

26TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Date: 26/02/2016

Present: See book of attendance (request with AUCSA)

PM = Policy Manual

GA = General Assembly

AOB = Any Other Business (discussed at the end)

EC = Elections Commission

Welcome

Lance Bosch welcomes everyone to the 26th General Assembly and thanks everyone for coming. He reminds the people if they want to leave in the midst of the GA, they have to sign off with Petra Karlsen Stangvik.

Determining Agenda

Lance goes over and explains the sequential ordering for the agenda and asks if anyone has questions.

*Q1: Christina Maat asks if we can vote on TedX budget first, as she has to leave soon.

**A1: Lance replies saying it's for the GA to decide, so he raises the motion to discuss TedX's budget first when we get to the budgets.

Lance asks if the GA wants to vote on the motion, otherwise, it'll be passed automatically.

He also explains the proper abstentions rule - abstentions do not count as a 'no', which happened at the previous GA.

Christina Maat explains why she has to leave early, namely, that she has to help kids out. No one wants to vote on the motion so it's unanimously passed. TedX will go first.

Topics

1. Looking back, looking forward

As we go through a brief timeline of this last semester (See presentation slides for the

elaboration), Petra Karlsen Stangvik says Dormfest takes place on the 24th of June. Subsequently, we move towards the first topic of discussion: the Diversity Commission.

2. Introducing the Diversity Commission

Andy introduces the Diversity Commission. See presentation slides for the elaboration.

3. Proposed Change of Banks

Andy explains the AUCSA's struggles with the current bank Rabobank and how we've approached Triodos as a potential bank to shift to. See presentation slides for points of explanation. Andy also explains how more info can be found with himself, or via the Triodos website.

Q2: Josh van der Kroft asks during times when money isn't used, which goes to the savings, whether it wouldn't be nice to have an investment portfolio to put that money into, thus to have another bank account.

Q3: Josh asks whether this money doesn't go into the savings account.

Intermission: we first moved on the next topic (4 - General Info) before readdressing the change of banks. That is the reason why the next question is Q6, instead of Q4, and why the first question in topic 4 - General Info is Q4.

Lance asks if anyone wants to vote on the change of banks, if not, it'll be passed unanimously.

Q6: Tade Hogensteldt asks if there are any open costs for committees, and what will happen with open bills in terms of the change of banks.

Jasper Meijer says that if we change banks, the money from the Rabobank will transfer automatically to Triodos.

Q7: Josh van der Kroft asks if there any downsides to move from Rabobank to Triodos; will it take a lot of time and effort and is it worth it.

A7: Andy says we have thought about this, the reason we are changing is that there are more upsides, less running costs. The only downside is that Triodos doesn't offer proper English service, but that is also the same with Rabo

Q8: Josh follows up asking whether there are no other downsides than the lack of English proficiency on the side of Triodos (which was also the case with Rabobank)

A8: Andy adds that Triodos doesn't have a lot of stores, 'fillialen' in Dutch, so it's a little hard to meet with them, but more than doable.

Lance asks again if anyone wants to vote on the change of banks, if not, it'll be passed unanimously. No one wants to, so it's automatically passed.

(Now you can continue with topic 5 - Voting on the Policy Manual)

4. General info - Conduct and Budget GA Spirit, Rules of the GA

Lance explains another time how a Budget GA runs for those who've forgotten, or for those who are attending for the very first time. See presentation slides for more information. He also explains how we will use a randomised order for the committee budgets; he will pick any committee randomly from a bowl, instead of the usual alphabetical order.

Q4: Anouk Ide says that in the email we sent out we will vote altogether on the change of banks, and whether we still are going to do so.

A4: Lance agrees. To clarify, this was a communication error, but still a really good idea to do.

Q5: Tade Hogensteldt says he doesn't have the new excel sheet in his email.

A5: Lance explains, that we sent it three times per week throughout three weeks, but only to only individuals, not to the committees, so he suggests Tade to check his personal email.

He also explains the plurality count again, so that abstentions do count as abstentions, e.g. when there are five votes in favour, four votes against, and ten abstentions, the motion in question is passed. It does not count as a 'no vote' anymore, which happened at the last GA.

Intermission: Go back to Topic 3 - Change of Banks: "Lance asks if (...) be passed unanimously." before continuing.

5. Voting on the Policy Manual

Lance explains we have only altered spelling errors from the ones we've sent to the public. If someone has sent us a potential alteration, it hasn't been incorporated yet. He also explains how we will go about the voting procedure. If no one wants to vote, it'll be passed unanimously, if not, we will take a look at the sections which are important. He asks if someone has any questions or whether we can go straight to the voting procedure

Anouk Ide says something about article 19, and regrets some things have changed as they (the Audit Commission members) weren't notified about it. It says that the Audit Commission will collect a biannual inspection of the books, while they agreed on a quarterly audit, that's why she would like to raise the motion to adjust it to a quarterly inspection.

Lance asks if someone has questions.

Q9: Tade Hogensteldt asks why we've done so eventually: chosen to work with quarterly audits instead of bi-annual ones.

A9: Andy explains that it would be hard for the Treasurer to prepare the budget (which consists of many excel files) for Audit's quarter annual audit. The idea to have the Audit more involved stems from the time when he himself (Andy) was in the Commission. It'd be difficult to realise a quarterly Audit, if they keep a similar administration as at the moment and he doesn't want the quality of the books to suffer, just to allow for a quarterly audit.

Q10: Josh says that the Audit makes recommendations, and he was wondering if there could be a mechanism where the Audit has binding suggestions for the AUCSA, he feels that it could be the case that the recommendations of the Audit are not taken as serious as they should be.

A10: Andy Daab explains, the audit recommends and secures our budget, they do not decide on the budget, that is done by the members through AUCSA, so their binding advice would be a recommendation for 900 people.

Q11: Josh asks a follow up questions to have an overview of the recommendations for the AUCSA at Budget GA's.

A11: Andy Daab thinks we could include that. But he also mentions that usually the audit does so. Also the treasury publishes white papers this year, but e.g. the treasury could make a statement at the GA on how the suggestions of the Audit are being dealt with.

Josh says that would definitely help.

So finally, we will go to the original motion

Anouk elaborates on the motion that it's hard for the treasurer to each time complete the books of a certain period and hand it over to the Audit, but that it's important for the Audit to regularly check the books.

Q12: Job Zegers says that in theory it's handy to have a quarterly audit, the more the better, but wonders why the Audit and the Treasurer want to have more checks of the books in terms of actual experience.

A12: Andy explains the reason we came up with the idea, was to include the audit more into the financial structure, but that idea was before we had the Vice Treasury, which proved to be a very useful part too.

Q13: Job elaborates saying he'd like to propose an alternative motion, as it might be difficult

to quarterly check the books, regarding the task that lies on the Treasurer to collect the books every three months. He proposes to have the option to have a quarterly check requested upon the Audit and the Treasurer.

A13: Anouk thinks this is agreeable, but in the original thing we wanted the audit to always have access to the financial books...(interrupted by lance because it concerns different article) Anouk says that one of the reasons for a quarterly audit is be that the budget is growing, so by doing it more often, we notice mistakes earlier/easier. Also it is important to do an audit before June, because a lot of big events are being held in June. If not, the Audit would have to do a huge check around September, which is already too late. By including it in the PM it will force the Audit to do these quarterly audits and then they will actually do it. If we don't add this, this might slip.

Anouk wants to incorporate the fact that the Audit should have permanent access to the books in the Policy Manual, as was agreed upon during the last Treasury meeting. Lance asks if we should first check the original motion before going into Anouk Ide's second motion. He thinks we've summed up all the arguments, and asks if there are any other remarks. The motion considers Article 19.4, to change it to the Audit's quarterly check.

Q14: Andy asks if we can incorporate Job's alternative motion.

A14: Lance says we will first take a look at the Audit's motion before going into Job's.

As follows from the voting, Anouk's motion to change Article 19.4 to the Audit's quarterly check instead of the bi-annual check, it's passed.

Q15: Maarten Albers says that some of the Advisory Council's comments haven't been incorporated into the PM

A15: Lance Bosch explains, that every change from the PM discussion with the Advisory Council has been included; everything after – including the Advisory Council changes sent per email - has not been included yet.

He would like to address 18.4, saying that TedX and AUCafé have their own bank account, and would like to propose the motion to alter the wording to allow the way things are going now, as the PM wouldn't allow for it at this point.

Q16: Dasha Ivanenko would like to have the specific definition for large and complex committees.

A16: Lance Bosch thinks the terms 'large and complex' are fine, but we can add "the discretion of the AUCSA board", so the current board can judge whether it's appropriate to define a committee as 'large and complex'.

Q17: Andy asks if Maarten could elaborate on his motion, as the treasury has issues with larger budgets based on sponsorships, and is not sure how feasible it'd be for those committees.

A17: Maarten says that Andy has misunderstood him a bit, he's not trying to change what the AUCSA is doing right now, just to alter the wording, so it allows what the AUCSA is doing right now. Because at the moment the PM does not state that it is allowed what the AUCSA is doing.

Q18: Daria asks if we can add something to financial freedom, to define it more clearly.

A18: Lance Bosch wants to make the alteration, that size and the freedom are both at the discretion of the AUCSA board.

Lance follows up changing the wording and asks if Maarten agrees. Maarten does.

No one wants to vote, so the motion's been unanimously passed.

Anouk Ide proposes a motion about article 19.8, that the letter of recommendation is sent out every time before a GA, but that that is not possible anymore, as we do not have four GA's a year, so she'd like to propose the motion to have the letter of recommendation twice a year instead of four.

Q19: Job Zegers wants to know whether there is going to be any form of communication between the Audit and the AUCSA members if there isn't going to be a GA, if there will not be four letters of recommendations.

A19: Anouk explains how they tackle a lack of transparency now. They have a lot of communication with the treasurer about short term practical issues; for long-term issues they have the letter of recommendations, but that those are specifically for those long term recommendations, so hard to write every three months.

Lance also elaborates that the PM is rather flexible, and that even though the Audit is obligated to send two letters of recommendation (if Anouk's motion is passed), they can still send one after every audit.

Job Zegers thinks it's better to have it set in stone to have a small report after every audit, to increase the transparency.

Anouk adds that the Audit will also provide a letter of recommendation before every GA, and after GA inform the members of the financial health of each audit of the AUCSA. So the eventual motion: The audit commission will provide the AUCSA board with a letter of recommendation to advise the members. On top that, after each Audit, they will inform the members of the financial health overall.

Lance moves on to the voting procedure. No one wants to vote, so it's also unanimously passed.

Q20: Tade asks a follow up question about Maarten's motion, he thinks that the ability for committees to have such freedom in finances is good to have, but not to have a separate bank account just for the sake of being a larger committee, and asks whether we will have solid criteria for such separate accounts - also in terms of the definition of larger committees.

Andy adds that everyone can approach the AUCSA if they have any comments.

A20: Lance Bosch explains, that some articles are intentionally vague, so the AUCSA board can make calls. So in this case the current board will take their financial realities in account and therefore will judge whether financial freedom applies to a committee.

Q21: Sofija Stefanovic would like to ask about the regular updates from the Elections Commission, and would like to see that in the Policy Manual too, as many only see the Elections Commission for the first time at the Elections GA, so she'd like to see more regular updates. She's not sure whether we have thought it through.

A21: Andy Daab will write something out and read it to the GA in a second (this has eventually become article 20.12)

Q22: Sofija asks another question about 20.8, which says the AUCSA needs one Dutch person, one International, and one male and one female, and she says that it sounds strange so she would like an elaboration on this wording.

A22: Andy Daab explains, this is because of statistics. With affirmative actions we run the danger of a transgender, being in a position where he is elected because of this attribute and not his/her qualities.

Sofija follows up that she would like a different wording.

Lance says we can also make it an AOB.

Q23: Maarten says relating to this, why we have such desirability for such quota, as they thought of thinking of scrapping these quota and asks why we have them now.

A23: Andy is referring to the statistics again. One would run the risk of 50% of the student body not being represented if these quota aren't included.

Lance elaborates saying we will address this article as an AOB, so people can think of the concrete wording.

Q24: Anouk asks how we will vote on the PM as a whole now, after all these motions.

A24: Lance Bosch says we first vote on everything besides the AOBs and then vote on the whole PM later.

Andy wants to propose the following wording for article 20.12 apropos Q21 from Sofija; that the Elections Commission will provide proper visibility throughout the procedure of the elections.

Q25: Job Zegers has been on the Elections Commission and feels that from his experience, since the EC is supposed to make an objective decision on which candidates to propose at the Elections GA, he feels that it's good to promote the visibility of this body, but not to make it mandatory, as it's not required for them to do so, but more nice for the members to have so. He still thinks there are some issues for the EC, that due to the nature of the body, the visibility shouldn't be required.

Josh van der Kroft has a comment about the EC, saying that last year he noticed when they made their findings, that the Commission kept praise for all the candidates that had been chosen, while totally disregarding the merits of the other candidates. He thinks that in the future, this should be considered.

A25: Lance wants to clarify Sofija's point: the actual EC is forced to update the student body about their findings. What we are actually discussing: the EC make updates about their progress before the Elections GA. In the past people at the GA were confused because the EC only highlighted the recommended people, which will less emphasised next time i.e. if this motion is passed.

He also wants to round up the discussion, as he feels this is another topic, but what he thinks is good to notice is that the AUCSA 16'-17' will alter the elections in general as well, and will definitely take this into account.

We will vote on the motion proposed by Sofija in Q21, worded by Andy; that the Elections Commission will provide proper visibility throughout the procedure of the elections. By the power of the GA, it has been passed.

Q26: Job Zegers wants to address the article 4.3 about voting procedure at GA's, it has been changed that you now need a amount of yes-voters, and no-voters, and ask if this isn't a problem.

A26: Lance says the PM provides the AUCSA with an official rule how to run the GA.

Q27: Job Zegers asks where this rule comes from.

A27: Lance explains that prior to this rule the wording was intentionally vague, so that AUCSA Boards had freedom apropos voting procedures at GA's, but as the current AUCSA already used the plurality rule throughout the year, they wanted to make this procedure official.

Lance asks the GA if we can move forward to vote on the PM as a whole, aside from the two AOB's that are both about the wording of the articles.

Q28: Anouk Ide asks that article 4.3.c states that the vote will be passed by a 2/3 majority at all times, excluding the people that have left in the meantime and asks why.

A28: Andy explains, that if people leave, their vote will no longer be counted as part of the absolute, total count. It has always been 2/3 majority, and the Board of 2009, who formed the first Policy Manual must have had a good reason for this.

Once again, we move on to the voting procedure for the PM as a whole. No one wants to vote, so it's unanimously passed by the power of the GA.

6. Introducing the Audit Commission

Presentation of the Audit Report

Didi Altena introduces the Audit Commission and says how the recommendations have been taken very seriously, but found one major point in the books of the first semester. They advise the treasurer to overspend with an amount of 5%, but that the current AUCSA overspent 8%, however committees still underspent eventually, and to take into account we have the chance to spend the money we have, and that the committees should keep that in mind, that it's unhealthy to cancel events.

Shambavi Chouhan elaborates on the transparency and approachability of the AUCSA, saying that the finances have become more eco-friendly and accessible. She asks if anyone has any questions, and that they're approachable via their email.

Lance mentions the underspending, and encourages committees to spend the money they've budgeted for, so that we demonstrate we need the money we receive, otherwise, we will receive less in the coming years, as management will think we indeed need less.

Q29: Tade asks about the fact whether the issue is the lack of communication, if committees underspend, that the money goes back into the savings e.g. of the AUCSA, so that we automatically solve the problem.

A29: Lance reminds the GA that this is addressed by his statement. If Committees can't execute their events, they should come to us, because we can help or allow other committees to access these funds.

7. The AUCSA Budget

Job says that his motions took more time than he thought, and would like to propose the motion to move TedX even further up, so that we first discuss TedX before the rest. The motion has been unanimously passed as no one wants to vote.

For elaboration on budgets, see the presentation slides, as well as the financial Administration of your AUCSA excel sheet, which has been sent out in several emails apropos the 26th General Assembly.

TedX: The budget has been unanimously passed as no one wants to vote.

AUCSA Events: Q30: Josh van der Kroft goes back to the fact what happens if we don't spend all the money we have budgeted for, if it wouldn't be an option to put the leftover money in the scholarship fund.

A30: Andy explains the ASF. As it is an AUC project, we could do so. The issue we currently have, is that the Introweekend location has to be paid by our budget too, but it is technically part of next year's budget. Therefore it would be better to keep a little leftover budget, so the next board can start on healthier terms.

Lance follows up on what Andy was saying, if we spend the money on ASF, the management might decrease the amount of fundings for the coming years of AUCSA.

The budget has been unanimously passed as no one wants to vote.

AUCSA Other: Q31: Sezgi Iyibilir asks about the decrease of income as the expenditures were less high than we thought, how that came to be.

A31: Andy says Stefanie used an expectations calculator, but the actual number of enrolled students was lower than expected.

Lance adds to this that management gave us a prediction number that was slightly higher than the actual amount as well.

Q32: Josh van der Kroft asks if there's a way in the future to avoid the confusion with the management.

A32: Andy wishes there was, but that would depend on AUC and their discretion to work with us. We will bring it to discussion with the management.

Lance suggests another solution: We could ask for a minimum expected income. The result would be that we have probably more money than we expect.

Q33: Job Zegers asks whether the server for the website has become free.

A33: Andy says we are still paying for that, but the cost that was scratched was for committee servers (see 2c010), which are not needed.

Q34: Job also asks what kind of flashlight costs EU 400.

A34: Lance says we need to buy a flash for the camera we already have, which sadly is quite expensive. The reason for this is because we don't want to spend money on renting a flashlight for many events in the future.

Q35: Angela Chaloska asks about why we first voted on the Policy Manual and then vote on the budgets.

A35: Andy explains why we didn't want to vote on the PM at the end: Because many people leave, it reduces the number of actual students voting on the PM.

Q36: Sofija knows about the donations to the Solidarity Fund, and asks if we could donate more to the SF. There's no external source of money for this, and explains how the SF works - namely a safety net for those AUC students in financial trouble. She feels that this is a crucial aspect at AUC, and while AUCSA already donated EU 500, she asks if more money could be donated.

A36: Andy asks if she would like to raise a motion with a specific amount of money. Lance says that we can now vote on the AUCSA Other, and when Sofija has come up with a specific number, we can vote for her motion.

Maarten Albers says that we can tie in underspending to the donating to the Solidarity Fund. Lance says this ties in what he said before, namely that if we spend money on donating, the management might decrease the overall amount AUCSA receives at the beginning of the year.

Sofija says that this has nothing to do with ASF, but a safety net just for the students, and that the money comes from voluntarily donators, such as parents of students, teachers, etc.

We move on to the voting on the AUCSA Other. The budget has been unanimously passed as no one wants to vote.

AUCSA Merchandise: Q38: Job Zegers asks about how the costs work in the Excel Sheet.

A38: Andy explains that most of the orders have been made before the first Budget GA.

Lance explains how the second column is the real expenditure.

Q39: Job asks a follow up question whether we expected more income from the sweaters than the actual one.

A39: Lance says it's because of the discount, which we gave to the incoming first years to foster AUC spirit amongst them.

Q40: Tade asks the same question about the sweaters, why they do not sell all that well.

A40: Ilen says that the biggest loss had to do with Intro Weekend - where we provided the

first years with an enormous discount - this also ties in with our First Year Pillarless than the actual costs of the sweaters.

The overall budget has been unanimously passed as no one wants to vote

Sofija raises the motion for the Solidarity Fund and asks for EU 250 extra from the AUCSA Other budget. Andy asks if anyone would like to vote on the motion. It has been unanimously passed as no one wants to vote

8. Committee Budgets

For elaboration on budgets, see the presentation slides, as well as the financial Administration of your AUCSA excel sheet, which has been sent out in several emails apropos the 26th General Assembly.

See above (in AUCSA Budget section): *TedX*: The budget has been unanimously passed as no one wants to vote.

Spoon: The budget has been unanimously passed as no one wants to vote.

AUCafé: The budget has been unanimously passed as no one wants to vote.

PlayUC: The budget has been unanimously passed as no one wants to vote.

Pangea: The budget has been unanimously passed as no one wants to vote.

IdeUC: The budget has been unanimously passed as no one wants to vote.

Acquisitions: Ilen says that we're happy to announce we've gathered EU 400 from Maslow. The budget has been unanimously passed as no one wants to vote.

Sharood: The budget has been unanimously passed as no one wants to vote.

Scriptus: Q42: Josh asks what the cost would be for the two issues to be published.

A42: Laura Galante explains that currently Scriptus published the third edition of the year, and they will have two more by the end of June.

Lance adds that Scriptus changed their plan to only have six issues, because they were not able to acquire sponsorship money. In terms of time, and problems, Scriptus would like to not publish any other issues beyond this.

Lance repeats what Laura has said and elaborates that these are issues 5 and 6, so they want to have only 6 issues instead of 8. Laura says that in terms of time management they stick to their plan of 6 issues. Lance says that Eu 600 has been removed.

Q43: Tade asks about the financial difference between the black & white and the colour edition, and why they want to have one colour edition.

A43: Laura says the colour edition is a special edition. Colour issue costs 478, opposed to 321 for B&W one.

Laura also has a motion, as they haven't spent the EU 50 for transition costs, to move it to the next edition. Andy adds that we're not allowed to move that EU 50 as that's stated in the contract. Laura adjusts the motion to have an extra EU 50 for the next edition. The motion has been unanimously passed as no one wants to vote.

The budget overall has also been unanimously passed as no one wants to vote.

Art: Q44: Dasha Ivanenko asks about the documents for the Scopophilia, as the income stated in the documents were way lower than the actual income.

A44: Andy explains the income has been adjusted with the money from the PIN machines, to 720, at latest record.

Daria also wants to make the motion to have EU 300 extra for unforeseen costs for Scopophilia.

Q45: Lance asks if she could elaborate.

A45: Dasha says the planning is rather hard, and they cannot always foresee the expenditures, and that it is not certain it will be sent but just in case.

Q46: Anouk Ide was wondering about the EU 500 extra they received at the last Budget GA.

A46: Dasha highlights it is for the next Scopophilia, so different from the motion at the last GA.

Q47: Jacob van der Ham asks if this will be for the future Scopophilia, or also for the compensating of the last Scopophilia.

A47: Dasha wants to adjust the motion to have EU 100 for Location personnel, EU 100 for working costs, and EU 100 for Renting.

Q 48: Anouk Ide asks what the amount is of unforeseen costs in the AUCSA budget.

A48: Andy says we have 1565 EU left.

Q49: Jasmijn de Zeeuw was wondering how it's possible that this motion is only raised now and not sent in beforehand for consideration of the AUCSA as with all other committees.

A49: Dasha explains that the Scopophilia team had a meeting with the AUCSA, and there were advised to raise a motion.

Andy explains committees everyone is still allowed to raise motions after these initial changes, so Art board took more time to elaborate on their motion.

Q50: Tade wants to have an extra elaboration on the side of Scopophilia to receive the extra EU 300. He wants a clarification for the extra EU300 and why they didn't ask for the concrete amounts in the first place, but for a vague EU 300 for unforeseen costs.

A50: Lance thinks this is more a structural comment instead of important

Dasha says she also feels bad for potential over-budgeting, but Scopophilia is hard to plan from scratch. At the time of the event Scopophila has a better idea of the actual money they need, but they'd rather budget for unforeseen costs now than for in the future.

Lance moves to the voting of this motion. There are some who wants to vote on this motion. By the power of the GA, the motion has been passed.

Lance says that before we commence with the voting procedure, the issue of underspending does not get solved by throwing money around, it isn't the issue that we spend all the money from the savings, but that we should spend the money we have budgeted for. He thinks that should be kept in mind while discussing the next budgets.

The budget has been unanimously passed as no one wants to vote.

Cut: Klaudia Godot mentions the fact a new event they are organising bi-weekly, and to raise the motion to have EU 90 extra for all events in total.

Andy says that they haven't spent the money for equipment yet.

Dasha explains that they will soon spend that money, it's been figured out already.

Q52: Lance asks how they will spend the money per session and what the title of the event will be.

A52: Dasha states they are Script Writing (creative writing) workshops and the idea is EU 10 per session.

Q53: Job Zegers asks how many people they expect at the events.

A53: Claudie Gadot says there is an interest of 15-20 people, interest is increased every time + they received FB PMs requesting such events.

No one wants to vote on the motion so it's unanimously passed and therefore the whole budget.

Zen: The budget has been unanimously passed as no one wants to vote.

Cuisine: The budget has been unanimously passed as no one wants to vote.

Dormfest: Andy explains that AUCSA has just received the specific costs of the budget, thus that it wasn't in the financial administration the AUCSA sent out to everyone. It has been altered a bit as they last year under-budgeted and Petra wants to elaborate on that: They finally spent EU 9000 last year instead of the budgeted 7000, so that's why they budget for 1000 EU more.

Q54: Josh van der Kroft asks if the people have access to the specific budget.

A54: Andy/Lance explain this is the case because the Dormfest budget has been submitted this morning

Jacob: We estimated the costs using the budget from last year to present where the money is going more or less - so this budget is still flexible.

Job Zegers raises the motion if we can put the excel sheet on the screen so everyone can take a look at it during the break. No one wants to vote on the motion so it's unanimously passed - so Dormfest's excel sheet will be put on the screen during the break.

OnStage: The budget has been unanimously passed as no one wants to vote.

9. Break - TedX Tickets Raffle

There are 80 people present and the raffle for TedX commences.

The first winner is Ana Chaloska.

The second winner is Josefine de Potter

The third winner is Berend Jansen

The fourth and last winner is Daria Ivanenko.

10. Committee Budgets Continued

To continue on *Dormfest's* budget: Q55: Tade asks if we can remove the EU10 budgeted for the flash, as there's one in the inventory of Art.

Lance elaborates that this excel sheet is an estimation of where the budget will go to, not a final sheet; he says we are voting on their overall budget.

Q56: Eden Benat asks for the money that goes to permits and why we would need that.

A56: Jacob van der Ham explains it will go to municipality permits for the allowance of loud music in the dorms.

Q57: Eden also asks why money goes to toilets as everyone has toilets in the dorms.

A57: Petra Stangvik explains Dormfest is open for everyone, of whom not everyone has toilets available.

The budget has been unanimously passed as no one wants to vote.

Solace: Andy explains the budget has recently been adjusted and not updated on the presentation slides.

Q58: Josh van der Kroft asks about the change of budget and whether we can see the actual updated budget on the screen. He would like to know more about the attendance of the past parties.

A58: Andy answers saying Cupidisco has not been evaluated yet, but at the Halloween party, Solace sold 437 tickets, which is more than last year.

The budget has been unanimously passed as no one wants to vote.

AIMUN: The budget has been unanimously passed as no one wants to vote.

Q59: Ana Chaloska asks if the reallocation that they sent in has been incorporated as well.

Ana simultaneously raises the motion for an extra of EU 500 to cover all the costs of the AUCMUN, to revive the conference at AUC and commence a potential nice tradition at AUC.

A59: Andy clarifies that they already have EU 500 from AUCSA, and asks how much money they need on top of that. AIMUN would like to have an extra EU 500 on top of that first EU 500.

Q60: Maarten asks why this wasn't budgeted for in the first place.

A60: Ana Chaloska elaborates: the conference last year was not part of AIMUN. This year they weren't sure they were going to organise one. The additional money from AUC will lower admission fees for the delegates, therefore attracting more delegates.

Lance elaborates saying the participation fee would be lower, so that more people can join, as the last time that was a problem, not many people showed up.

Q 61: Job asks how much the previous participation fee was, and how much they want to make it now.

A61: Ana explains there was a way smaller conference last year, so it's not really comparable. (40 delegates rather than 100)

The Fee is going to be 20, last year 15. But we want to increase the quality of the conference,

e.g. by arranging guest speakers, which they didn't have last year.

Q 62: Job asks a follow up question that if they do not get the money, whether they will increase the participation fee.

A62: Ana replies saying they will.

Q 63: Tade Hogensteldt asks where exactly the money will be spent on, what will happen during the AUCMUN.

A63: Ana explains where the budget goes to: Logistics needs most of the money, this pays for the building for example. They have to pay for eight additional opening hours, starting at 9:00 AM, because on the weekend the AB opens later.

Lance sums up and says that the EU 500 will cover the renting of the building.

Q 64: Tade says that the EU 20 for participants is rather low, and that it is a fair price, as food and activities are both included and why they think it should be lower than that.

A64: Ana first of all mentions they are aiming to have the fee as low as possible. It's a first time conference, people haven't been part of it yet and they practically have a low reputation. Lowering the fee will attract more delegates.

Lance asks if anyone wants to vote on this motion. Someone wants to so we proceed to voting procedure.

By the power of the GA, the motion has been passed.

The budget has been unanimously passed.

Curiosity: The budget has been unanimously passed as no one wants to vote.

Yearbook: The budget has been unanimously passed as no one wants to vote.

PubQuiz: The budget has been unanimously passed as no one wants to vote.

Debating:

Q65: Gerold asks how they generated their income whilst not being around that long.

A65: Jaime Lopez explain that income comes from the bake sale which they had one time last semester.

The budget has been unanimously passed as no one wants to vote.

HandsOn: The budget has been unanimously passed as no one wants to vote.

Dormsessions:

Q66: Josh asks about a gage and why it is EU 90.

A66: Tessa Verhees explains that gage is the money given to the artists.

.

Q67: Tessa Verhees asks about the difference in the excel sheets apropos total income and expenditures.

A67: Andy says he got this budget yesterday. He forgot to cancel one of the events. The real expenditure is 4660 (net 2905).

With the adjustments in mind, Lance asks if anyone has any questions. No one does.

The budget has been unanimously passed as no one wants to vote.

Catch:

Q68: Jacob says that his budget altogether is different from the current excel sheets on the screen and asks if that could be altered now.

A68: Lance asks if he can provide us with the concrete amounts and writes down the correct numbers, however, it doesn't alter the totals, and asks if anyone has other questions. He explains that we can clarify later on in private with Catch if needed. - AUCSA and Catch.

The budget has been unanimously passed as no one wants to vote.

Jeugdlab: The budget has been unanimously passed as no one wants to vote.

WebRadio: Eden Benat and Gerold would like to raise the motion for an extra EU 250 to pay future dj's and an extra EU 10 for an upcoming event - dj workshop. Andy explains that the former motion has already been approved and incorporated and as no one wants to vote on the latter, it's also unanimously passed.

The budget has also been unanimously passed as no one wants to vote.

Junket: Erik van Halewijn raises a motion to ask an extra for EU 112 for an ice skating event which they'll use as a nice gesture they would like to have for discounted tickets for R2E students.

Q 69: Job Zegers asks about how many.

A 69: Erik answers saying forty.

The motion has been unanimously passed as no one wants to vote, as well as the budget.

11. Total AUCSA Budget

By the power of the GA the total budget has been passed.

12. AOB (Any Other Business)

Job's comment on 4.3.d - Anouk's Q28 - 4.3.c:

“Job Zegers wants to address the article 4.3 about voting procedure at GA’s, as it has been changed to the 2/3 majority at all times and ask if this isn’t a problem.

(...)

Q28: Anouk Ide asks a follow up question that ties in with Job Zegers’ comment about article 4.3.c that states that the voting procedure at GA’s needs a 2/3 majority at all times, excluding the people that have left in the meantime. Why this is exactly happening?”

Job Zegers elaborates on the wording of the article, as it doesn’t seem very clear when a motion is passed or not. Lance wants to propose a new word choice: (see PM).

Lance elaborates saying that they will vote on the first motion, namely the wording of article 4.3.c - from a “majority” to a “plurality”. The motion is unanimously passed as no one wants to vote.

The second motion for word choice to clarify the usage of abstentions. Maarten says that as he understands now that the abstentions count within the total amount of votes. Gordon says that abstentions reduce the total amount of votes. Jobs says we shouldn’t use the GA as a platform to think about the exact phrasing of the article, as everyone agrees on what it should mean.

Tade asks if we could repeat the intention of the article. Lance proposes the motion to send out the adjusted article.

Josh asks that with the usage of plurality we don’t necessarily have to change this part apropos abstentions of the article, as abstentions then naturally don’t count within the total amount of votes.

That motion has been unanimously passed.

Sofija's Q22 — “Sofija asks another question about 20.8, which says the AUCSA needs one Dutch person, one International, and one male and one female, and she says that it sounds strange so she would like an elaboration on this wording.

She follows up that she would like a different wording”

Sofija elaborates saying that it’d be more appropriate to encourage to the issue of representative members of the community within the AUCSA. The wording as it is now, seems weird to her. Lance asks if she wants to alter the current one, or to add another article. Maarten agrees with Sofija but says that this might encourage nepotism as well, as the Board in question only encourages people based on the quota of article 20.8

Tade Hogensteldt wants to propose a motion to erase the gender part - “one male and one

female”.

Job Zegers says he agrees but that there was reasoning behind the quota of one male and one female, we should consider a middle ground, e.g. changing it into that there should be two people who identify as different genders within the AUCSA Board.

Lance says that the PM remains flexible and doesn't represent set and stone quota for the AUCSA. Andy says that there are two motions currently:

1. Scratch the latter part considering gender in article 20.8
2. To further stretch the second part of having one male and one female

Q70 : Josh asks whether we've ever not fulfilled the requirements

A70: Lance says as far as he can remember, there has never been a purely male/female board, same for Dutch/international.

Q 71: Josh asks what would happen if an AUCSA is selected without the requirements of those quota

A71: Maarten says that this is about the board that the EC proposes, not the eventual Board.

The first motion is unanimously passed as no one wants to vote.

The second motion needs a formal voting procedure. However, it's also passed by the power of the GA.

Sofija wants to have another article to set in stone that the EC encourages a diversity within representatives in the AUCSA

Tjalie Schreur says that while she hasn't experienced elections yet, but that she thinks it should be based on experience rather than gender.

Tijs de S says that the easiest way out is to have two different genders in the proposed board.

Lance adds saying that we can also have a proposed board not consisting of solely one gender.

Maarten thinks that in contrast of society, he thinks that we shouldn't need gender requirements but indeed look more at the experience of the candidates.

Lance thinks we have established all arguments and wants to move on to a motion.

Petra wants to add that it's important to keep in mind the goal of the Policy Manual and that it doesn't encourage people to run for the AUCSA, as that's more a task for the EC and the current AUCSA.

Job wants to clear out a misconception, namely the procedures of the EC, and the usage of 'encourage the EC to...' and says that from his experience in the EC they were very aware of the diversity that needed representation, and thinks it's pointless to put such terms in the Policy Manual that is about rules rather than the encouraging of certain commissions.

Andy wants to get back to the motion; that the board isn't comprised by solely one gender.

Q72: Artemi Kortynev asks if this wording doesn't exclude non-Dutch speaking from Dutch

nature.

A72: Lance explains that this comes from a practical level, as the AUCSA needs one Dutch speaker due to the contact with many Dutch external affairs.

The motions has been passed by the power of the GA.

Josh van der Kroft says that in the past he's noticed that most of the GA's happen after classes, where the building often closes. He'd like to raise the motion to separate the GA's of this length either in two, or during weekends, like this one.

Lance thinks this is not a motion to be put in the PM, but that this can definitely be part of the transition of the current AUCSA with the next Board.

Tim Moolhuijsen proposes to put it in the transition manual.

Job Zegers wants to compliment the current AUCSA about taking action with the changing of the Policy Manual.

13. Closing

Lance thanks the last attendants for having stayed throughout the entirety of the 26th General Assembly and closes the session.