

E U D

Minutes

15th GA 2000

15th General Assembly of the European Union of the Deaf

Gent, Belgium

Thursday 13 April and Friday 14 April 2000

Agenda

1. Welcoming Address
2. Roll Call
3. Adoption of Minutes GA 1999
4. Adoption of the Annual Report 1998-1999
5. Presentation and Adoption of the Financial Reports of 1996-1999.
Presentation of Preliminary Financial Report of 1999-2000.
6. Presentation and Adoption of the EUD Application for EU Co-ordination Grant 2000-2001 (proposed EUD Budget and Work Programme for 2000-2001).
7. EUD Work Priorities for 2000-2001 and Beyond
8. Revision of EUD Statutes
9. Motions Tabled
10. Replacement of Board Members
11. Discussion of New Vision for EUD
12. AOB

15th General Assembly of the European Union of the Deaf

**Gent, Belgium
Thursday 13 April and Friday 14 April 2000**

Minutes

Thursday 13 April 2000

1. Welcoming Address

KS opened the meeting and added some general information regarding background to staff changes in the Bureau. He gave an overview of EU level changes, including the Euro, employment, enlargement, funding opportunities, etc. and outlined the draft agenda for the GA. He described how motions from Finland and Spain would be handled. These motions were forwarded to all members prior to this meeting.

2. Roll Call

12 countries represented: Austria: Trude DIMMEL; Belgium: Andre LATHOUWERS and Martine FRAITURE; Denmark: Knud SONDERGAARD and Anne VIKKELSO; Finland: Markku JOKINEN and Liisa KAUPPINEN; France: Adrien PELLETIER and Pascal SMITH; Germany: Rudi SAILER; Greece: Helly CHRISTOPOULOU and Giannis CHRISTODOULAKOS; Ireland: Eddie REDMOND and John Bosco CONAMA; Italy: Ida COLLU and Sebastiano MANCIAGLI; Luxembourg: Jacques BRUCH and Josy HOFFMANN; Netherlands: Alexander BOSMAN and Martie KOOLHOF; Portugal: Amilcar MORAIS and Arlindo OLIVEIRA; Spain: Luis Cañon REGUERA and Feliciano SOLA LIMIA; Sweden: Lars-Åke WIKSTRÖM and Ingvar EDWALL; UK: David BULLOCK and Lorna ALLSOP

Observers :

Belgium : Pierre DEWIT; Denmark: Dan OLVHOJ; Finland: Sirpa LEHTINEN;
Portugal: Armando BALTAZAR

Staff : Helga STEVENS, Lorraine LEESON and Johan WESEMANN

Interpreters : Mindy BROWN and Gerdinand WAGENAAR

3. Adoption of Minutes GA 1999

Finland asked that point 6 regarding the EUD agreement with WFD be altered to reflect fact that Liisa Kauppinen represented FAD and not WFD. Minutes to be amended to reflect this. Minutes adopted by members.

Following discussion regarding the approval of the minutes of the 2000 GA, it was agreed that draft minutes would be forwarded to all members for their consideration. All suggested editorial changes should be forwarded to the secretariat in writing for approval by the Executive Board.

4. Adoption of the Annual Report 1998-99

The report was disseminated to all members prior to the GA. During the meeting, the president offered a verbal overview of the content of this report. He called on HS who outlined work in progress regarding the Year of Languages 2001 (meeting with EBLUL, contact with Liz Lynne, MEP (UK), etc.), and HS said that EQUAL proposal developments were still not clearly outlined or available. KS outlined the current position regarding the forthcoming Slovenia meeting where HS will attend as EUD representative. He stated that he hoped that NDA representatives would attend the Slovenia meeting too. KS noted that funding regulations for the period post-2001 are not yet clear. The report was adopted by the delegates.

5. Presentation and Adoption of the Financial Reports of 1996-1999. Presentation of Preliminary Financial Report of 1999-2000

KS made an announcement regarding the financial reports that were forwarded from 1991-1997 (1 copy per country). Note that the report for 1997 included an additional document relating to the Sign Languages Project.

KS provided a summary overview of EUD's financial history and situation including changes in bookkeeping procedure: Until 1996, Denmark's DDL was responsible for bookkeeping. In 1997, it was decided that bookkeeping should occur in one place (i.e. Belgium). A result of this was that the accounting year changed: it then began on April 1. DDL maintained responsibility for the SL Project and salaries. He pointed out that EUD received no EU funding for the period of January-May 1997. The EU funding calendar changed to 1/6-31/5 (previously it was the calendar year). The last 30 % of the SLP project funding was reduced which, even after receipt of outstanding monies, led to a deficit of 71.474 Euro. The president explained that EUD are still in discussions with the Commission regarding the audit of costs relating to the SLP conference.

The president outlined the annual accounts for 1997 (Annex 1). The Balance Sheet for 1997 (Annex 2) was then displayed. The figures relating to the Sign Languages Project were also displayed (Annex 3). Annex 3 illustrates a number of invoices that are outstanding, including travel costs for some delegates and the fee due to Bristol University. The total sum yet to be paid by EUD is 95.000 + Euro. The outstanding figure due from the Commission is 71.474 Euro. HS is to meet with the Commission on this matter, as current deficit cannot be paid by EUD at this point in time. The president opened the floor for questions.

Germany asked if income raised from registration fee for delegates attending the conference was listed. KS said that a total of -14.228 Euro was received from registration fees for the conference and is listed in Annex 3 under the section on « Conference ». JW and HS met with the Commission regarding the SLP audit.

Spain raised a question regarding column 2 of Annex 3 which includes invoices which cannot be paid by EUD at this time. The delegate asked how Bristol were reacting to non-payment of the final payment. The President said that he would explain the current situation to Bristol, in response to a letter requesting why there had been a delay in payment of this invoice. Ireland raised a question regarding the outstanding Commission funding, asking what percentage of funding that represents. The delegate also asked how EUD will prioritise outstanding payments should a reduced amount be received from the Commission. The President noted that while this matter had not yet been raised amongst the Executive Committee, if delegates wanted to draw up a proposal, he would be happy to take it to a vote. Otherwise, a mandate could be given to the Executive committee. The Irish delegate said that he hoped that a percentage fee would be paid to all people who have not yet received payment. The President suggested that another possibility is that the Commission may impose payment restrictions on EUD. KS pointed out that this would not be a problem. The UK pointed out that delegates had already agreed to donate the outstanding third instalment due to National Associations to EUD. JW pointed out that some NDAs have not accepted this. Regardless, JW asked that these contributions be added to the overall figures for Annex 3. Germany felt that the issue of paying outstanding invoices must be separated out from the issue of validating the financial reports. KS proposed that EUD negotiate with individual NDAs regarding the donation of their outstanding fees.

It was pointed out that the figures for 1991-1996 figures were included here for reference only as they are in the same format as later year's financial reports. They had previously been distributed and approved in a different format. France asked for a vote for adoption of the figures for 1996-1997. Some discussion followed regarding the relationship between approving the financial report and possible implications for the receipt of outstanding monies from the Commission. KS pointed out that EUD had been subjected to an audit and HS noted that a copy of the Commission's audit had been sent to all NDAs in 1999. France observed that there were three issues for consideration : (1) the audit is complete : (2) propose a vote on the global financial issues and : (3) discuss payments to be made on receipt of Commission funding.

The President asked that the financial report for 1997 be adopted. Members adopted the report. KS called for the members to mandate the Executive Committee to deal with payments from funds yet to be received from the Commission. Members approved this proposal.

The treasurer outlined the financial report for 1998-1999. 1998 figures were dealt with in Holland last year. Regarding figures for 1999-2000 (Annex 4- 10 months of budget 99-00 and Annex 5, for full year), AL outlined the sum already received from the Commission to date (83.000 Euro) out of a total of 100.000 Euro. He reminded members of EUD's request for contributions and noted that some countries had responded though some had made no contributions. He pointed out that additional payments had been received after this draft report was printed. Those figures will be added to the final report. He noted that EUD's budget for this year is on target to meet the budget outlined to the Commission. AL opened the floor to questions on this report, asking for approval of the report.

Germany asked why we seem to be approximately 23.000 Euro below budget at present. AL pointed out that outstanding/ invoices yet to be received for General Assembly and Conference will be covered for this figure. Austria raised a query in relation to

interpreter's fees. AL responded that the figure 614000, etc. refers to an account code and not to fees paid. He pointed out that the number of interpreters hired varied depending on meetings/ conferences attended, etc. and noted that these fees are co-funded by the Belgian social system: previously, the Dutch government covered interpreting costs and the Commission accepted these costs as co-funding. Ireland asked if the EUD's homepage had yet been established. EUD responded that it had been set up but needs further work to develop it more and requires regular updating. Ireland suggested that the costs involved in setting up the homepage should be less. HS outlined the view that a professional would be bought in to establish an interactive framework for development in conjunction with members. UK suggested that EUD needs to do some external fundraising. HS pointed out the difficulty in securing funding for EU related activities at national level. JW added that public perception considers EUD to have a lot of money due to EU connections, though this is not the case. He called on members to see what funding could be secured at national level, feeding into EUD. The Netherlands suggested that each NDA could ask their government for funding for international work. The delegate suggested that all NDAs should follow the same route and all funding could then be pooled. The delegate called for support for this principle from all members. Sweden called on the Executive Committee to clarify correspondence requesting support to the amount of 1.600 Euro. He said that he had seen a request for 1.500 Euros. AL showed a copy of the letter that requested 1.600 Euros dating from November 1998. AL pointed out that these figures are currently for information only. On completion of the final report for this year, the report can be brought to a vote/ approved. This will be at next year's GA. When the final report is sent to the Commission at the end of May, it will also be sent to all NDAs.

6. Presentation and Adoption of the EUD Application for EU co-ordination grant 2000-2001 (proposed EUD Budget and Work-programme for 2000-2001)

17 April is the deadline for receipt of application proposal for the co-ordination grant. The final application must be posted on Monday. HS provided an overview of the proposal's content, including drawbacks regarding lack of documentation available for the Year of Languages proposal and EQUAL. This limits what EUD can propose in this application. HS also provided the rationale behind a proposed « helpdesk ». She outlined the proposed meeting arrangements for the Board and Executive Committee in the coming year and described the importance of attendance at meetings relevant to deaf and disability issues, e.g. the European Parliament Disability Intergroup meetings in Strasbourg. HS outlined the ways in which EUD's application relates to this year's theme of « Non-discrimination ». HS drew the members' attention to the proposed budget (Annex 6). This can be compared with the details of the 1999 proposed budget (Annex 7). She outlined the current situation regarding funding cutbacks at Commission level. She said that a total of 1,3 million Euro is available for European NGOs in the disability sector.

Germany raised a question regarding EUD's work on employment issues as this is a priority for the EU. JW responded saying that the EU perspective is that employment issues need to be tackled at national level. This ties in with HS's idea of a role for an EUD helpdesk. The UK asked if EUD have discussed the issue of funding applications with other ENGOS. The delegate also suggested that the membership rapidly need to decide on whether EUD should move towards lobbying or becoming a « helpdesk »

organisation. HS responded that such a decision needs to be voted on at the GA next year. HS referred to Annex 6, the proposed budget for 2000. She noted that the figure of 52.280,74 Euro for own contribution includes membership fees (14.250 Euro), rent income (20.000 Euro) and own contributions (18.030,75 Euro). The Flemish government contribution regarding interpretation is not included here, but can be added. JW's interpretation costs are not included here as co-funding as he no longer works for EUD. KS noted that the application will be forwarded to the Commission by Monday and asked the members for approval of the application. All members approved the application.

7. EUD work priorities and projects for 2000-2001 and beyond

The President noted that these points were covered in relation to the preceding point.

Sweden asked for the floor and pointed out that Sweden will hold the roving presidency of the EU in the first six months of 2001. The government want to host a number of conferences inclusive of disability perspectives, following from the success of the Tampere Meeting in 1999. The government have already made contact with several organisations in Sweden, including SDR. They propose that 2 conferences will be held and suggest EUD's attendance at both conferences. The first conference will be an « expert meeting » between governmental experts where we can attend as observers. The theme is « Towards a Barrier Free Europe for Citizens with Disabilities » Provisional dates are 21-27 April. Sign Language and International Signing interpreters will be provided. Currently, the Swedish government are asking the EU to cover national sign language interpretation costs and will recommend contact with EUD. The second conference titled « Agenda 22 » which relates to the UN Standard Rules, of which there are 22 ! EDF will be heavily involved and the delegate suggests that EUD may also play a role. The delegate proposed that the next EUD GA be held in Sweden as it would tie in with these conferences.

Germany supported the Swedish proposal and added that Germany remain interested in hosting a conference centred around the Year of Languages, in Munich in September (6-9) 2001. This would be a cultural event. In addition, a conference focusing on language issues could be arranged. Finland suggested that perhaps Germany and Sweden could co-operate on these issues, and perhaps find a link between their proposals. Finland highlighted the point that the issues could be related as for Deaf people, the barrier we face is linguistic, which makes both conferences of relevance. The delegate pointed out that the original idea for the Year of Languages came from the Council of Europe, which incorporates 45 countries.

Friday 14 April 2000

The President welcomed the delegates and opened the meeting. He informed members that he had received a fax from the other German delegate who sent his apologies for not being able to attend the meeting. FSSB delegates were also unable to attend today's meeting.

8. Revision of EUD Statutes

The President outlined the reasons for the proposed revision of statutes. He outlined the voting procedure for each section. A majority vote is 50%. Two thirds must approve each change proposed.

Regarding Amendment 5 – additional membership list. A Swedish delegate pointed out that in the past, the SDR had the FNSF vote by proxy. KS called for members to vote to approve this. Greece proposed that the wording be change to reflect that EUD developed from the ECRS with their 12 members. The president said that it was impossible to retrospectively amend the old statutes. Instead, only new statutes could be considered. The President pointed out that EUD's statutes must comply with Belgian law. UK supported this view. HS said that it was possible to explore whether the original document could be revised to include all members on the original list of founding members. The president noted that the amended statutes must be forwarded to the Belgian government for their approval. Germany proposed a vote for inclusion of all members on the list of founded members. The president called for a vote on this proposal. The majority voted in favour (14 :1).

Article 2. Section 3. Definition – The President noted that this is an addition and refers to the WFD/EUD definition of deafness. The President called for a vote on this amendment. The members accepted this amendment.

Article 3. Section 1. Membership Categories. – This refers to the addition of a sixth form of membership : (f) individual members. Ireland proposed that individual members must also be members of their national associatoin. The president responded that this is a matter for national discussion. He said that that issue raised relates to point 3.7 and will be dealt with in realtion to that point. The president called for a vote on this amendment. The members approved this amendment.

Article 3. Section 2. Relates to full members. Some changes have been proposed in this section. The president described the background to the acceptance of one member organisation per country, though in Belgium, two associations have been members. The President called on Belgium, in the course of the coming year, to establish a federation to lead to single Belgian membership of EUD. The FEVLADO delegate responded that documents leading to the establihsment of a new Belgian association are currently with the Belgian authorities for the sake of international activities. However, both FSSB and FEVLDO will continue to exist within Belgium. Greece sought clarification on the voting rights of other categories of membership apart from those of full members. HS responded that only full members have voting rights. The President noted that this question related to Article 4 and would be dealt with there. KS called for a vote. The members accepted this amendment.

Article 3. Section 7. Individual members. Italy called for more clarification on each of the articles to ensure that all members are clear on what they are voting on before they are called on to vote. The president responded that information on these proposals had been sent to members well in advance of this meeting. Ireland asked for clarification regarding the aim of individual membership. The president called on Liisa Kauppinen to provide an overview of how many individual members WFD has. LK responded that

there are no so many. JW pointed out that in principle we should encourage support of EUD from individuals too. It was re-emphasised that individual members would not have voting rights, but would be entitled to information only. Italy stated that they were not happy with this proposal as they felt it was not a useful or appropriate category of membership. The delegate supported the inclusion of honorary members. She also pointed out the need for specification that Board members must be Deaf. HS outlined the rationale behind individual membership again. JB asked KS whether board members could become individual members of one's own free will after their mandates have been terminated. KS said that this was possible. The president called for a vote on this amendment. The members voted in favour of this amendment. Italy opposed.

Article 3. Section 9.1. Termination. This relates to votes relating to the termination of membership with EUD. This relates to Article 3. Section 9.2. Following a query from Finland, the president explained that EUD had worked in consultation with Terry Riley (UK). HS explained that termination of membership could occur if members felt that an association were not fit to be a member of EUD. Procedure for evaluation and mediation of a process must be included in the statutes and could be included in the internal rules. Ireland asked who would be members of the « termination committee ». KS responded that this would/ could be specified in the internal rules. JW asked who would select such an independent arbitrary panel. HS proposed that the section referring to the establishment of an arbitration panel be removed from the proposed amendment. Ireland sought clarification regarding who these independent arbitrators would be. HS responded that they envisaged someone like WFD/ EDF, etc. Members agreed to delete Article 3. Section 9.2.

Regarding Article 3. Section 9.1. Termination. KS called for a vote on this amendment. HS proposed that an additional clause be added allowing proposed terminated members the right to defend themselves. Members accepted this addition and the overall amendment.

Article 4. Section 4.1 Meetings. This relates to proposed changes in terms of holding a General Assembly on an annual basis. The members accepted this amendment.

Article 4. Section 4.2. This relates to Extraordinary meetings. Italy called for removal of reference to the Executive Director and asked for that to be replaced by the president. Spain supported the Italian proposal and added that a three-month timeframe for arrangement of a meeting was not practical, as shorter timeframes for decisions, etc. might arise. He proposed that this be changed to a period of one-month. Finland proposed that the reference to the director should remain, as they could, in consultation with the president and the executive committee, decide on calling an extraordinary meeting as necessary. France asked for a change of wording, i.e. that the word 'or' be deleted. Spain asked whether there was a specification of the role of the Executive Director in the Internal Rules. JW responded that there is. KS called for a vote on the amendments as specified. Members approved the proposed amendments.

Article 4. Section 5.2. Quorum and Vote. Greece sought clarification regarding what happens if only one delegate attends a meeting and whether they have the right to use both votes. The delegate also asked if the quorum was related to number of delegates or associations. HS noted that members are associations, therefore the quorum is decided on the basis of the number of associations present at a meeting. Italy said that a quorum must comprise 50% plus 1. She asked that this be included. The members supported this

change. Italy suggested that the English wording needs to reflect that more than 50% are present. Denmark proposed the following formula : 50,1><49,9%.. HS suggested the wording « more than ». Members voted in favour of this amendment. KS asked if the principle of two votes per country could be accepted. Italy sought clarification on the right of a single delegate to take two votes by proxy. A majority of members voted in favour.

Article 4. Section 5.4 Voting. This refers to how voting is implemented. The president explained that in some countries, in situations where a vote receives an equal number of votes for and against, that the motion is rejected. In the case of elections, another possibility is to have a secret ballot in such a situation. This overrides the old statute where the president has a casting vote in situations where there is an undecided vote. Finland suggested that the old statute regarding the President's right to a casting vote be maintained. Members approved this proposal.

Article 5 Section 1.1 The Executive Board – This relates to the maximum number of members (5). Greece suggested that the word « maximum » be deleted. Spain suggested that the following wording be added « a minimum number of 3 and a maximum number of 5 ». KS suggested a vote on the number that be specified. He asked members to vote on the Greek amendment. Members agreed that five members make up the Executive Board. Sweden proposed that the term « executive » be deleted. KS called for a vote on this matter. All members agreed.

Article 5 Section 1.2. This relates to the co-opting of three additional persons to the board for specific purposes (e.g. the year of languages).

Article 5. Section 2.1 Competencies. Greece asked for clarification regarding the hearing status of members of the board. He asked that a clause be added stating that all candidates to the board must be deaf. Finland stated that candidates would be selected from among the full members, of whom all are deaf.

Sweden asked why EUD needed a treasurer within the executive board. The delegate suggested that financial details are the responsibility of the executive director. As a result, the board would comprise of the President, the Vice president and three members. HS suggested that a phrase be added that the executive director is responsible for reporting to the board on financial matters and the board are responsible for monitoring the executive director's implementation of this fact. Members voted unanimously to approve this change. This was added as Article 5 Section 2.1(c)

Article 5. Section 2.1(a). Finland sought clarification on this point. The delegate asked if the GA's decisions must be conveyed via the executive board to the secretariat. The president called for votes on all amendments to Article 5. Members adopted the changes.

Article 6. Section 2. Accounting Year change. The President called for a vote. The members voted in favour of the proposed change in accounting year.

The president asked for members to vote overall on the changes that were proposed.
Unanimously approved.

The president noted that the final version of amended statutes must be signed by all members and asked that members uphold deadlines imposed for return of documentation.

Internal Rules : The president pointed out that documentation regarding the internal rules had been forwarded to all members and only one response was received-from David Bullock (UK). KS suggested that we approve the internal rules in principle and hold open discussion at the GA in 2001. Sweden pointed out that while the statutes must be approved by the GA, the GA could mandate the executive to deal with the internal rules. These would then be forwarded to members who could then suggest changes. The president called for a vote on this proposal and it was unanimously approved.

9. Motions Tabled (See Annex)

(a) Finland : new project- sign language users in the Information Society

Finland noted that the EU's Presidency currently identify the area of information technology as a priority and want to consider where Deaf people fit in vis-à-vis digital TV, distance teaching via the internet and video-phone/relay services, etc. They ask that EUD moves to support developments for Deaf people in this field. KS responded that this is a good idea. However, he asked how EUD board members would be involved on a practical level given the infrequency of their meetings. He suggested the nomination of experts in these areas. JW supported the Finnish proposal but suggested that the concept of mobile text telephony be added to the proposed motion. Finland agreed that this area is included in the motion, though not explicitly. In terms of co-ordination of activities, the delegate suggested that HS and the president could put together an inventory of expertise. The delegate suggested that EUD ask a member association to take a leading role in such a venture. Germany outlined developments in their country. KS outlined project developments in Norway. Spain described the Horizon Forum programme that has just come to an end and suggested that EUD collaborate with the technology group who have been meeting for 3 years. Discussion should occur via Jim KYLE, University of Bristol. HS outlined a meeting with Jim KYLE where EUD were asked to become officially involved in their dissemination meeting in June. The president asked if the members would vote to mandate the board to work on this. He also asked that members inform EUD of experts in their countries. Finland proposed that EUD contact the EP and explore possibilities for funding, then allow the national councils to consider means of moving ahead on three project areas. They asked that the NDAs forward a list of their national priorities to EUD. This would allow HS to co-ordinate priorities. The members approved this. KS suggested that the next (old) board meeting be dedicated to the idea of Information Society developments.

(b) Spain : National Sign Language Interpreters and International Sign

Spain provided an overview to their call to have NDAs provide their own national sign language interpreters at EUD meetings to overcome the power gap between those who are skilled international signers/ users of English and those who are not. The delegate suggested that perhaps the co-ordination budget could include some funding towards this cause. KS responded that this does not seem to be an issue for the board. However, for assemblies/ conferences, there seems to be an issue. Spain noted that the major problem was not with international signing, but with English. The delegate asked that all documentation be sent to NDAs well in advance of meetings to allow for time to prepare for meetings. France suggested that perhaps training should be provided for

delegates to EUD meetings on the use of international signing. Denmark suggested that the documents be translated to International Signing and distributed to members. Sweden reiterated the request that the English documents be distributed well in advance of meetings. Holland suggested that Belgium and Holland work together in dealing with documents, while Germany, Austria and Switzerland could co-operate. Austria asked if other NDAs could seek funding for translation of documentation to their native sign languages. Spain pointed out that that was not their motion. HS pointed out that the EUD proposed budget for the coming year could include reference to interpretation costs, but this would also mean additional costs for NDAs as EUD must contribute 30-40 percent to the Commission's co-funding. She pointed out discussion last year regarding the contribution of NDAs and the debate that was involved. The president pointed out that there were two problems (1) financial and (2) the quality of interpreters throughout the EU. He proposed that the board consider Spain's proposal, but asked members if they really wanted interpreters at the GA. Spain decided to withdraw the motion, though appealed for English language information to be distributed well in advance of meetings. Finland suggested that EUD consider using Deaf relay interpreters at their meetings. France pointed out that one difficulty is language, but another is that many delegates come unprepared as they do not know about the inner workings of EUD. Sweden noted that a mentorship programme could be established whereby experienced delegates coach new delegates regarding procedure, etc. Spain withdrew their motions, noting their support for Finland's suggestion of using Deaf relay interpreters. They also asked that papers be forwarded to NDAs in advance of meetings to allow for translation to international sign where required. HS pointed out that when EUD's web-page is established, more information will be more readily available to members. JW called on the members to clearly decide that at conferences, national sign language interpreters will be used. The EP have adopted their resolutions on sign languages and we followed up on this calling on them to pay for interpreters at meetings. We need to use this as a lobbying tool.

10. Replacement of Board members

KS suggested that given the changes to the board (now 5 members rather than 15), this issue is no longer a relevant item. The president proposed cancelling this item. Italy disagreed. The delegate stated that as the statutes will not be officially instantiated until approved by the Belgian government. As such, KOOLHOF is to continue to represent The Netherlands, MORAIS to represent Portugal and DIMMEL to represent Austria. KS called for a vote to accept these nominations. This was accepted by the members.

11. Discussion of New Vision for EUD.

MJ described the Portugal (Lisbon) meeting which set out a primary vision for EUD. This stated that EUD called for recognition of Deaf people as full citizens in the EU. This included Three sub-themes: (1) recognition of the right to use sign language; (2), empowerment through communication and information and (3) equality in education and employment. The question raised was « Is this still the vision of EUD or must it be amended ? » Spain suggested that in order of importance, (3) must become number (2). France suggested that EUD consider the role of identity, humanity and citizenship in the framework of the vision. The delegate suggested that (3) is a tool, but not relevant to the political vision *per se*. France pointed out that their NDA have developed a « Deaf »

version of the UN Declaration of Human Rights and suggests this may be a useful tool for EUD's discussion. Finland suggested we define a vision timetable (e.g. a period for which the vision will be relevant). The delegate suggested that the issues of relevance include defining ourselves as a people and considering what it means for us to exist in this world. She suggested that we work on developing a vision for approval by the GA in 2001. MJ summarised that the notion of individual rights need to be included, and that a timeframe for implementation be documented. France pointed out that no benchmark exists for the definition of minimum standards in Deaf communities. Such an instrument for definition of standards should be included in the vision statement. Sweden pointed out the importance of including reference to Deaf people as a community and as individuals. The delegate referred to use of the terms « inclusion » and « mainstreaming », defining their general use and the relevance to Deaf people. The aim is to « normalise » Deaf people, assuming that « outsiders » cannot be happy, and they must be included in general society. This led the delegate to argue for the definition of Deaf people as a group, which becomes a tool for arguing against the concept of inclusion. MJ asked that vision statement include reference to the recognition of Deaf people as members of a minority, where only through recognition of this minority can individual rights can be achieved. Ireland asked for feedback on EUD achievements on an annual basis (i.e. at the GA). France described the vision of Deaf children to have a « Deaf land » and suggested that this is an underlying vision of simplicity which should guide our work. We could use this to guide our action plan.

12. AOB

12.1 Ireland asked that a national annual report be presented by each country at the next GA.

12.2 France noted that the procedure of selection of the current director did not meet with normal procedure. The delegate proposed that a new open interview procedure be put in place, to ensure transparency. He pointed out that he did support the current director, but felt that the procedure had not been appropriate. KS responded that the statutes say that the competence for hiring staff lies with the executive. Therefore, this is not a duty of the GA. KS outlined the background to the decision to forward a letter to NDAs looking for support to appoint HS as director. In October 1999, 8 NDAs showed support. 1 did not support this nomination and 3 made procedural suggestions. Given the majority support, the board appointed HS, in line with the statutes. Ireland suggested that the appointment of HS may effectively have established a precedent for future candidature. The delegate asked that this be addressed by the board. KS said this would be discussed. France noted that his query was related to the notion of transparency and confidence. The delegate stated that the selection of the director was not transparent and argued that the board are subordinate to the GA and must implement the decisions made by the GA. KS stated that the appointment stands, but future discussion could take place. Italy supported the French comments on selection of the current director. The delegate called for adherence to the statutes in appointment of candidates, which she felt had been ignored in this instance. Italy called for HS to leave the room to allow for a vote. KS said that no vote could be taken under AOB, but a motion for discussion on this point at next year's GA could be tabled.

12.3 Spain pointed out that he (Luis) was appointed two years ago to evaluate the situation of employment and underemployment of Deaf people in the EU. He said that

he formulated a questionnaire and distributed it among members, but received only one response from Finland. In January 2000, another questionnaire was distributed and only Austria responded. This lack of co-operation makes it impossible for him to continue working in this domain. On this basis he offered his resignation from this task. He hoped that the new board would have more success in their future work.

12.4 Greece stated that they had distributed a document regarding the recognition of Greek Sign Language. The delegate outlined the background to this, including reference to the education of Deaf people. Greece thanked the EUD for their indirect influence on this matter.

12.5 Portugal stated that DUARTE has stepped down from his post in APS and that the delegate had replaced him.

12.6 Regarding the number of Sign Languages in the EU, LL asked that members forward details of the number of languages that exist/ co-exist in each member country to EUD bureau.

KS thanked FEVLADO for their support in hosting this GA. He thanked the members for their contributions over the past two days and over the past fifteen years. KS closed the meeting at 1.30pm.

* * *
* *

Minutes taken by: Lorraine LEESON, EUD Administrator

Signatures:

Knud SØNDERGAARD, EUD President

Helga STEVENS, EUD Director

AMENDMENTS MADE BY Knud SØNDERGAARD, Helga STEVENS and Lorraine LEESON

Last amended: 05.05.00
29.05.00
03.07.00
19.07.00
06.09.00
22.09.00

c/my doc/EUD 99-00/ Board Meeting/ GA 2000/Final minutes2

EUROPEAN UNION OF THE DEAF**EUD GENERAL ASSEMBLY 2000****MOTIONS FORM**

The Finnish Association of the Deaf (name of NAD)

would like to submit the following MOTION to the EUD secretariat to be presented to the EUD General Assembly convening on 13-14 April 2000 in Gent, Belgium.

MOTION proposed:

(Please use one form per motion. Copy this form as much as needed.)

EU has been very active in promoting the usage of new information technology and its applications within the EU. In connection with the above The Finnish Association of the Deaf would like to propose that EUD would start a project, similar to the Sign Language project: The Sign Language users in the Information Society within the EU region. In this project the EUD members, the national associations of the Deaf would also be active partners in their own countries.

Justification:

New technology can give almost limitless possibilities for the participation and interaction of the Sign Language users, if we are involved in the development process.

Important fields for participation, which should be utilised:

- Digital TV/second generation interactive TV-set (own production, interpreted programmes, captions)
- Sign Language teaching, culture, and information in the Internet
- Third generation cordless video-phone/Internet and relay services for the cordless video-phones

The production of information, transmission and interaction are in the process of moving from the ears to the eyes. We could give our input in this good development.

Signed by: (name of the President or Chair) _____


Markku Jokinen

Please e-mail or send this form to the EUD, Franklinstraat 110, 1000 BRUSSELS, Belgium, fax +32 2 735 53 54, e-mail: eudeaf@pophost.eunet.be, before or on 1 April 2000.

EUROPEAN UNION OF THE DEAF
EUD GENERAL ASSEMBLY 2000.

MOTIONS FORM

The: Spanish National Confederation of the Deaf

Would like to submit the following MOTION to the EUD secretariat to be presented to the EUD General Assembly convening on 13-14 April 200 in Gent, Belgium.

MOTION proposed:

(Please use one form per motion. Copy this form as much as needed.)

Introduction:

In Board Meetings or in General Assemblies of EUD, information, communication and knowledge access is not full because there is not Sign Language Interpreters of different national Sign Languages, and all members of EUD have to use International Sign, which do not allow to everybody to deep in some discussions and debates in some important issues. No doubt in regard to all Board Members of EUD are fluent neither International Signs nor English mouthing support to International Signs, which means that they can not receive all information with good quality. This means a treat of most-favoured countries (northern countries) giving them more power, to the detriment of southern countries

We think this motion is directed towards to get an improvement of EUD, because if we can deep more in all debates and discussions, knowledge quality will be better and in this way all countries could have more information and also get balanced and equality of opportunities between Northern and Southern countries.

Motion:

In all Board meetings or General Assemblies organised in EUD, could exist the possibility to get all information through National Sign Languages from different countries with National Sign Languages Interpreters paid by each country. Those countries which are not allow to paid these interpreters, could have the possibility to get information through International Signs Interpreters like until this moment, paid by EUD.

Signed by: (name of the President or Chair) Luis J. Cañón Reguera.

Please e-mail or sed this form to the EUD, Franklinstraat 110, 1000 BRUSSELS, Belgium, fax +32 2 735 53 54, e-mail: eudeaf@pophost.eunet.be, before or on 1 April 2000.