

European Union of the Deaf

Minutes

19th General Assembly

Dublin, 8-9 May 2004

FINAL VERSION

EUROPEAN UNION OF THE DEAF

***MINUTES
of the
19th General Assembly Meeting***

08-09 May 2004

Dublin, Ireland

AGENDA

1. Welcoming address.....	3
2. Introduction of new EUD administrator Karin VAN PUYENBROECK.....	3
3. Roll call.....	3
3.1 Delegates:	3
3.2 Observers:.....	4
3.3 EUD Board:	4
3.4 EUD Staff:	4
3.5 Interpreters:	4
4. Adoption of the Agenda for the General Assembly 2004	4
5. Acceptance of Hilde HAUALAND as new EUD Board member, replacing Markku JOKINEN ..	5
6. Approval of the Minutes of the General Assembly 2003 (held in Athens, Greece).....	5
7. EUD Annual Report 2002-2003: presentation and ratification	5
8. Report on EUD 2003 Website Project.....	6
9. Financial Reports	7
10. Summary Report on EUD Action plan for 2003-2004 and plans for 2004-2006.....	8
11. Ratification of membership applications	11
12. Amendments to EUD statutes.....	12
13. Draft UN Convention on Disability	13
14. Motions tabled	14
15. Report on relations with EDF and EDF activities	15
16. Information from EUDY	16
17. Any other business.....	17
18. Workshops	18
18.1. Sign languages and sign language interpreters: the problem of “working languages” at European level	19
18.2. The way forward for sign languages in Europe: should we propose a new legal instrument to the Council of Europe?.....	20

MINUTES

1. Welcoming address

EUD President, Knud SØNDERGAARD (KS), opened the 19th EUD General Assembly meeting, and welcomed the delegates by expressing that it was nice to see so many countries present: 14 Full members and Norway and Iceland as Affiliated members. He also warmly welcomed the observers from Hungary, Latvia, Malta, Poland, the Slovak Republic and Slovenia (new EU member states), Bulgaria (EU candidate country), Russia and Switzerland (non-EU countries). He said also to be happy to have the president of the WFD, Markku JOKINEN and the president of the EFHOH, Marcel BOBELDIJK present, and finally he welcomed Thomas PHILIP, as observer for EUDY.

KS noted that all information for the EUD General Assembly had been sent out in advance, but that some documents would only be distributed at the General Assembly itself.

KS described the programme for the General Assembly and briefly highlighted the themes for the workshops on Sunday, which would deal with the topics of "Sign Language and Sign Language interpreters" and "Sign Languages in Europe and the possibility of proposing a new legal instrument to the Council of Europe".

2. Introduction of new EUD administrator Karin VAN PUYENBROECK

Karin VAN PUYENBROECK briefly introduced herself. She told that she started working at the EUD Office in January 2004, that she had studied Law and also is a qualified sign language interpreter in Belgium. She is also a CODA. She works part-time at the EUD Office.

3. Roll call

3.1 Delegates:

Full members:

Helene JARMER and Günter ROISS (ÖGLB-Austria), Bernard FLEURUS and André LATHOUWERS (FFSB and Fevlado-Belgium), Anne VIKKELSØ and Dan OLVHØJ (DDL-Denmark), Liisa KAUPPINEN (FAD-Finland), Adrien PELLETIER (FNSF-France), Alexander VON MEYENN (DGB-Germany), Nikolaos SPANOS (HFD-Greece), Eddie REDMOND and John Bosco CONOMA (IDS-Ireland), Sebastiano MANCIAGLI and Terry GIANSAANTI (ENS-Italy), Jacques BRUCH (VGSL-Luxembourg), Benny ELFERINK (Dovenschap-the Netherlands), Luis J. Cañón REGUERA and Amparo Minguet SOTO (CNSE-Spain), Lars-Åke WIKSTRÖM and Yvonne MODIG (SDR-Sweden), Tyron WOOLFE (BDA-United Kingdom). FPAS, Portugal, had not reacted to the invitation to come to the General Assembly.

Affiliated members:

Irene GREFTEGREFF (NDF-Norway), Berglind STEFÁNSDÓTTIR and Haukur VILHJALMSSON (Iceland).

3.2 Observers:

Markku JOKINEN (President – World Federation of the Deaf), Thomas PHILIP (EUDY), Marcel BOBELDIJK (European Federation of Hard of Hearing), Jeff McWHINNEY (BDA – UK).

Also some of the new EU Member States were represented: Zsolt NYÍRŐ, Janos PODANI and Adam KOSA (Hungary), Maruta PITERNIECE (Latvia), Karl BORG (Malta), Kazimierz DIEHL (Poland), Mária BENKOVA (Slovak Republic), Franc PLANINC, Frida PLANINC and Anton PETRIC (Slovenia).

Vasil PANEV (EU candidate country Bulgaria), Valery RUKHLEDEV (Russia) and Roland HERMANN (Switzerland) were also present.

3.3 EUD Board:

Knud SØNDERGAARD (President), Terry RILEY, Helly CHRISTOPOULOU, Amilcar MORAIS and Hilde HAUALAND (All Board Members).

3.4 EUD Staff:

Helga STEVENS (EUD Director) and Karin VAN PUYENBROECK (EUD Administrator).

3.5 Interpreters:

Gerdinand WAGENAAR and Mindy BROWN.

KS said that the UK (BDA) had not paid their membership fee to EUD. The EUD Board had discussed the matter to see whether the UK would be allowed to vote. BDA delegate, Tyron WOOLFE, told the General Assembly that the UK accepted it had lost its voting rights and that he would talk with the BDA Board to see what went wrong. A few minutes later Jeff McWHINNEY, BDA Chief Executive, entered the General Assembly and immediately confessed that a mistake had been made, and that the contribution would be paid as soon as possible. The General Assembly subsequently decided to allow the UK to vote.

With regard to affiliated members, Norway and Iceland, it was clarified that they would have voting rights, like in 2003.

Catherine BANNON, who works as a civil servant for the Irish Government – Department of Foreign Affairs, attended (part of the) meeting. KS welcomed her and said it was the very first time that an official from a Government attended a EUD General Assembly.

4. Adoption of the Agenda for the General Assembly 2004

KS went through the agenda of the General Assembly meeting and told the delegates that the EUD Board had asked FAD-Finland to withdraw their motion about the UN Convention (point 14) and

that in exchange Finland would have some speaking time (which had been added to the agenda as point 13). He also told that the item "any other business" would change places with the workshops, so that the entire Sunday morning could be dedicated to the workshops.

The agenda was approved.

5. Acceptance of Hilde HAUALAND as new EUD Board member, replacing Markku JOKINEN

KS explained that Markku JOKINEN (MJ) had been elected as President of the World Federation of the Deaf (WFD) in Montreal in July 2003 and that he had decided to step down as Board Member on 31 December 2003. The Board had sent e-mails to the EUD members in order to find someone to replace MJ, but no reaction came, so they decided to choose Hilde HAUALAND (HH). HH introduced herself briefly to the GA. KS explained that next Board elections would be held in 2005.

Denmark asked to clarify the EUD statutes regarding replacements of Board members and also asked whether this decision needs to be formally approved by the General Assembly. KS explained that following the Statutes the Board has a mandate to decide upon the replacement of a Board member, but to ensure good understanding, would like the EUD GA to endorse their decision. Only regarding the position of the EUD President the EUD statutes stipulate that this position would be automatically taken over by the Vice-President.

Denmark asked who was EUD Vice-President at the moment. KS responded that EUD at the moment does not have a Vice-President.

6. Approval of the Minutes of the General Assembly 2003 (held in Athens, Greece)

No comments were made regarding the minutes from the EUD General Assembly 2003, held in Athens, Greece. KS then called upon the General Assembly to formally approve the minutes of the 18th General Assembly of EUD.

The minutes were approved.

7. EUD Annual Report 2002-2003: presentation and ratification

This Annual Report deals with the period 01/09/2002- 31/08/2003, which follows the grant period and has been sent out to the EUD members together with the other documents for the General Assembly.

HS briefly commented on this Annual Report, which has been approved by the European Commission: she explained about meetings with the Council of Europe (CoE) and the European Parliament (EP) and gave some information about EDF and their several committees. HS had presided the Disabled Women Committee, KS was part of the Complex Dependency Needs Committee, Terry RILEY sat in the Communication Committee, Markku JOKINEN attended the Human Rights Committee and Johan WESEMANN (former EUD Director) sat in the Committee

for Universal Access. Sweden was represented in the Social Policy Committee - Subcommittee on Education. Common problem was that deaf people had to pay partly for their sign language interpreters themselves, since EDF can only reimburse the costs of one sign language interpreter per Committee. EUD strongly protested against this kind of treatment and raised the question of accessibility.

The European Year of Disabled People, which took place in 2003, dealt with lots of different themes and also made deaf people visible, also sign language issues were raised during the Year.

EUD worked together with EDF to participate in a European Commission working group on telecom in order to get compatible text phones and to have standard videophones in the future.

EUD also worked together with the European Federation of the Hard of Hearing (EFHOH), whose president Marcel BOBELDIJK was attending the EUD General Assembly, in order to improve access to television for deaf and hard of hearing people.

Prior to the EUD General Assembly 2003 in Athens, Greece, EUD had organised a seminar which was titled "Genetics and Bioethics". A report of this seminar had been published in a thematic issue of EUD Update.

HS explained that the workshops on Sunday will deal in a more specific way with the problem of sign languages at European level and the ways to protect them, possibly by means of a new legal instrument.

Sweden explained that the Swedish person who was member of the Subcommittee on Education had withdrawn himself. The Swedish person had wanted to discuss the use of sign language in education but this was made impossible due to continuing discussions with Silvana BARONI (FEPEDA -Federation of Parents of Hearing-Impaired Children).

The report was approved by the General Assembly and KS thanked HS for the good work she did drawing up the report!

8. Report on EUD 2003 Website Project

HS explained that the EUD 2003 Website Project aimed at giving information about the European Year of Disabled People 2003 in different sign languages. It was also an excellent opportunity to give information about EUD and sign language in sign language. HS explained the www.eudeaf2003.org website will be included in EUD's homepage www.eudnet.org, and -when relevant- updated.

HS explained that the development of the EUD website poster had been a challenge, with a first version of the poster being thrown out just before printing. It was then completely redesigned. In addition it was decided to print postcards as well for easy dissemination.

HS explained that due to some misunderstandings it was no longer possible to have the exact statistics about the number of people that visited the website in 2003, but an overview as from January 2004 made it possible to estimate an average numbers of visitors.

It was stressed that the European Commission considered the website to be a very positive model, due to the good quality of the sign language video presentations, and also since the info was relevant. This good result was made possible thanks to the Finnish multimedia company which had developed the website. In addition, a Deaf expert from Finland, who had lots of experience with multimedia, had provided advice on the technical parts of the video streaming. The Finnish Deaf TV Studio, who took care of the filming, had also done a good job.

HS mentioned that the report on the Website Project had only been completed in the weeks before the General Assembly, but stated that everyone would receive this report in the near future. She also stressed that feedback about the website was still welcome!

Markku JOKINEN congratulated EUD with this website and stated that it was the first website worldwide which could show so many different sign languages.

It was suggested that maybe a link could be put on the website in order to make contacts with the new EU countries.

With regard to www.eudnet.org, Germany asked a question about barrier-free design, this means that a website should be accessible to different sorts of people (blind, deaf, mentally disabled etc). The question was raised whether a website in written English only achieved this goal, because not everyone was able to read and understand English. Maybe the use of international sign language would be a good solution to reach the grassroots level?

TR brought up that sign languages are a "hot" item at the moment, recently the British Government had recognised sign language and this had raised interest in sign language. It is a good idea to have a website with information in sign language.

HS explained that a video in international sign existed but would give a wrong political signal and it could maybe give a wrong view on the issue of sign languages. The Board had already discussed this idea and rejected it because of political reasons. One of the dreaded reactions would be that people will state that it is no longer necessary to work in different sign languages, because it is possible to work in international sign language. So Deaf people could be forced to work in international sign language only, and not with their own sign language interpreters. HS also explained that this subject will be dealt with more thoroughly in Sunday's workshops.

9. Financial Reports

HS explained that the Financial Report for 2003 had just been finished, so copies of this document were being distributed at the General Assembly. She added that the report only dealt with finances for 2003 and that it had already been approved by an external auditor, who had suggested only some minor corrections.

The financial statement for the year 2003 ended 31 December 2003 with a balance sheet total of EUR 74.969,15 and a gain for the year of EUR 381,58. This exercise includes 12 months of activity. This financial statement has been prepared on cash-based accounting principles, which means that all movements are implemented in a chronological way. The figures of the Global Annual Report are the sum of all the results from 3 different projects: the **Annual Coordination**

Projects and the two separate projects: the **Euro Project** (2001-2002) and the **2003 Website Project**. (see annex *)

Regarding the **Annual Coordination Projects** the financial year 2003 consists of two coordination projects: the VS/2002/0348 project which covers the period between 01/09/2002 and 31/08/2003 and the VS/2003/0432 project which covers the period between 01/09/2003 and 31/08/2004. The figures which are implemented in the annual financial report are those which apply to the year 2003.

The **“Euro – not deaf to the Euro”-Project** started in 2001 and ended at the end of January 2003. The European Commission finally approved the accounts submitted and sent an order for recovery of EUR 8.008,41, which EUD paid to the European Commission on 23 July 2003. Thus this project is now closed. The EUD office has been trying to sort out all the outstanding payments.

The **2003 Website Project** started in December 2002 and was closed at the end of 2003. First payment of the grant was made on 12 December 2002 which amounts to EUR 48.225,00. On basis of the final report sent out to the European Commission, we expect to receive another EUR 13.794,82 in 2004. However, the figures for the project still show a huge loss of EUR 12.140,96. EUD tried to find sponsoring to cover this loss by contacting telephone and multimedia companies, but this did not lead to results. HS explained that each of the NADs agreed to drop EUR 250 for presentation work, but that there still remains an amount left to be covered. Delegates were asked if they could drop their travel expenses so that it could be considered as a donation. This was agreed.

HS stated that EUD had received a warning from the auditor that the work of EUD would be in jeopardy if the EUD member organisations did not co-operate more with EUD to solve the financial problems of the past years. Financial support for EUD is essential since European funding alone is not enough for EUD to function.

Italy asked what the amount of EUR 56.378,60 covered in the Website Project. HS replied that this included the costs for the posters, postcards, technical design for the website etc, but that this can be found in a more detailed way in the project report.

The Netherlands asked to get informed about the EU prospects. HS replied that this information will be given in point 10 of the agenda, regarding the Action Plan.

KS made clear that the EU never provides 100% funding, but that their support is mostly limited to 60-70% of the budget, so EUD has to finance the rest of the budget itself. He added that the membership fee will stay at EUR 2.000, but that maybe next year it will be proposed to increase this amount.

Finland congratulated EUD with having a small surplus for the year 2003 and said to make sure to keep up the good work.

10. Summary Report on EUD Action plan for 2003-2004 and plans for 2004-2006

KS explained that the entire Action Plan would cover the period 2004-2006. On 14 May 2004 the new application and budget needed to be submitted to the European Commission. HS explained

that several EUD activities such as the Seminar on Employment and the creation of a new website are already in line of what the EC asks EUD to do.

EDF

KS gave a brief overview of EDF (more thoroughly dealt with in agenda point 15), and said that EUD is still working on ways to influence the Council of Europe.

Enlargement

Estonia and Lithuania did not answer to EUD letters. On the other hand EUD had made some contacts with deaf people in the Czech Republic and thanks to Board member Helly CHRISTOPOULOU, a contact has been made with Cyprus, but both countries could not make it to the EUD General Assembly and sent their apologies.

Sign language as minority language

HS gave some information about contacts with the Council of Europe regarding the topic of sign language as a minority language. The European Parliament had adopted Resolution on Sign Language in 1988 and 1998, but the European Commission is not bound by these resolutions. Moreover, EC powers regarding minority languages is limited since there is no legal basis in the EU treaties. EUD Administrator, Karin VAN PUYENBROECK (KVP) went to the Mercator Seminar, which was held in February 2004 in Spain, and tried to make some contacts with attending persons, in order to get the door opened. The EU Action Plan promotes that European citizens learn more than one foreign language, so maybe this entrance can be used.

The Council of Europe on the other hand is more focused on Human Rights, Social Rights and Linguistic Rights. Efforts had been undertaken to get sign languages included in the Charter for Regional and Minority Languages. HS added that she noticed that Eastern European countries seemed to be more in favour of sign languages than Western European countries.

As already said before, sign languages seem to be a very hot item at the moment. On Sunday's workshops this topic will be dealt with more closer. HS briefly explained that there are other ways than only focussing on the Charter for Regional and Minority Languages, since this Charter is politically very sensitive, because it deals with ethnic minorities (such as the Roma), and governments are not so motivated to implement this Charter.

The UK asked some more information about a Sign Language Conference that is supposed to be held in the UK next year. Terry RILEY answered that a minister had made such statement, but that this is not a formal decision yet. The UK delegate added that the UK has different organisations each with their own competence, but that the BDA is the official representative body of the Deaf community, and thus needed to be involved in such a conference, otherwise this needed to be boycotted. Also Ireland expressed its concern regarding the more dominant place that RNID is taking up at the moment, by referring to the Brussels Conference ("European conference on Access to the Information Society for deaf, hard of hearing and speech-impaired people") last February. KS said that a clear distinction between BDA and RNID had to be made, the last being a service provider.

MJ noted that the CoE also deals with EEMARS countries. He has had several contacts with governments from Eastern European countries and results have been positive.

HS warned against the so called boycotting of RNID. RNID is free to make applications for EU funding and to undertake activities at EU level, cfr RNIB. In the end much of the objectives of RNID and EUD are the same so if EUD should boycott RNID this would be politically rather strange. She noted that this problem of conflict only seemed to rise in the UK.

However, Germany said that this problem also occurs in other countries. In Germany you have the DGB which is an umbrella organisation. EUD is also an umbrella organisation so it needs to have cooperation with others (cfr HOH).

Sweden noticed that it had received a request for partnership from RNID. Sweden had considered this proposal and came to the conclusion that sometimes elbow work is needed in order to have more influence.

Finland warned that the EU must work with all sorts of organisations, but that Deaf people cannot allow that hearing people speak *for* them.

A verbal report was given regarding the European Year of Disabled People and the Disabled People's Parliament. KS noted that on the EP Day only very few deaf people turned up (11). EUD was also present at the WFD Congress in Montreal, Canada, in July 2003.

Budget 2004-2006

HS explained that **funding** for the period 2004-2006 will consist of three periods: September 2004-August 2005, September 2005-August 2006 and September 2006-December 2006. The total budget will be EUR 615.000, which will be split among 5 organisations, meaning a maximum of EUR 123.000 per organisation (for the period 2004-2005). EU contributions will be limited to 77%. Through EDF the EC had been requested to allow a 6th organisation but it was unlikely the EC would respond positively as criteria had already been set.

EC priorities for the period 2004-2005 will be: (a) capacity building (i.e. strengthening new countries), (b) advocacy regarding citizenship rights (i.e. development training and dissemination of materials and developing issues regarding human rights) and (c) raising awareness through the internet (i.e. by expanding the EUD homepage, providing translations, providing all sorts of materials on the homepage, information in sign language). HS stated that EUD should not overlap with EDF or other ENGO's but will have to do complementary work, so cooperation with inter alia EUDY, deafblind persons and EFHOH will be necessary.

HS wanted to stress clearly that these priorities were set by the EC, so it is not EUD itself who decides about the Action Plan.

The Netherlands asked what the outcome was of the subtitling discussion that the European Parliament had started in August 2003 and stressed that European cooperation was needed in this area. Sweden added the problem of international signs on commercial tv, but also on the website. KS answered that EUD had to limit itself to the priorities set by EC.

KS said that the withdrawn motion of Finland maybe can be used with regard to (b). Liisa KAUPPINEN said that indeed the UN Human Rights Convention would be an excellent theme for a seminar, because it is necessary to raise more awareness regarding the UN Convention.

She further explained that the IDA (International Disability Alliance) consists of seven organisations (WFD etc), and that IFHOH recently joined as the 7th member.

Observer Marcel BOBELDIJK (MB), President of EFHOH, introduced himself briefly by thanking the President and the Board for the invitation to attend this General Assembly and the seminar. He explained that EFHOH counts 27 members throughout the whole of Europe, so being an EU member state is not a condition. MB explained that he had enjoyed working with HS in the past, especially regarding the subject of subtitling, and hoped that this cooperation could continue in the future. He also suggested the theme of accessibility (cfr visual information in train stations etc) as a possible future topic for collaboration.

Ireland asked how EFHOH received funding. MB answered that their source of income consisted of membership contributions and of sponsoring by manufacturers of hearing aids, and stressed that EFHOH did not receive any EU funding. He also said that EFHOH did not really have an office, but that their Swedish member functions as a secretariat.

Germany asked what will happen after the Commission receives the application, is it possible for the EC to make amendments or do they simply have to follow what is written down? Germany also asked for more information regarding regulations and laws in other countries regarding deaf issues such as subtitling and interpreters' services (for example the UK is said to have model legislation on those subjects).

HS thought this was a good idea but due to limited resources this could only be done with help from the NADs themselves! In the past EUD had tried already several times to collect information, e.g. by sending surveys, but often no answers were received or very late! This way it is of course more difficult and time consuming to collect information.

Spain thought this problem could be solved by putting the information on each of the NADs own website, that way it is accessible for everyone and EUD doesn't get extra work.

MJ suggested to send the Sign Language Report 1997 again to all members in order to get it updated. Switzerland added that the workload could be shared by dividing responsibilities among NADs. Austria added that different countries belonging to the same language groups (eg all German speaking countries) could work together.

11. Ratification of membership applications

KS explained that five countries had applied to become a Full member of EUD: Latvia, Poland, Hungary, Malta and Slovenia. All five countries already are Full member of WFD. The General Assembly had no objections regarding these applications, however they raised some questions.

Spain considered it would be necessary to change the criteria to become a member. For example now a country can become EUD member if the majority of the Board is deaf, and the President is hearing.

Finland stated that all application countries are also member of the WFD, which has a long tradition of thoroughly investigating every application. WFD always consults regional secretariats because some countries have more than one deaf association and also wants to find out if the organisation is really deaf-led. Liisa KAUPPINEN ensured that in this case all five application countries are deaf-led and that the majority of the board members is deaf.

The General Assembly discussed changing the criteria, but it was also brought up that EUD cannot force an organisation to have a deaf President, since organisations are free to choose their own chairperson. Sweden suggested an indirect limitation by stating in the statutes that hearing persons cannot be delegates at the EUD General Assembly.

The General Assembly voted in favour of ratifying the decision of the EUD Board to accept the membership application of the five application countries. KS welcomed the five new members.

Also two other countries, Bulgaria and Romania had applied to become an Affiliated member. These two memberships applications had also been approved by the Board, and ratification by the General Assembly followed. KS also welcomed these two countries.

Ireland asked what Romania meant by being an *apolitical* organisation. Regarding this point there seemed to be a different interpretation. HS explained that *apolitical* would mean that the organisation is not liaised to a political party or in other words does not support one specific political party.

KS explained that the Board had proposed that the new Full members would pay 500 € for the first year, 1.000 € for the second year, 1.500 € for the third year and 2.000 € as from the fourth year.

This proposal for a reduction in membership fees for the new Full members was approved.

Iceland asked to discuss the status of Iceland and Norway as Affiliated member. KS explained that this would be dealt with in point 14 of the agenda, regarding the tabled motions.

HS said that if the General Assembly wanted to make any changes regarding the voting rights, the correct procedure needed to be followed.

Norway did not find the explanation about the membership fees very clear. KS explained that these special rates are only for the new countries, but that Malta and Iceland, like Luxemburg will not have to pay the full price since they were very small countries with a small deaf population. The General Assembly made the proposal to treat Cyprus under the same regime, which was adopted.

12. Amendments to EUD statutes

KS explained that during the EUD GA 2003 in Athens some Full members had expressed their concern about the balance between EUD Full members and EUD Affiliated members. They also wanted clarification regarding the voting rights of Iceland and Norway which were Affiliated members. Following the wish of the EUD GA and to keep matters simple, the EUD Board had discussed changes to the statutes and proposed to simply move the EFTA countries to the Full Membership category. If this is done, then changes to the Statutes can be kept to a minimum.

Sweden had no objections regarding the amendments to EUD Statutes but wanted to know what is the relation between EUD and EFTA countries and why for example Bulgaria will not fall under this regulation and if the EC agreed with these criteria.

HS explained that Iceland, Liechtenstein, Norway and Switzerland are EFTA countries and that they form together with the European Union, the European Economic Area (EEA). Furthermore, Bulgaria will be part of the EU in 2007. As for agreement of the EC: enlargement and capacity building is one of the EC priorities so new countries can be included as members.

Switzerland asked what status Affiliated members have. KS explained that Affiliated members normally do not have voting rights and that they pay a lower membership fee, and in addition they have to pay themselves for their travel expenses. Norway said that Full members thus have benefits since their travel expenses are reimbursed.

If the proposal to amend the statutes is accepted, then Norway, Iceland and Switzerland can choose whether they will become Full member or stay Affiliated member. But Affiliated members not have voting rights!!

The GA agreed unanimously to adapt the statutes regarding the Full members as follows: an extra paragraph is added to art. 3 section 2: *In addition, national organisations of Deaf people active in the Member States of the European Free Trade Association (EFTA), that meet the above-given criteria are also eligible for admission to the Full membership category*” and art. 3 section 3 1st paragraph is removed.

The GA also agreed unanimously to change the articles regarding the Board in order to make them more clear. Art. 5 section 1 is to become: *“1. Each Full Member has the right to propose one candidate for the Board. The candidate proposed by a Full Member has to come from the country of that Member. The General Assembly elects the Board Members.”* and article 5 section 5 is to become *“... The replacement must come from one of the countries of a Full member. In the event of the office of the President becoming vacant, the position will be automatically filled by the Vice-President. All replacements must be ratified at the next meeting of the General Assembly.”*

Hungary said that it would be better to adapt the size of the Board in order to avoid similar problems in the future. This could be discussed at the next General Assembly. Sweden agreed with this proposal but wanted to know whether the Board can make use of written procedures (cf ratifying decision at next Board meeting). The GA authorised the Board to look into this and prepare a proposal for next GA.

13. Draft UN Convention on Disability

Liisa KAUPPINEN (LK) had asked to put an item on the agenda which would deal with the Draft UN Convention on Disability. She would like to ask the EUD members to lobby to insert references to deaf people and sign language in the draft ‘United Nations Comprehensive and Integral International Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Rights and Dignity of Persons with Disabilities’ (hereafter ‘the Convention’) and asked the Board to get some speaking time, since this is a rather urgent matter.

LK explained that the UN had proposed and adopted several Conventions in the past, but that it was the first time a specific Convention for Persons with Disabilities was being drafted. She talked a little about the history of the Convention, and explained that a Working Group had been set up whose task was to prepare a Draft Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. This Working Group consists of governmental/political representatives, INGOs dealing with disability, representatives of regional areas and a Human Rights legal expert. LK herself is member of the Working Group and represents deaf people. The Working Group met for the first time in January 2004 and consisted of more than 200 people. The final outcome of this meeting was the proposal of a draft convention which includes an introduction, 25 articles and two appendices.

This draft convention with all comments will be discussed at the next UN Ad Hoc Committee meeting on 24 May – 4 June 2004. Only governments will have the right to participate in the discussion and can make decisions about the text. Although WFD has consultative status in the UN, WFD will only be allowed to give comments and to lobby its views to government representatives. More concretely WFD proposes comments and changes in connection with draft articles 3 (“definitions”), draft article 13 (“freedom of expression and opinion, and access to information”), draft article 17 (“education”) and draft article 19 (“accessibility”).

LK thus urgently asked EUD members to lobby their national governments within the next two weeks and inform either WFD or EUD of the outcome. WFD had already sent a detailed letter to all its ordinary members and LK urged EUD members to really follow up.

14. Motions tabled

MOTION 1 – Submitted by CNSE, Spain:

“The last month of July of 2003, the World Federation of the Deaf (WFD) in its XIV Assembly designated the Spanish National Confederation of the Deaf (CNSE) as the responsible entity of organizing the XV WFD Congress in the year 2007. The importance of this event and its celebration in Europe make necessary the cooperation between the EUD and the CNSE. For this reason the CNSE requests to the EUD that it supports and collaborates in the organization of the XV WFD Congress which takes place in Madrid (Spain) in 2007. So it is necessary to create collaboration lines and synergies that outline as one objective the possible search of sponsors and economic supports at European level, as well as the participation activation in the congress of all those deaf people associations of the European Union in which the socio-economic conditions of their countries are hindering the full participation of deaf people, like the situation of many of the east countries.”

KS explained that the EUD Board fully supports this idea but cannot promise if EUD will have financial sources available. HS added that it would be no problem to give moral support, by means of using the EUD logo and putting a link to the event on EUD homepage and promised also to hand over contact details about the (expert) network and EU funding.

MOTION 2 – Submitted by FAD, Finland

“EUD will arrange a training or a seminar to its member countries related tot the United Nations Comprehensive and Integral International Convention on the Protection and Promotion of

the Rights and Dignity of Persons with Disabilities so that the member associations can advise governments to ensure adequate attention for the rights of the Deaf.”

Finland had been asked to withdraw this motion – which happened (see above).

MOTION 3 – Submitted by FNSF, France and the EUD Board:

“FNSF and the EUD Board would like to propose that FNSF (through its member, the Association Générale des Sourds de Montpellier et sa Région) organises the First European and Mediterranean Deaf Congress on 11-13 November 2005 in Montpellier, France. EUD would provide input to the programme and help find sponsoring and also publicise the event on its homepage.”

Adrien PELLETIER – FNSF, France explained that the original concept was to establish an organisation similar to the Deaf Nordic Council, which would be composed of France, Spain, Portugal, Greece and Italy. In order to make this possible, Deaf representatives from the countries mentioned needed to be brought together. Thus FNSF and its member organisation developed the idea to organise a Deaf Mediterranean congress in November 2005 in Montpellier and asked EUD to support this initiative.

The EUD Board had discussed this proposal during its February Board meeting, at which two representatives from Montpellier were present. EUD was in favour of the idea but due to its structure, could not get actively involved in a southern/Mediterranean event only. Therefore the EUD Board asked FNSF/Montpellier to make it an European event, as well as to try to incorporate the 20th Anniversary of EUD into the programme. Only then could EUD help actively and still be able to give account for this activity to the European Commission. Montpellier/FNSF had discussed this internally and could agree with these conditions. Further details to be worked out by Montpellier.

UK asked whether also Northern African countries would be involved. France answered that this would be the case.

A question was raised whether the next EUD General Assembly would be held at the same time in Montpellier. HS explained that this would not be the case: next year’s General Assembly will be held in May, most likely in Luxembourg and the event in Montpellier will be in November 2005 and would inter alia include the celebration of EUD’s 20th anniversary.

Greece added that it would like to keep the Mediterranean Congress separated from the EUD GA, in order to avoid having to be present at different settings at the same time.

The General Assembly approved of this proposal.

Denmark asked whether it was intended to organise this event every 4 years and mentioned that WFD organises its next World Congress in 2007, so that the event in 2005 would not interfere with this. HS and KS said that this could not be guaranteed since EUD is dependent on national deaf associations and does not have a strong financial basis.

15. Report on relations with EDF and EDF activities

EDF will have its General Assembly next weekend (14-16.05.2004) in Warsaw, Poland and Adrien PELLETIER and Terry RILEY will attend this Assembly as EUD representatives. In 2005 EDF will elect a new Board.

Adrien PELLETIER explained that it would be necessary to get into the bodies where decisions are made and that the GA and other meetings needed to be accessible, meaning provision into sign language, etc.

Amilcar MORAIS (AM), who is part of EDF Youth Committee, said that last year's European Youth Conference, organised by EDF, was being held in Athens, parallel with EUD GA. AM considers it necessary to talk about the topic of "mainstreaming" because there appeared to be some conflicts between Italy & Spain and Sweden regarding the meaning of "mainstreaming".

At the moment EUD has representatives in 7 committees, for example HS is chair of the Women Committee. The problem appears to be that EDF is giving an overflow of information, and that nobody has the time to read all these tons of paper.

Sweden explained that in the EDF Subcommittee on Education there had been an enormous discussion between the representative of FEPEDA and the Swedish representative. Although the EDF staff supported the Swedish view, which was in favour of sign language, every meeting again the conflict seemed to rise, which made further discussions impossible and thus the Swedish delegate had withdrawn. The (draft) Rome Declaration held a plea for mainstreaming, but good education is independent from having good oral skills! EUD had heavily amended this draft declaration in 2003 and subsequently EDF had "buried" the issue since no consensus could be found!

16. Information from EUDY

Amilcar MORAIS (AM) explained that due to some problems the planned Youth Camp, which would have taken place in Holland, will not take place. The European Deaf Youth Conference will take place in August, in Denmark. HS asked EUDY to share more info about EUDY with EUD.

Thomas PHILIP (TP), who attended the General Assembly as Observer for EUDY, told that he had participated in a training course about Human Rights and Minority Groups arranged by the CoE. These courses arranged by the CoE are open to people from Youth NGOs, and the EUDY is eligible for applying for courses in Human Rights or other issues according to Deaf Youth themes. The steps of the application will be discussed at the EUDY GA in August 2004 in Copenhagen but EUDY is planning to have a training about Human Rights and Minority Groups at a future Youth Camp (probably late in 2005).

He also gave some information about the "European Deaf Youth Forum" in Copenhagen that will take place in August 2004 and said that this Deaf Youth Seminar is hoping to get more response from youngsters, because this forum will also be used to disseminate information about funding etc.

The UK added that it was a pity that the Dutch Deaf Youth Association had collapsed, and thus the planned Youth Camp will not take place. The question arose as from which age people can attend the WFD Youth Camp 2005. This camp will not be for Juniors but only for youngsters between 16-30. Tyron WOOLFE also asked whether EUDY will get active support from EUD. HS explained

that in 1996 EUDY had chosen to become independent from EUD. EUD keeps sending information to EUDY, but vice versa there seems to be a problem. However, EUD has no problem in supporting EUDY by e.g. forwarding info and placing text on its homepage. However, EUD could not decide for EUDY and do their work!

The Netherlands clarified that it was not the fault of the EUD Staff nor the EUD Board that the camp would not take place. This decision was made by the Dutch Youth Section itself, who acts independently.

The UK suggested to attract a staff member (with a 2 months contract) who could work at the EUD office and who would focus entirely on organising a youth camp. The UK delegate said that a long term strategy was necessary.

AM added that every 2 years the EUDY Board is replaced by half, but that the real problem is that the Board doesn't get much financial support for meetings and that few Board members can express themselves clearly in English.

TR supported the idea that an intern would come to work for short time in the EUD Office. In the past a comparable situation has occurred, when someone from Sweden and the Netherlands came to work in the EUD office for 3 months. He asked NADs to look for funding to help support EUDY by sending an intern to EUD to help EUDY.

17. Any other business

Human Rights Conference 2005

Finland mentioned the International Human Rights Conference that will be organised by WFD and FAD on 29-30.09.2005. On the first day, 29.09.2005, the meeting will only be open for Deaf people, the second day, 30.09.2005, observers will also be allowed to attend the meeting. On 01.10.2005 FAD will celebrate its 100th anniversary. All events will take place in Helsinki, Finland and FAD would like to invite the entire EUD Board to this event. EUD members are welcome too and will receive an invitation from FAD.

Captioning

Switzerland brought up the subject that MGM had intended to stop plural captioning on DVDs, and would like to ask EUD to join in a letter campaign. Germany added, regarding to this point, that the danger for killer languages occurs (e.g. English). Denmark remarked that the industry no longer seems to feel the need to produce video recorders which can caption subtitles. Austria remarked that this subject is also related to Human Rights, and that in Austria you still can find VCRs which are able to record subtitles. KS asked to pass these names on. TR added that we are moving into a digital age and that DVDs are able to record, but that recording subtitling via analogue means often is no longer possible.

Deaf Academic Symposium

Sweden informed about the Deaf Academics Symposium that will be held in Stockholm in August 2006. The aim is to invite deaf people with a university degree or a higher education level degree. This information is already now distributed because it will be necessary to contact people in order to make them aware of this event. HH added that similar events were organised in the USA (in

Texas in 2002 and in Gallaudet in February 2004). This would be the first time that such an event would be organised in Europe!! KS suggested to put this item on the agenda of next year's GA.

Co-operation with EDF

Ireland wanted to have more exclusive cooperation with EDF regarding deaf-related issues. HS answered that it is a matter of "of or for", as FEPEDA and RNID are already speaking *for* the deaf. FEPEDA is an organisation of parents of deaf and hard of hearing children, but there have been disagreements regarding e.g. education. RNID is a service provider targeting Deaf and hard of hearing people. HS added it is strange that blind people are able to speak by one voice, but that deaf people are represented by 6 different organisations (Hard of Hearing, deaf, deafblind, parents, interpreters and CI). It will be necessary to have a Deaf voice in the EDF Board. We have to make sure we have a strong Deaf candidate next year for the EDF Board elections. Hopefully Adrien and TR will manage to do some lobby work during the EDF GA next week. HS added that already contacts have been made with EFHOH regarding the theme of subtitling.

Voting cards

The Netherlands proposed to have by next year's GA real (red and green) voting cards in order that votes really can be counted. Ireland added that it would like to have clearly noted which country votes in favour/against/withdraws itself. KS and HS fully agree with these proposals. The Board is to discuss this further.

Deaf vs Sign Language User

France asked to have a discussion about which word will be used in the future; for example in Scandinavia the term *sign language user* is used instead of deaf, in France people talk about *communauté sourd* (instead of *communauté de sourds*). This discussion is similar to that of *socio-cultural-minority group* or *disabled group*. KS suggested to set up a workshop regarding this theme at next year's GA.

Number of delegates

Hungary asked to clarify how many delegates can attend the EUD General Assembly. KS answered that following the EUD Statutes 2 delegates can attend the EUD GA, but that EUD only covers expenses for one person. If a country attends the EUD GA with 2 delegates, then they both have one vote. But one Full member always has two votes!

Interpreter for GA

Greece remarked that due to fingerspelling and the use of International Sign lots of information gets lost. In the past each country brought its own national sign language interpreter to EUD GA and thus information was 100% accessible, as for now it is only for about 60%. Greece urged countries to be creative and to use signs, rather than fingerspelling.

Promoting DVD

Interpreter Mindy BROWN asked some speaking time to promote a DVD she had made as a sign artist.

18. Workshops

Before starting the workshops Eddie REDMOND, chairperson of IDS, handed out a present (box of Irish chocolates) from IDS to all attending persons.

KS informed the GA how the workshops would be carried out. The delegates would be divided into two smaller groups, each group would get about one hour to discuss a theme, then both groups would swap places. HS briefly gave some information about the two workshop themes. The first workshop would deal with the topic of "Sign languages and sign language interpreters: the problem of 'working languages' at European level. Two years ago Sweden brought up this issue in a motion and at last year's GA there had been no time to discuss this, so it was proposed to be the theme of a thematic workshop. The second workshop "The way forward for sign languages in Europe: should we propose a new legal instrument to the Council of Europe?" would be used to give some recent information about contacts with the Council of Europe and to discuss the way forward.

18.1. Sign languages and sign language interpreters: the problem of "working languages" at European level

The background for this workshop was the increased level of activity and interaction among sign language users at European level. Since there are few or no common rules for "working languages" and the use of interpreters at European meetings, there is a need for guidelines for language use and use of interpreters at European level meetings.

This workshop was led by Hilde HAUALAND (HH) and Lorraine LEESON (LL). They made an overview of four "ideal types" of situations:

- internal meetings (EUD, EUDY, European/Regional Deaf majority meetings) and
- external meetings (EU, CoE, DG, conferences and hearing majority meetings – both types where subdivided in onstage and offstage situations).

HH and LL postulated four major questions:

- who is responsible for: hiring/paying/choosing interpreters,
- which sign languages should be working languages,
- can international sign interpreters be used in any situations and
- how to encourage training for interpreters and Deaf people?

The members discussed the idea that each country would make a list of preferred interpreters and that this list would be handed over to the EC. Some countries were hesitant regarding this idea, because they believe it still remains a personal right to bring one's own preferred interpreter, without the EC making a choice itself. Denmark said that this item is one of situation responsibility, thus that everyone must take a part of the responsibility. Finland stated that equal access must be guaranteed.

It also depends on who organises the event which sign language provision can be asked. If deaf people are invited to an event, they can demand for their own national sign language interpreters, but if deaf people go to an event out of own interest, you cannot oblige the organiser to provide sign language interpretation in 15 different languages. It is not possible to bring 25 national sign language interpreters to European events, although sometimes information gets lost. Compare with the EUD Seminar on Employment, the international sign interpreters did a good job but some signs were just not clear to the public. At the seminar people could look at the text screen, but this is not a solution, since not everyone can understand written English. Also, it is a problem of finances.

Norway said that for example at the WFD Congress in Montréal there were 3 working sign languages (International signs, ASL and Quebec Sign Language), which were projected on huge

screens, and English was being used as spoken language. On the other hand each country was allowed to bring its own national interpreters, but these interpreters were not allowed to work on stage, and had to be paid by the countries themselves.

Ireland remarked that a big part of the EU budget is dedicated to interpretation, thus maybe in the future a part can be reserved for sign languages? In Ireland there is a tradition that in contact with the government, the government pays for the interpreter but deaf persons get the chance to choose their own interpreter. Maybe this principle must be also employed at international level?

The Netherlands reminded that in the past each country brought its own interpreter to EUD meetings. Now international signs are being used but by means of this only superficial information is being provided. Greece agreed by stating that 15 years ago it could understand 100% of what was being said, but by using international signs lost of information gets lost and so it gets difficult to pass relevant information on to the national deaf club.

Austria proposed to make a clear distinction between internal and external situations: in external situations international signs are hardly needed, in this situation the EU pays for the interpreters. In seminars etc it ought to be considered to bring one's own sign language interpreter in order to get full access.

At the end of the workshops it became clear that no real solution could be formulated to solve the problem of access for Deaf people at EU events. Deaf people may be allowed to bring their own sign language interpreters to EU events, but may have to pay for this themselves, unless an agreement with EC can be reached (for example if you are the only Deaf representative at a conference).

18.2. The way forward for sign languages in Europe: should we propose a new legal instrument to the Council of Europe?

HS said that there were three ways to achieve legal recognition of sign languages in the Council of Europe. The three options are:

- (1) to add a protocol to the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages,
- (2) to create a separate legal instrument,
- (3) to add a protocol to the European Social Charter.

Each of these instruments has its own advantages and disadvantages. For example (2) could acknowledge the specific character of sign languages but has the danger to become invisible in the sea of existing instruments.

During recent discussions with officials of the Council of Europe, in Strasbourg, EUD was advised to change the focus from the Charter for Regional or Minority Languages to the European Social Charter (ESC). Although the ESC has not been designed with languages in mind, it addresses in many ways the barriers that Deaf sign language users experience. The ESC places obligations on the Member States in the following areas: housing, health, education, employment, social protection, movement of persons and non-discrimination. An advantage would be that this mechanism also deals with employment and has a good monitoring body.

Finland said that it could not make a choice between the two instruments at the moment, but that it would like legal experts to investigate which way would be best. Positive about the ESC is that it has a powerful monitoring mechanism.

Sweden stated that the Charter for Regional or Minority Languages is politically not very strong but doubted that sign languages can be used in terms of social policy. HS answered that sign languages are to be considered in the middle of the continuum of language rights and social rights, so the idea to add a protocol to ESC needed to be further investigated.

Norway asked if it would be relevant to include sign language in all seven areas? Ireland answered that this Charter is already 4 years old. HS said that EUD knew of the existence of such a Charter, but that it never was considered to be an option before. She added that, apart from Bosnia and Herzegovina, almost all countries had ratified the Charter.

Austria said that the Austrian Parliament is of the opinion that this Charter is social and thus is not relevant for Deaf citizens. The fear was expressed that inclusion in this Charter would mean that deafness would be considered as a disability again!

Denmark said that relying only on the European Social Charter would be not enough, although the seven different domains are very concrete and there exists a strong monitoring body.

Markku JOKINEN pointed at the existence of the The Hague Recommendation and stressed that this instrument also needs to be consulted.

HS summarised that the ESC could have different benefits, including access to rights on 7 different domains and a strong monitoring mechanism. She clarified that although the Charter for Regional or Minority Languages has lots of barriers, both ways should be addressed at the same time. Each country should let some legal experts make a balance of both instruments. EUD needed to investigate the benefits/drawbacks of the ESC in more detail, together with external experts and CoE officials who work with ESC.

On a separate note, MJ added that it would be very important to have a deaf representative at the forthcoming UN Conference!

LK said that either way would need some governmental approval, thus that countries needed to lobby their governments because it seemed that some governments were ignorant about the issue.

KS concluded by saying that the Board will work out further principles and that the outcome will be presented to the General Assembly.



KS closed this 19th General Assembly by thanking IDS for its help in organising and thanked the delegates for turning up. He informed that in 2005 Board elections would be held and already asked the NADs to start thinking about candidates. The next General Assembly will be held in Luxemburg.



Minutes drafted by Karin VAN PUYENBROECK, EUD Administrator on 09.05.2004
Revised by Helga STEVENS, EUD Director on 14.07.2004 and Knud SØNDERGAARD, EUD
President on 30.07.2004.
Revised by the Secretariat on 03.11.2004 following amendments proposed by Members and the
decisions of the Board.
Final revision on 05.11.2004 by Helga STEVENS, EUD Director.

Signatures:

Knud SØNDERGAARD, EUD President

Helga STEVENS, EUD Director

C2: EUD Files/EUD 03-04/EUD GA 2004/Minutes of GA 2004 - Final

EUD GENERAL ASSEMBLY 2004: PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO EUD STATUTES

Introduction

The EUD Board proposed in 2003 to give full voting rights to EUD Affiliated members upon the request of some Full Members. At that time (in 2002-2003) only National Deaf Organisations from Norway and Iceland were Affiliated members.

This proposal was made in order to give those members a say in EUD matters, on equal footing with Full members. To this end the EUD Statutes needed to be amended.

This was discussed for the first time during the EUD GA 2003 in Athens during which some Full Members expressed their concern about the balance between EU members, those countries which will join the EU and other European countries. Thus the matter was deferred back to the EUD Board for further consideration.

Following the wish of the EUD GA and to keep matters simple, and viewing the fact that the main problem will be solved with the accession of 10 Central European countries to the EU on 1 May 2004, the EUD Board would like to propose to simply move the EFTA countries to the Full Membership category. If this is done, then changes to the Statutes can be kept to a minimum.

This is now reflected in its proposals for amendment of the EUD statutes. (See below).

In addition, the EUD Board was faced with the replacement of Markku JOKINEN who retired as EUD Vice President which he did not wish to combine with his new function as WFD President. When looking for a replacement to fill this vacancy, the Board found that the Statutes were not very clear and precise on this point. Therefore the Board has proposed some amendments to clarify this further to avoid discussions in the future.

Summary of proposed amendments

NOTE: changes are underlined.

1. Move of EFTA countries to Full Membership category

ART 3. Section 2. Full Members

1. ~~1.~~ 1. Only National organisations of Deaf people active in the Member States of the European Union, with a clear majority of Deaf voting members among its membership and with a governing Board with a majority of Deaf persons and whose goals are similar to the above-described aims are eligible for admission to the Full membership category.

2. In addition, national organisations of Deaf people active in the Member States of the European Free Trade Association (EFTA), that meet the above-given criteria are also eligible for admission to the Full membership category.
3. These organisations will hereafter be referred to as Full Members.
- 4.2. Full membership is limited to one national organisation of the Deaf in each country.

ART 3. Section 3. Affiliated Members

1. ~~This category applies to non-EU national organisations of Deaf people that meet the above-given criteria and that are active in countries belonging to the European Free Trade Association (EFTA).~~
2. This category ~~may also apply~~applies to non-EU national organisations of Deaf people that meet the above-given criteria and that are active in the Central and Eastern European countries, which have signed an association treaty with the European Union and/or may be joining the European Union in the future.
3. This category may also apply to non-EU national organisations of Deaf people that meet the above-given criteria and that are active in countries that are geographically situated in Europe and that have signed or may sign a co-operation treaty or a free trade association treaty with the European Union.
4. Affiliated membership is limited to one (1) national organisation of the Deaf in each country.
5. These organisations will hereafter be referred to as Affiliated Members.

II. Changes to the Articles regarding the Board to make it more clear.

ARTICLE 5. THE BOARD

ART 5. Section 1. Members, election procedure, and duties

1. Each Full and Affiliated Member with voting rights has the right to propose one candidate for the Board. The candidate proposed by a Full or Affiliated Member with voting rights has to come from the country of that Member. The General Assembly elects the Board Members.

ART 5. Section 5. Replacement

1. Should a vacancy occur on the Board, he or she will be replaced at the discretion of the Board. The replacement must come from a EU country or EFTA country. In the event of the office of the President becoming vacant, the position will be automatically filled by the Vice-President but this must be ratified at the next meeting of the General Assembly.

END OF AMENDMENTS

EUD GENERAL ASSEMBLY 2004:

MOTIONS

EUD has received several motions for the EUD GA 2004. They are listed below.

MOTION 1 – submitted by CNSE, Spain

“The last month of July of 2003, the World Federation of the Deaf (WFD) in its XIV Assembly designated the Spanish National Confederation of the Deaf (CNSE) as the responsible entity of organizing the XV WFD Congress in the year 2007.

The importance of this event and its celebration in Europe make necessary the cooperation between the EUD and the CNSE. For this reason the CNSE requests to the EUD that it supports and collaborates in the organization of the XV WFD Congress which takes place in Madrid (Spain) in 2007.

So it is necessary to create collaboration lines and synergies that outline as one objective the possible search of sponsors and economic supports at European level, as well as the participation activation in the congress of all those deaf people associations of the European Union in which the socioeconomic conditions of their countries are hindering the full participation of deaf people, like the situation of many of the east countries.”

MOTION 2 – submitted by FAD, Finland

“EUD will arrange a training or a seminar to its member countries related to the United Nations Comprehensive and Integral International Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Rights and Dignity of Persons with Disabilities so that the member associations can advise governments to ensure adequate attention for the rights of the Deaf.”

MOTION 3 – submitted by FNSF, France, and the EUD Board

FNSF and the EUD Board would like to propose that FNSF (through its member, the Association Générale des Sourds de Montpellier et sa Région) organises the First European and Mediterranean Deaf Congress on 11-13 November 2005 in Montpellier, France. EUD would provide input to the programme and help find sponsoring and also publicise the event on its homepage.

MOTION 4 – submitted by the EUD Board

The EUD Board proposes to give full voting rights to EUD Affiliated members. This is in order to give those members a say in EUD matters, on equal footing with Full members. To this end the EUD Statutes need to be amended. Please see attached the EUD statutes as amended.