ELSA Switzerland** In our legal system, the liability situation is clear because the contracts are all handed out by ELSA International. They are standardised contracts between the employer and trainee, so it is clear to us that the liability is that of EI; if we had other contracts then we would have too many. And since third parties cannot have personal information, the National Board and Local groups are seen as ‘the middle man’ and are not actual parties to them.

**ELSA Czech Republic** As I was part of ELSA Prague last year, we had an issue that may point to the fact that we may need more contracts. I share the view that liability is on the EI, but we had a situation in which the EI signed the contract with the employers as normal, so first the employee paid everything necessary but then two weeks before the start of the traineeship, employer cancelled it entirely. The local group felt bad in the face of the trainee because it did not have any power over the law firm and the money paid. The firms must have traineeships that they cannot simply cancel like this and if they do they must be obliged to pay all the expenses.

**Chair** Any other questions?

**ELSA Czech Republic** Not a question but more of a suggestion on a more specific agreement between the local groups and the law firm because EI may not always have power over a local company to pay for expenses.

**ELSA France** How will the working groups work on this issue?

**VS** Work has not started yet, I did not go over the detail yet but after KAM it will be a lot clearer. We expect to find partners to help us out with that.

**ELSA Switzerland** Regarding data protection with third parties handling information. It is us who are part of ELSA Switzerland and then ELSA Switzerland is part of EI. I talked to groups who have a centralised list of all ELSA members instead so that you could check for certain whether a person is a member or not. Do we know that if this is possible and whether the working group is planning on discussing this as part of their agenda?

*Clarification requested.*

**ELSA Switzerland** Legally is it possible to have a centralised list with all the ELSA members on all levels with EI handling all this data?

**ELSA France** I would like to point out that it is already possible to some extent, because you as the national board can request a confirmation letter to check whether an applicant is a member or not from the group.

**ELSA Austria** Different methods exist, but lists like that I think are impractical to do on an international level.

**Chair** Any other comments or clarifications? If none we will leave it for the working group.

**ELSA Belgium** It is perhaps important for the working group to consider having smaller working groups for each country due to the vast differences between the systems meaning that the contract from EI might have to be adjusted to the national jurisdiction to ensure compliance.

**VS** Currently in the decision book there is a possibility to have a form and so it is not a problem to apply this to the local groups. With a centralised system we could try and find out if that is possible. I will see to this for STEP purposes, but at the moment the way of checking is contacting the local groups and having them consult their own lists.

As for the situation with the contracts, I am up to having a penalty system. I do not have any concrete proposal now but hope to in the future. Maybe when we have clearer contracts, we will also be able to have a sanction system. There may be issues that might arise, especially financial ones. For example, ten years ago we had application fees for STEP, maybe that could be a solution, but legally it must be made clear. Any comments?

**ELSA Germany** In answer to Czech Republic's question – this discussion of a structure for a sanction system is an on-going hot topic. Once an employer decides upon a trainee maybe ELSA should have another contract between the employer and trainee as it usually happens in all law firms because of the data protection in question. Then with a signed contract you can directly apply the contract itself without necessarily getting EI involved.

**ELSA France** Maybe we should first ask for professional advice because you cannot say that a local group, using a form that is not theirs, immediately means that EI is liable. There is a connection between the local level and EI, but it is not a direct membership, so there isn't that much of a close legal link between the two. I believe we need to reflect on that. If you say there is one, then there is conflict between the local group and EI and not the local group and the company. It might depend on the contract and what exactly applies, so it can get quite complex.

**ELSA Switzerland** For example with the contract provided by EI you are allowed to translate the form but the contract signing happens with it in its original form in English. This makes it clear that it is not your contract but rather one that is going directly to EI. We are therefore negotiating on behalf of EI, but if we are made liable then that would mean that there should be a contractual relationship between the employer and the local group as well. In that case, we, as the national board, would also have to have a contract with EI and if you think of the number of traineeships that would be too many contracts. No one would be able to have an overview of all that.

**ELSA France** I agree it is easier and clearer as it is but I have one question only - who will be signing? This is important because if you consider what we are discussing now and you would have to make sure the EI is definitely signing it, making it clear for the company that the liability is shared between them. It could be pre-signed for instance, so as soon as the company signs, the contract is deemed concluded.

**ELSA Switzerland** I would have to have many contracts signed and if I have to wait for Vedran's signature each time it could become administratively difficult.

**Chair** We have exchanged ideas so the working group can now refer to the minutes; but for now we will stick to having a legal professional having a look at this question.

**ELSA Cyprus** One last question - in our marketing mailing list at some point there was the issue of membership cards; you mentioned this centralised database and so I am asking whether it is legally possible to have a separate ID number for all ELSA members in general.

**AH** With regards to the legal side of it, I would not want to say anything specific yet, but there are some associations that currently have a similar system, such as ESN. They have an online platform with login and password details. Whether we want this and how we would practically implement it is a separate question.

**Chair** Any other questions? I see none.

Saturday, 29th of August 2015

---

11:55 – 12:50

### **ELSA Alumni and Anniversary**

Participants list:

Anna HAIPOLA ( <i>AH</i> )	ELSA International
Hector TSAMIS ( <i>TS</i> )	ELSA International
Vedran STANKOVIĆ ( <i>VS</i> )	ELSA International
Robert VIERLING (Chair)	ELSA Germany
William ANTOINE (Secretary)	ELSA Luxembourg
Anastasia KALININA (Secretary)	ELSA UK (LG)
Christine BECK	ELSA Switzerland

Julien DONZEL	ELSA Switzerland
Matěj BENDA	ELSA Czech Republic
Nikola KRATKA	ELSA Czech Republic
Tatu KARHA	ELSA Finland
Milos PUPIK	ELSA Czech Republic
Mikko TERVAHAUTA	ELSA Finland
Birgitta OTS	ELSA Estonia
Breeze VAN ECK	ELSA Luxembourg
Luca GOMES	ELSA Luxembourg
Isabella ROSMAN	ELSA Sweden
Lisa HENRIKSSON	ELSA Sweden (LG)
Krzysztof STEPKOWSKI	ELSA Poland
Michal LACHECKI	ELSA Poland (LG)
Marialena KARANTINO	ELSA Greece
Petros Orestis KATSOULAS	ELSA Greece (LG)
Erlend SERENDAHL	ELSA Norway
Oda ERIKSEN REOENNING	ELSA Norway (LG)
Ferdinand HNATKOW	ELSA Germany
Maximilian LABUDEK	ELSA Germany (LG)
Gabrielle LENFANT PIERRE	ELSA France (Alumni)
Ipshita SINGH	ELSA France
Mihaela ANGELOVA	ELSA UK (LG)
Rob VAN BERGEN	ELSA the Netherlands
Nadege SANGO ALFONSO	ELSA the Netherlands (LG)
Faiq OMAROV	ELSA Azerbaidjan
Daan WILLEMS	ELSA Belgium (LG)
Ketevan MCHEDLISHVILI	ELSA Georgia
Ani MIKIASHVILI	ELSA Georgia
Michaela MAJOROVÁ	ELSA Slovak Republic
Petra LAŠOVÁ	ELSA Slovak Republic (LG)
Lambrini XENOU	ELSA Cyprus
Jan DOHNAL	ELSA Slovak Republic
Raphael KARLISCH	ELSA Germany (LG)
Jacqueline MELZER	ELSA Germany (LG)
Verena BASNER	ELSA Germany (LG)
Christian KROGH	ELSA Denmark
Mads LORENTZEN	ELSA Denmark (Alumni)

*Chair announcements.*

*AH gives presentation.*

**AH** Do any of you use LinkedIn for ELSA?

**ELSA Denmark** We have one, but it has been neglected. I am going to try and be more active on it this year.

**ELSA France** We do not use it for ELSA, but we have used it to send invitations to Alumni. A former member of EI was present at one of our events that way, so it is a good tool for maintaining contact with them.

**ELSA Czech Republic** For all the local groups, the employers and speakers could always be directed to the LinkedIn page first when we contact them, but otherwise it is not used that actively.

**AH** What are you planning on doing for the anniversary? We have a suggestion about writing a history about your national group so that we can present this at ICM Malta, there would be an exhibition.

**Chair** Discuss it with the people next to you and we can come up with some concrete ideas to put through.

*Group exercise follows.*

**ELSA Azerbaijan** Every national group saying happy birthday and compiling that in a video for ICM Malta; this could be a marketing idea for the entire network.

**ELSA Belgium (LG)** Maybe have a song.

**AH** What do you think of these ideas generally?

*General thumbs up.*

**ELSA Germany** We have an alumni network, but they are not motivated. If we could send a call amongst them for contributions of photos and materials, we could create a collage. It will bring the current national presidents and alumni together in this creative way.

**ELSA Georgia** We were thinking of having a whole ELSA week dedicated to this with presentations on new projects; gathering partners and distributing reports, marketing materials and possibly even having an exhibition. A birthday cake and maybe a charity event with some participating lawyers is also an idea.

**AH** That's a creative idea. Fun fact: EI is actually thinking about forming a band as a board date. And something else, you can also get hold of the history of your group by checking the old editions of your membership magazine if you have one.

**ELSA Netherlands (LG)** We thought of making a video on Alumni, interviewing them on how ELSA contributed to their later success, so locals can see that this is a big contribution to our future.

**AH** Perhaps also an exhibition night at the ICM. We previously tried out having a European night with countries bringing in their own cultural foods, but it did not work out, so maybe we could try that now instead focusing on exhibiting the individual country's history of the group? What do you think?

*General thumbs up.*

*Chair announcements.*

Saturday, 29nd of August 2015

---

15:07 – 17:15

## **Best practices in Board Management**

Participants list:

Anna HAIPOLA ( <i>AH</i> )	ELSA International
Hector TSAMIS ( <i>TS</i> )	ELSA International
Vedran STANKOVIĆ ( <i>VJ</i> )	ELSA International
Robert VIERLING (Chair)	ELSA Germany
William ANTOINE (Secretary)	ELSA Luxembourg
Anastasia KALININA (Secretary)	ELSA UK (LG)
Christine BECK	ELSA Switzerland
Christian KROGH	ELSA Denmark
Mads LORENTZEN	ELSA Denmark (Alumni)
Matěj BENDA	ELSA Czech Republic
Nikola KRATKA	ELSA Czech Republic (LG)
Tatu KÄRHÄ	ELSA Finland
Jarl-Johan HÉDE	ELSA Finland (LG)
Mikko TERVAHAUTA	ELSA Finland
Birgitta OTS	ELSA Estonia
Breeze VAN ECK	ELSA Luxembourg
Luca GOMES	ELSA Luxembourg
Isabella ROSMAN	ELSA Sweden
Lisa HENRIKSSON	ELSA Sweden (LG)
Krzysztof STEPKOWSKI	ELSA Poland
Michal LACHECKI	ELSA Poland (LG)
Mariarena KARANTINO	ELSA Greece
Petros ORESTIS KATSOULAS	ELSA Greece
Erlend SERENDAHL	ELSA Norway
Christina BALTSAVIA	ELSA Greece
Eirini RAFA	ELSA Greece
Erlend SERENDAHL	ELSA Norway
Oda ERIKSEN REOENNING	ELSA Norway (LG)
Ferdinand HNATKOW	ELSA Germany
Maximilian LABUDEK	ELSA Germany (LG)
Mihaela ANGELOVA	ELSA UK (LG)
Gabrielle LENFANT PIERRE	ELSA France (LG)
Ipshita SINGH	ELSA France
Rob VAN BERGEN	ELSA the Netherlands
Nadege SANGO ALFONSO	ELSA the Netherlands (LG)

Erik MUCHENSCHNABEL  
Faiq OMAROV  
Daan WILLEMS  
Ketevan MCHEDLISHVILI  
Ani MIKIASHVILI  
Lambrini XENOU  
Raphael KARLISCH  
Jacqueline MELZER  
Verena BASNER

ELSA Austria  
ELSA Azerbaijan  
ELSA Belgium (LG)  
ELSA Georgia  
ELSA Georgia  
ELSA Cyprus  
ELSA Germany (LG)  
ELSA Germany (LG)  
ELSA Germany (LG)

*Energiser break.*

*Board management simulation and speed experience-sharing exercise follows.*

*After coffee break workshop resumed at 16:54.*

**AH** Would someone like to share what you discussed?

**ELSA Denmark** I will not elaborate on what the problem was, but generally it came from viewing the projects as just the individual's rather than of the whole board. If something is not going as you want, you have to remember that it is not your own but the boards', and also important to remember not to take everything personally.

**ELSA Norway** In the beginning, it is a good idea to have everyone understand each other's workload and so they know what to expect throughout the year having this as common ground.

**Chair** Anyone else?

**ELSA Denmark** Again I will just briefly state that the essence of the situation was the transition period, specifically with sharing passwords. Maybe better to make it possible for them to pass them on in time afterwards, otherwise some issues may arise with the next boards' work and it is important to reduce these.

**Chair** Anyone else?

**AH** This was for conflict management, now we will move on to the planning part.

**ELSA Czech Republic** Team building for the national board in our experience has been the best during ICMs for the entire delegation because we connect with each other either through reporting time or general social time.

**Chair** Anyone else?

*AH finalises presentation.*

Saturday, 29th of August 2015

---

17:16 – 18:37



## Experience Sharing on Partners

Participants list:

Anna HAIPOLA ( <i>AH</i> )	ELSA International
Hector TSAMIS ( <i>TS</i> )	ELSA International
Vedran STANKOVIĆ ( <i>VS</i> )	ELSA International
Robert VIERLING (Chair)	ELSA Germany
William ANTOINE (Secretary)	ELSA Luxembourg
Anastasia KALININA (Secretary)	ELSA UK (LG)
Christine BECK	ELSA Switzerland
Christian KROGH	ELSA Denmark
Mads LORENTZEN	ELSA Denmark (Alumni)
Matěj BENDA	ELSA Czech Republic
Nikola KRATKA	ELSA Czech Republic (LG)
Tatu KÄRHÄ	ELSA Finland
Jarl-Johan HÉDE	ELSA Finland (LG)
Mikko TERVAHAUTA	ELSA Finland
Birgitta OTS	ELSA Estonia
Breeze VAN ECK	ELSA Luxembourg
Luca GOMES	ELSA Luxembourg
Isabella ROSMAN	ELSA Sweden
Lisa HENRIKSSON	ELSA Sweden (LG)
Krzysztof STEPKOWSKI	ELSA Poland
Michal LACHECKI	ELSA Poland (LG)
Marialena KARANTINOOU	ELSA Greece
Erlend SERENDAHL	ELSA Norway
Christina BALTSAVIA	ELSA Greece
Eirini RAFA	ELSA Greece
Erlend SERENDAHL	ELSA Norway
Oda ERIKSEN REOENNING	ELSA Norway (LG)
Ferdinand HNATKOW	ELSA Germany
Maximilian LABUDEK	ELSA Germany (LG)
Mihaela ANGELOVA	ELSA UK (LG)
Gabrielle LENFANT PIERRE	ELSA France (LG)
Ipshita SINGH	ELSA France
Rob VAN BERGEN	ELSA the Netherlands
Nadege SANGO ALFONSO	ELSA the Netherlands (LG)
Erik MUCHENSCHNABEL	ELSA Austria
Faiq OMAROV	ELSA Azerbaijan
Daan WILLEMS	ELSA Belgium (LG)
Ketevan MCHEDLISHVILI	ELSA Georgia
Ani MIKIASHVILI	ELSA Georgia
Lambrini XENOU	ELSA Cyprus
Raphael KARLISCH	ELSA Germany (LG)
Jacqueline MELZER	ELSA Germany (LG)
Verena BASNER	ELSA Germany (LG)

**AH** How many use media cards?

*Show of hands.*

*AH presents the EI media card.*

*AH presents co-operation outline for Moot Court Competitions.*

**AH** Questions? None noted.

*AH proceeds with presenting a sample co-operation outline.*

**AH** Do you think this amount is enough to receive?

ELSA France It is okay for big partnerships.

**ELSA Norway** I would say it is low.

**ELSA Czech Republic** It's not balanced; maybe they should give more. In Czech Republic this is considered low. Our general partner, Allen & Overy, gives us around 6,500 euros a year for our projects. They are promoted everywhere and it is a big part of our S&C events, but I think it is a fair amount of money that is definitely enough for us – we use it to support our local groups and for other practicalities, such as losses or travel expenses.

**AH** Could you talk a bit about your ELSA Streaming project as well?

**ELSA Czech Republic** This is an original Czech project – online lectures given by top lawyers. We have a website for it: [elsastreaming.cz](http://elsastreaming.cz). Last years it was not updated as much, but we are planning on bringing its popularity back. It is around a one to one and a half-hour streaming of a talk or training streamed online which we get to keep indefinitely. Therefore the promotion of the firm is very large but unfortunately it is not so popular with law firms yet, because they consider the amount paid too much for a lecture.

**Chair** Thank you.

*AH finalises presentation.*

**AH** Would it make sense to promote an accommodation partnership? What they do is connect landlords with students. Uniplaces partnership is an example. We are not going to talk specifically about this partnership, but about the concept and whether it would be useful, for example, for booking accommodation for Erasmus students and STEP. Maybe also for those locations where many delegations tend to happen. On a show of hands?

*General thumbs up.*

*Energizer break followed by punishments.*

*Resumed at 18:01.*

**ELSA Norway** Suggestion for having just one delegate per country for the discussion about the IPM participation issue.

*Mostly thumbs up.*

**Chair** Note that voting for that will happen tomorrow so be prepared.

**ELSA Denmark** With the proposal regarding the summoning of the Council, Rob had a look and there are more issues.

**ELSA Netherlands** This is a bit complicated, so I can do that tomorrow instead.

**ELSA Czech Republic** As you may know, the Czech and Slovakian delegation will be leaving earlier and if I am correct there is no proxy possible, is that true?

**Chair** Yes that is true, I am afraid it would not be possible to vote in absence through proxy.

*Group exercise follows discussing the following with regards to partners.*

- *Who do you work with?*
- *Since when?*
- *What kind of cooperation?*
- *Is it going well?*

Saturday, 29th of August 2015

---

21:04 – 21:58

## **Discussion on statute regarding IPM**

### **In reference to Art. 13.2 S&SO**

Participants list:

Anna Haipola ( <i>AH</i> )	ELSA International
Hector Tsamis ( <i>HT</i> )	ELSA International
Vedran Stanković ( <i>VS</i> )	ELSA International
Robert Vierling (Chair)	ELSA Germany
Anastasia Kalinina (Secretary)	ELSA United Kingdom
Krysiek Stępkowski	ELSA Poland
Ani Mikiashvili	ELSA Georgia
Tatu Kärhä	ELSA Finland
Breeze van Eck	ELSA Luxembourg
Erik Muchenschnabel	ELSA Austria
Christine Beck	ELSA Switzerland
Michaela Majorová	ELSA Slovak Republic
Lambrini Ksenou	ELSA Cyprus
Isabella Rosman	ELSA Sweden

Birgitta Ots	ELSA Estonia
Matěj Benda	ELSA Czech Republic
Faiq Ömerov	ELSA Azerbaijan
Mihaela Angelova	ELSA United Kingdom
Mads Lorentzen	ELSA Denmark
Christian KROGH	ELSA Denmark
Erlend Serendahl	ELSA Norway
Ferdinand Hnatkow	ELSA Germany
Willems Daan	ELSA Belgium
Christina Baltasavia	ELSA Greece
Ipshita Singh	ELSA France
Rob van Bergen	ELSA The Netherlands

**Chair** Let's all commit to getting this meeting done by the hour. There were many on-going discussions that I will shortly present, so we will talk specifically about those. If I am missing something, please let me know. Then, we can come up with something concrete to vote on tomorrow. Mads, please shortly present again.

*ELSA Denmark presents proposal.*

**Chair** If we have this idea to make the change of it being two people, I should stress that at this IPM this would only affect ELSA Finland and ELSA Germany. What we were discussing is that we have two different IPMs – first would be open like this one so that its aim would be to motivate people and then have the second, a smaller one, as Denmark is proposing, after half a year when you are already more familiar with the topics and you can discuss them as we are doing with the IPMs as they are now.

The other suggestion is to split up the workshops; that is, to have two on-going workshops, which would both cover BEE areas; we discuss hot topics for whatever amount of time needed with just those who have voting rights and the other group would do something else with another IB member. The purpose is to have a smaller group, as we have now to be better able to discuss important matters. That way it remains BEE-related and everybody learns something, but at the same time there is a smaller group that does the actual decision-making.

**ELSA Belgium** So the limitation will only be with the first IPM?

**Chair** Yes, this is one of the proposals; that is, to have two different kinds of IPMs. The second idea is to have split workshops.

**ELSA Norway** Even for the second option, it would still be beneficial to limit the number of participants.

**Chair** Ok – let's first go for more suggestions.

**ELSA France** To clarify - the second IPM would be presidents only or president plus two people?

**Chair** No, the idea is to limit the people; one president and two people would not change anything. The proposal is to cut down the amount of people also you cannot make the spots

tradable because it would end up being the same amount of people if you can just get spots from other non-attending countries.

**AH** It is still president and another person. Just to clarify, no one is suggesting that there be just one person per country - right?

*None noted.*

**Chair** I see no other suggestions, so I will talk about the two different IPMs with one bigger and one smaller one in winter. I will open speakers list now.

**ELSA Norway** As you said this only currently applies to Finland and Germany and so limiting it to two people at the smaller IPM would not change anything, essentially it would still be inefficient.

**Chair** Please explain why? Aren't you saying fewer people make it more efficient?

**AH** This is why I mean - two people per country is still not efficient because it will end up being forty people which is still too many.

**ELSA UK (LG)** If for example we agree on having two spots for each country what happens when some countries will not be attending? Will these be allocated to other delegations and if so how will the allocation be done?

**Chair** That is what I was saying when I said that you cannot have them be tradable, because otherwise we would end up with the same amount of people coming.

*Clarifications.*

**ELSA Austria** I am in favour of the second option, in my opinion we could have the efficiency we want and still have people who wish to come to the IPM that way. Now we only have two countries who would be affected so there is no sense in saying just two participants should come.

**AH** Why I am in favour of there being more people is because I fail to see how these extra people really disturb the discussion. We could just make it up to OC to have as many spots that they can handle; each country can have at least two, as it was done here and then the rest is up to other factors.

**ELSA Norway** If that strategy would be implemented it would be another massive ICM; this is a real possibility.

**ELSA Switzerland** If you are leaving it up to the OC, then it would get bigger and bigger. Up until now it has been stable, so around 50 to 60 people at each event. There was no need to regulate it so far but if it remains open the OC would take advantage of having more people just because they can and to make it more lucrative.

**Chair** We need to get back to some structure. I need to stress that whether we choose one option or another – it does not matter we simply cannot have 100 people participating. It is hard enough already to have a workshop with 60 people. So let's get back to the first proposal - what are the comments on that one, to have a larger IPM with the same amount of people as we are here in summer and a smaller amount of people in winter?

**ELSA Switzerland** I do not like the idea of having two different kinds of IPMs. We are changing the structure of it that way; but with the second option we are changing the agenda of it, but with the first option we are effectively inventing a new event.

**ELSA Belgium** We have to limit it making clear choices. We can limit it saying only presidents or only three spots, so both are possible. The first could be general for networking for all and then the second would be made more specific for presidents.

**Chair** To clarify - we are not suggesting there be only presidents because even if we go with what ELSA Denmark is saying there will be a second person from any other area accompanying the president.

**ELSA Norway** The issue is that IPMs have grown in size and as I see it the second option is the only way we can cater to that number.

**Chair** Does that mean you want to continue with discussing the second suggestion?

*General thumbs-up.*

**Chair** Ok, so we will proceed with the second suggestions and the comments for that.

**ELSA Switzerland** Maybe we should be regulating it right now; trying out this second option in Brno. If it fine we can regulate it after when we see how it works out in practice.

**ELSA Norway** You mean not regulating the number of participants yet?

**ELSA Switzerland** Yes.

**VS** Think about the OC; that way, we are obliging them to have accommodation for 100 participants.

**Chair** To clarify – with this second option there would be the same amount of people on both IPMs. The only obligation is that there would be two different rooms and also we would need to have another IB member to lead the second group.

**ELSA Denmark** I believe if we have two workshops without changing the regulations, this would be just something for the IB to decide upon. All we have to decide upon is how many people should be there in order to make sure we are abiding by our statutes, but otherwise it is a good idea.

**ELSA UK (LG)** On discussing limitations we should keep in mind that we, as an organisation, strive to expand as much as possible. Provided that we are constantly growing in terms of members, do you not think that this limitation would be problem rather than a benefit in the long run? Regulating the number of participants would mean we would be failing to achieve our main objective; that of having as many trained officers as possible?

**Chair** As far as I know we are not discussing possibilities – some kind of limitation must happen and it should never be any more than 60 people.

**ELSA Norway** Sorry for going back to giving a suggestion, but maybe we could have the OC plan three spots per country that are then distributed amongst the attending countries?

**ELSA Switzerland** But that still ends up being too many people.

**Chair** Ok, going back to what we are discussing is that if ELSA Denmark is right we are breaching the statutes, but we are looking at the practical side of having to deal with the amount of people coming, in terms of agenda, workshops and the like, not changing the amount that is coming.

**ELSA Norway** What regulates how many people can come now?

**Chair** This statute, so Article 13.2 (*reads out*) which according to the interpretation of ELSA Denmark means that you have to make sure that currently only 43 people have the right, after that it is up to the OC. For me, however, it merely says you have the right to attend, not that that is the exact amount that should attend.

**ELSA Norway** So the current regulation gives the minimum amount.

**Chair** Yes, that is how I am interpreting it.

**ELSA Denmark** I disagree, you cannot bring any more than that, its one person per country and no more than that. That is how we are interpreting it.

**ELSA Switzerland** Perhaps we should have a show of thumbs-up/thumbs-down of who agrees with this interpretation? If some interpret it as Robert is saying then the discussion would change entirely.

**Chair** I would suggest we are not discussing this right now and anyway we do not have the time. We should assume that we agree with Mads and that we should change it because according to this interpretation we are violating the statutes. We will not go into the discussion of what is right or wrong, that will get us nowhere.

**ELSA UK (LG)** It is crucial that we first all make sure that we agree on the interpretation and get back to the basics about that, since if we find out that we interpret it otherwise then we would not even need to be having this discussion in the first place.

**Chair** From the way I am looking at it, we currently have common ground of what we want the IPM to look like. We can always change the specifics at the next ICM, but the problem is that if Mads is correct then most of us would not be able to even be here right now.

**ELSA Denmark** We brought this up because we are interpreting in this way. We have to figure out how we can put it, so that we are not violating it. In doing that we inevitably have to consider whether we want to be bigger, smaller, etc. Efficiency is important, but it is a separate discussion.

**Chair** If we come up with a concrete outcome here, we could be able to have something to propose at the next ICM and then there is where we will have the main discussion. Any other direct comments?

**ELSA Finland** Looking at it from a broader perspective, maybe we should have spring SAM and KAM I just wanted to mention that.

**Chair** Any direct comments to that?

**ELSA Austria** My suggestion is that we regulate this by saying 60 spots, for example, then allocate them priority-wise, where national presidents would be first and then everyone else.

**ELSA Norway** I agree, we can discuss this further on the mailing list, however, it would be best if it was proportionate to the country.

**Chair** This creates the same problem though – if you create the right for there to be two people per country then it would automatically mean the IPM could, in theory, be 86 people in total.

When we were talking about, we realised that this is a not regulation in itself, because it remains up to EI to create the agenda. The agenda is not something you can regulate because it must remain flexible. The only way is to try it out and we will vote on this tomorrow in the Miscellaneous; that is, to have two separate workshops for a certain amount of time of BEE material happening at the same time.

**ELSA Belgium** I think it is a good proposal because national presidents are dealing with different matters from the local presidents.

**ELSA UK (LG)** Could you please clarify your point?

**ELSA Belgium** Local presidents' activities are more practical and reach out to the students, whilst nationals deal with the coordination of the local groups, so this separation is helpful.

**ELSA UK (LG)** If we are about to regulate the number of those attending, it should be specified how many local presidents can attend these meetings. Local groups are the driving power of this association. They are the ones who conduct the events themselves and so we cannot exclude them.

**Chair** Please note time constraints. I clarify - the second proposal means having one common workshop where the current status of the international network would be discussed. The game that we had yesterday would be something that only the local groups would do to network and exchange ideas, but at the same time we restrict the decision-making for the national groups' representatives.

**ELSA Sweden** It would be good to try it out; the amount of hours could be based on what we want to discuss. If we have a lot on the mailing list then we would have a fair allocation based on that. We cannot specifically regulate that though.

**Chair** We can try it out in Brno and see. Thumbs-up/down for that? Does the EI think it is possible?

**AH** Yes, I think it would be possible. The only concern is that the local presidents might feel the need to contribute and if they are not given the chance they would feel excluded, but I cannot imagine what such topics could be, especially considering that they could discuss these during reporting time. I am personally willing to try it out.



**Chair** Crucially important to stress is that national presidents are voted for by their national council – they are there because they were elected to represent us. This should be made clear, especially with regards to any possible communication issues.

**ELSA France** So what happens if the national president cannot attend?

**Chair** They would have a substitute.

**VS** So everything would stay the same and we would basically continue breaching the statutes.

**ELSA Denmark** Yes.

**Chair** It is a matter of interpretation, but for now we can try it out and then decide further.

**ELSA Denmark** Just the formulation should be specified; for example, either it being a maximum of 60 people, or on the other hand, just the president or his substitute.

**Chair** Yes that could actually be our concrete proposal for this ICM should there be the danger that we are actually in breach. I will summarise what the outcome of this workshop is tomorrow and then we will have an informal voting on it.

**ELSA Switzerland** If you want to formulate it like you said; if you just put it in as a maximum 60, then the allocation would be up to the national groups as it was done now, so it would not change anything.

**ELSA Denmark** Yes, but we are saying that you cannot have more than 60 but at the same time there should also not be more than 2 people per country. That is what we need to make clear. We need to see how we can replace what it says there with something that more accurately reflect what we are doing and then have a discussion on that.

**Chair** That would mean that, against what Kikki (*ELSA Switzerland*) just said, so all these groups would not be able to bring that many people. You are saying that Germany can still have that many people as long as the discussion can happen in another room.

**ELSA Denmark** Yes, but I still believe that it makes a difference in how many people we are per country.

**ELSA Norway** I agree and I suggest we discuss that on the mailing list.

**Chair** How I see things now is that we have common ground, which is that we accept the fact that more people want to attend and we are trying to see how we can have that while at the same time have the efficiency we want. If we will start discussing the amount of people then we are basically taking a step back in the discussion, but please correct me if I am wrong.

**ELSA Denmark** They should not necessarily be against each other, so we now have 20 countries, so then we would be 20 people, then the other 15 people will be another workshop. We are not going back in any way because at any point they can join together.

**ELSA UK (LG)** I second to his opinion it is not a step backwards whatever outcome the content of this workshop, the decision still rests with the IB; that is, the decision as to how many people should be the upper limit.

**ELSA Austria** Do you think we are currently in breach this regulation?

**ELSA Denmark** I believe that we are. At the same time I believe that changing it to a smaller setting is better, but if we think we are breaking the rule then we are going to change it at some point so why not talk about that now.

**ELSA Azerbaijan** As far I understand the issues are with regards to statutes and efficiency. If we have a certain amount of places available, the national president is simply guaranteed a spot and then the rest is allocated as was done now with Thessaloniki. Every single national president though would retain the right to attend.

**ELSA UK (LG)** I believe the statute says only one person can attend so the president or his substitute.

**Chair** We already agreed that we should change that.

*Clarifications.*

**Chair** What I am trying to say is that, in my opinion, our common ground is to try this out; have it as it is now, but change the agenda. What you are saying is that you wish to reduce the total amount and have the separate workshops. The compromise is that we give the people a chance to come and then try to create a system where efficiency can be reached within that.

**ELSA Denmark** We want to make it as efficient as possible and this might affect something else, such as the number of people.

**Chair** Then we have another formal way of trying it out somehow. The options are now to have the same amount of people, but dividing the workshop as per the agenda or do the same thing but at the same time also limit the total amount of people, so all these larger groups here would not be allowed to have more than two people. We will have an informal voting about that tomorrow. It would be unfair to change it already for Brno because they have started organising it.

**HT** These are statutes - in order to change them we have to pass it at the ICM and get a notarial deed; the fact is it will not be changed in time for the IPM Brno either way. Getting a notarial deed means money as well as time, which I do not recommend. I do not see the word 'only' either, so, in my view, it can be flexible. It has so far been the tradition that the IPMs are not limited to just one president and the reason why it has been that way up until now is because it is common sense that there might be more than one person per country.

To summarise my point – changing this would need a notarial deed, ie more money, time and considering that there is no restriction at the moment in my view and a tradition exists that has been so far accepted by the Council and has been working quite well means there is no change necessary. I think we should see how this works out in practice and then we will consider whether we need to change the statutes.

**ELSA Denmark** I disagree, especially because it is statute, if it was the decision book, it would have been different, but this is something that cannot be ambiguous. Regarding practise I see what you mean but that does not mean it is ok to continue doing that. As far as the legal issues

involved, I understand, but perhaps we can include this in the ongoing processing of the notarial deed.

**HT** We cannot take one notarial deed for each change. Instead we do them all at the end of the year in one go, because there is the problem of it being an expense. After ICM Batumi we will not proceed because we will have most likely more proposals to change in Malta and we will collect all of them together and only then proceed with the notarial deed.

**ELSA Denmark** How far along you with the changes approved in Cluj-Napoca?

**HT** We are in the middle of final part of the procedure, so we cannot include this.

**ELSA UK (LG)** I would like to pass a proposal to create a working group on this matter. Each of us can get back to our national boards and discuss it internally and come up with a concrete solution, especially if just the national president should be given the right or many people should be represented on the national level.

**Chair** Pointing out time constraints - personally I think this is the IPM and we are all gathered here to discuss these very issues. If we decide to create a working group we are effectively taking a step a back. It is here that we have the opportunity to discuss and decide. So I will present you all this to you tomorrow and you can vote on it informally. I note that the change will not happen in Brno as of yet. If nothing more I close the discussion now.

Sunday, 30th of August 2015

---

10:12 – 12:55

### Miscellaneous

#### Participants:

Anna HAIPOLA ( <i>AH</i> )	ELSA International
Hector TSAMIS ( <i>HT</i> )	ELSA International
Vedran STANKOVIĆ ( <i>VS</i> )	ELSA International
Robert VIERLING (Chair)	ELSA Germany
William ANTOINE (Secretary)	ELSA Luxembourg
Christine BECK	ELSA Switzerland
Julien DONZEL	ELSA Switzerland
Christian KROGH	ELSA Denmark
Mads LORENTZEN	ELSA Denmark (Alumni)
Tatu KÄRHÄ	ELSA Finland
Jarl-Johan HÉDE	ELSA Finland (LG)
Mikko TERVAHAUTA	ELSA Finland
Breeze VAN ECK	ELSA Luxembourg
Luca GOMES	ELSA Luxembourg
Isabella ROSMAN	ELSA Sweden
Lisa HENRIKSSON	ELSA Sweden (LG)
Krzysztof STEPKOWSKI	ELSA Poland
Erlend SERENDAHL	ELSA Norway

Christina BALTSAVIA	ELSA Greece
Eirini RAFA	ELSA Greece
Erlend SERENDAHL	ELSA Norway
Oda ERIKSEN REOENNING	ELSA Norway (LG)
Ferdinand HNATKOW	ELSA Germany
Maximilian LABUDEK	ELSA Germany (LG)
Mihaela ANGELOVA	ELSA UK (LG)
Gabrielle LENFANT PIERRE	ELSA France (LG)
Ipshita SINGH	ELSA France
Rob VAN BERGEN	ELSA the Netherlands
Erik MUCHENSCHNABEL	ELSA Austria
Mattias ZECHA	ELSA Austria (LG)
Daan WILLEMS	ELSA Belgium (LG)
Ketevan MCHEDLISHVILI	ELSA Georgia
Ani MIKIASHVILI	ELSA Georgia

*Waiting time for all remaining participants.*

*Workshop resumed at 10:28.*

**Chair** Thank you very much for all those who participated in last night's workshop. ELSA International and ELSA Switzerland has some presentations, so we will proceed with those.

*AH gives presentation on the South Programme.*

**ELSA Switzerland** I don't believe that this is not working, because we get so much money for practically nothing, the fact that it takes so much time is for me confirming my opinion that it will not work.

**ELSA Switzerland** At some point ELSA can become the "patron" for the new association and maybe that is the reason behind all that money.

**AH** I understand why there is that much money; that is because it is good PR for the European Union and Council of Europe to show that they are supporting the new democracies in the Arab countries.

**ELSA Switzerland** Would it be good to become their mentor like this?

**AH** I think it would be good for us, because if one day there is the will to have a kind of ELSA Morocco, there is the need for a new association, because they couldn't join ELSA.

**ELSA Norway** I think we should not delay the voting much longer because the Swedish delegation is leaving in one hour.

*ELSA Austria presents proposal.*

**ELSA UK (LG)** With us the issue is that we cannot use the name of the university for our group as it is property of the university.

**Chair** Any more comments?

**ELSA Belgium (LG)** It can be a problem as you said with ELSA Brussel and Brussels and it will be discussed with our national president. But in general, I think it is a good proposal, because it shows a certain unity and this is the aim.

**ELSA France** It would definitely be useful for France to have an international regulation, so that we have conformity with every group.

**AH** ELSA International thinks it is a good proposal and will discuss it in the mailing list.

**Chair** We a proposal also to change the dates from ELSA The Netherlands.

**HT** Two solution that have not happened recently and we will discuss it internally and take it into consideration.

**Chair** We will still have the proposal.

**HT** All this happens because we don't know how many voted we need to withdraw a proposal.

**ELSA Denmark** It is very important that if we only go for the amendment we will need a 2/3 majority.

**Chair** Should ELSA Denmark's proposal be discussed further?

*General thumbs down.*

**Chair** So we will go for the voting now. Total voting countries is 15.

## **Council Meeting Decision Book amendment concerning the section “External Relations” of the Board Management, External Relations and Expansion part (BEE 01/12 II)**

The International Presidents' Meeting proposes the following to the Council:

# External Relations

## **~~6. Exclusion of companies and organisations~~**

---

~~6.1. These principles apply to ELSA International and National Groups as for obtaining a unified course of action with regards to the types of organisations and companies that all levels of ELSA should not associate with in order to maintain a consistently valuable and strong brand of the association.~~

### **~~6.2. Criteria for product based exclusion of companies and/or organisations~~**

~~6.2.1. ELSA shall not partner with or receive funding from companies or organisations which themselves or through entities they control:~~

~~(i) produce weapons~~

~~(ii) produce tobacco~~

- ~~(iii) engage in the adult entertainment industry~~
- ~~(iv) engage in the gambling industry~~

~~6.2.2. For the purpose of events with a limited time period ELSA can partner with and receive funding from companies and organisations which themselves or through entities they control:~~

- ~~(i) produce alcoholic beverages~~
- ~~(ii) produce oil, gas or coal~~
- ~~(iii) engage in the fast food industry~~

### **6.3. Criteria for conduct-based exclusion of companies and/or organisations**

~~6.3.1. ELSA shall not partner with or receive funding from companies or organisations if there is an unacceptable risk that the organisation or company contributes to or is responsible for:~~

- ~~(i) serious or systematic human rights violations, such as murder, torture, deprivation of liberty, forced labour and the worst forms of child labour~~
- ~~(ii) serious violations of the rights of individuals in situations of war or conflict~~
- ~~(iii) severe environmental damage~~
- ~~(iv) gross corruption~~
- ~~(v) other particularly serious violations of fundamental ethical norms or values deduced from the philosophy statement of ELSA~~

### **6.4. Monitoring and procedure**

~~6.4.1. ELSA International may investigate the matters pertaining to any breach of these principles on all levels of the organisation. ELSA International shall publish guidelines to these principles as needed.~~

~~6.4.2. A National Group suspected of violating these principles shall be given ample time to provide information about the nature of their cooperation with the company and/or organisation as well provide evidence against the suspected violation. ELSA International shall properly document the suspected violations that lead to a decision of exclusion.~~

~~6.4.3. In light of new information ELSA International can revoke a prior exclusion.~~

~~6.4.4. ELSA International shall regularly publish a list of excluded companies through the appropriate communication channels~~

## **7. Sanctions**

---

7.1. If any ELSA Group or ELSA International violates these regulations the involved Groups should, within six months from the time the harmed Group was informed, reach an agreement on a suitable sanction. The Council shall be informed about the sanction agreed on and a copy of this agreement shall be sent to ELSA International. The agreement cannot be object of any discussion or decision by Council. In case no agreement is reached the Council shall decide on a suitable sanction.

~~7.2. In case no agreement is reached the Council shall decide on a suitable sanction.~~

7.3. A sanction can in no case exceed the amount fundraised. The sanction shall be paid to the ELSA Group whose rights were violated. If the rights of ELSA International were violated,

the sanction shall be paid to ELSA International. Until the payment, the debt will be considered a debt towards ELSA International for the purpose of article 9.5 of the Statutes.

7.4. In case of a sanction imposed on a Local Group, the respective National Group shall be considered the Group involved and is liable for the sanction.

Voting for the removal of amended section (in Cluj-Napoca) with regards to partners:

In favour:	13
Against:	0
Abstentions:	2

Total amount of votes: 15

**Chair** Next round of voting on the IPM issue. Last night we more or less found common ground and decided to try in the next IPM to have split workshops with the same amount of people attending as now. We might have to look into our statutes in order to make them more specific in order for it to be clearer who can attend. The following will be an informal voting on whether we want this small change of having separate workshops.

Voting on the IPM trial:

In favour:	12
Against:	0
Abstentions:	3

Total amount of votes: 15

**Chair** So at the IPM Brno there will be 60 spots for participants and 12 for ELSA International; that is, IB members, trainers, etc.

**AH** It does not have to be 12; we will see who can attend and who we want to send. It could happen that we might have around four as now. Would you be in favour of having more than two IB members present?

**ELSA Switzerland** I don't see the point of having more than two IB members because you are busy.

**ELSA Germany** We need to make sure we have enough people that are needed.

**ELSA Sweden** I think we should see what the workshops will be about, in case there is a need for it we should say no.

**Chair** If there are no further comments, we can proceed.

*Video from ELSA Austria.*

*Energizer and coffee break follows.*

*Workshop resumed at 12:00.*

**Chair** We will have a voting for you to allow us to sign the minutes for you.

**ELSA UK** So we can amend them before that?

Chair Yes.

Voting for the International Board, Chair and Secretaries to sign minutes for all.

In favour:	12
Against:	0
Abstentions:	0

Total amount of votes: 12

*Motion unanimously approved.*

*Results of the Ice Breaker challenge announced.*

**AH** I would like to ask everyone for your input on the IPM – evaluation, expectations for Batumi and favourite moment.

**Chair** Closing and thanks.