

## Convenor Report Amsterdam EUDC 2010

This is the final report from the Amsterdam EUDC 2010 Organisation Committee. This report covers all issues pertaining to Council specifically or that may be of interest to Council Members. It discusses a number of issues in detail without going into a number of issues that may be more relevant to future hosts as this is not a full evaluation of the tournament and all of the organisational issues involved. We have set up a more detailed document with evaluations and lessons learned from organising Amsterdam Euros which will become available to whomsoever asks for it by September 2011. The document should also become available on the Euros Council website and will become available at [info@debatbond.nl](mailto:info@debatbond.nl) (The Dutch Debate Association).

Since most of the things we raise here concern either difficult decisions, or procedures that might be contentious, it does not provide a full picture of the tournament, but mostly of the problems. Overall, however, we have been satisfied with how the tournament ran and we hope that sentiment was shared by all who were present. We would like to thank the European debating community one more time for granting us the opportunity to host Amsterdam Euros. We believe it has greatly helped the development of debating in the Netherlands at university and schools level. The greater number of Dutch teams present in Galway is a testimony of that feat. It was also an invaluable experience for all of us involved.

If any questions arise from the comments in this report, please direct them to Anne Valkering [anne.valkering@gmail.com](mailto:anne.valkering@gmail.com), who will be present in Council at Galway EUDC 2011 to present the final report of Amsterdam Euros.

### ***Registration***

We proposed a different registration due to the fact that we felt the old “first-come-first-serve” was an unfair system purely based on luck. Given that being put on the waiting list may mean not being able to come, we felt that another selection criterion was necessary. Other systems will still have to have some form of a selection criterion for whether a team is able to attend or is put on the waiting list.

Any selection criteria beyond luck, or first-come-first-serve, will therefore need a lot of time, careful scrutiny and debate before it should be accepted. We therefore stuck to the old procedure of registration, with a set opening date and time and a lot of registrations in the first minute. We think a few teams did miss out because they thought that place 34 (or higher) on the waiting list probably wouldn't get them in, or because they would not be able to apply for funding with that position on the waiting list, something we would have tried to prevent with our system. One partial solution we recommend is that invitation letters are distributed to teams on the waiting list who need them for funding applications (with a clear statement that no rights could be taken from that). We stated our intent to do so in one email and on our website but probably were not sufficiently clear or repetitive as we received no request for said letters. We should realise that especially if interest is going to increase more in the future (which it probably will) we may very well have to start refusing people to

participate, unless we want to make Euros grow to a size comparable to Worlds. Given that, we do believe a new selection process may be necessary.

We allowed fourth teams in, but only under very specific conditions, on the basis of their institutions providing a large number of high quality judges. This guideline was set up in 2009 by the CA team based on the presumption that institutions sending a fourth team would benefit greatly from that (a fourth team usually being a first-years team), while the rest of the debating circuit would not, or only marginally benefit from the same extra team. The criteria were not published but the CA team sent them to institutions they expected could qualify. Only Oxford made use of the offer, their fourth team was allowed entry when the waiting list was empty.

We had publicised our intention to allow entry to non-European teams once our waiting list was empty from the start. This was, however, not clear enough to prevent a bit of an outcry when we allowed an Australian team to participate over other fourth teams. We should have been clearer about the reasons for our decision, but we hope our statement through Facebook was sufficient explanation.

Our decision to not take in fourth teams from other institutions was solely based on two reasons: we felt that it would be unfair to now allow other institutions the same benefits without incurring the same costs, and the fact that this became feasible only at a very late date (five weeks before the competition) when we were finalising our registration documents, room assignments, catering deals, finances, etc. Adding new teams at this stage would have meant a whole lot of extra work, without a guarantee that we would have been able to cater for all of their needs and wishes.

We promoted registration through the BD and EUDC mailing lists, through Council members and all participants at Newcastle Euros. In addition, we sent out an email about the Championships to a list of 250 universities in Europe of which we knew they did not have a debating society. The latter probably did not produce any results (apart from the invitation being posted on websites in Innsbruck, Copenhagen and Sevilla), but we hope it does have results in the future and we will send the list on to future hosts. We have also compiled a list of all institutions that have participated in Euros since 1999, which should provide information for eligibility in the future and have passed on that list to the presidency and the next host.

We designed our own registration system because the system used at previous tournaments cost money, while also not being exactly what we needed – for example, in Koç, the way the language survey was set up meant that anyone not answering any question besides: “Do you want to apply for ESL/EFL status?” would automatically qualify for EFL status as all answers would turn out on the lowest level of language contact. We decided this was money and trouble worth saving. The form was designed to be as simple as possible, so that everyone could fill it in quickly in the first period (for which we published the questions in advance). We tried to keep it as simple as possible for the second form as well. It was harder to design the second form to be functional as well as user-friendly, and it probably needs redesigning. We focused on security and stability though, and this provided few problems. We had one login for all participants from one institution, as we figured it would be better if we grant some form of control to delegation leaders over the rest of the team and it meant that we would have several contacts in case people failed to fill out their information. The negative

side-effect that others can see what people fill in seemed minor considering they would be people from the same institution who presumably know about such things already.

Registration opened on the 1<sup>st</sup> of March and closed on the 8<sup>th</sup>. 256 teams registered within the registration period, another 9 registered after – of those 9 only Team Australia actually participated. In the end, 192 teams were on the tab, 190 teams should be assumed to have participated in full for the whole tournament and only one of these 192 were a permanent dummy team. A total of 19 teams cancelled after paying the prepayment of 50 Euros per person, these were the real culprits for claiming spots that others could have taken.

We have been generous with extensions as long as people communicated with us about it. Those institutions that needed long extensions were asked to sign a document stating that they would be required to pay the prepayment if they would cancel spots even if they would not attend. We have had to request such payment from only two institutions. In addition, we had three teams that cancelled after making the full payment due to all sorts of nasty unforeseen circumstances. We cancelled teams when they did not reply or gave no reasons for not paying, which would mean we just could not expect them to pay.

Overall, we have been very strict on implementing the prepayment rule, without exception. We hope that this will make it easier for future hosts, as institutions should become less likely to claim spots (through the prepayment or signing a document) that they may not be able to fill. This does mean that we should not move back the date for registration too much. It takes time to find enough people willing to put time, effort and most importantly money in going to some other European country in the middle of summer to debate. Definitive replies usually do not come until two months before the tournament and moving the first payment date too far away from the tournament also means that more institutions will decide to pay up the prepayment, but not send teams, or may find out later that they did want to send teams. This may actually lead to more insecurity for hosts.

Payments were allowed through bank and PayPal: the Netherlands does not have much credit card traffic, so that would have been horribly expensive. The same goes for cheques: those would have been both expensive and tricky, as they have been outdated for over a decade in the Netherlands, where almost everything happens with debit cards and internet banking.

## ***Food***

We had a certain amount of trouble with the caterer at the Free University because communication with the caterer went through the Congress bureau and not directly. The last changes to our schedule and the last plans had not reached them yet by the time the tournament started, which resulted in a number of problems during the first day, with long lines, food available that went way over budget if you took the 3.50 challenge seriously. This was a particular problem because somehow the cashiers had been instructed not to charge participants for the extra costs, which resulted in some people taking breakfast stuff for up to 21 Euros (this included 5 Red Bull, crisps and ice cream for one person) without being billed for all the extras. Halfway through lunch that policy was finally changed. In addition, the second day we managed to have the cafeteria take away most of the items

that were too expensive, and prices were printed at more spots and hopefully were more visible. Overall, the first day cost us 1500 Euros more than expected.

Our location caterers for the most part prepared all dinners for our participants, but some special diets were prepared by two separate caterers (one for Kosher food, one for allergies – on Thursday, we ordered Halal pasta separately for those who wanted to eat Halal). Those meals were catered to each individual's needs. The decision to order separate meals for allergies was made by our main caterer, not by us or by the participants involved. We had contacted all people who ordered Kosher and Halal food and some of the people who had allergies before the tournament to inform them of their food arrangements.

In the end, only half of the specially prepared meals were picked up at any given day. In case of the allergies food, this was probably due to the fact that we had failed to contact all people for whom we had ordered separate meals. It is relatively hard to inform people individually once the tournament starts, so this is better done before the tournament, but we contacted only half of all those involved due to time-management problems. Luckily, people with serious allergies contacted us anyways, but some people with slightly less serious problems for whom we had prepared meals never picked them up.

In case of the Kosher food, however, this was not due to any miscommunication on our part, but on people choosing not to pick up the meals. Given that the meals in both cases were about double the price of a normal dinner, we incurred considerable costs from people asking for separate meals before the tournament and then not making use of that facility. We recommend that next hosts take more care than we did ensuring that people really want their individual meals, something we failed to do in the case of allergies. If this does not help, we recommend Council consider the possibility to allow hosts to request people who order specialty diets and then do not make use of that facility to pay for the extra costs incurred by the host.

## ***Hotels***

Amsterdam does not have large hotels and is actually short on hotel beds, or so a recent tourism board research proclaimed. This meant that we had to make use of two or more hotels. We were quite happy to find two hotels that were relatively close together and could fit approximately equal groups. The hotels were at walking distance from another although probably not many people walked it. Room assignment was done firstly on the basis of who arrives early or leaves later and has contacted us about this, we put those people in one hotel (the Blue Tower) as much as possible and filled up the remaining spaces in that hotel with other people from the same institutions. This was the only criteria in assigning people to the two hotels and we still had to separate some institutions, and move some early arrivals or people staying on to the Blue Square.

We had tried to make sure everyone arriving early was asked whether they wanted to make use of a night in the hotel at our discount rates. Some people never replied, others never filled in their arrival date, so we missed out on quite a few people who simply turned up in the hotel on Sunday. This would have been slightly problematic at any summer day in Amsterdam, but problems were

confounded by the occurrence of the first World Cup final with a Dutch team in it since 1978. The population of Amsterdam had nearly doubled for that night with people watching the final on one of the squares in the city and all hotel rooms were fully booked in the Square, whereas the Tower only had very few options available and was unwilling to rent our those rooms for discount rates. This meant that people who had not contacted us were forced to pay much more, or to sneak into other people's rooms.

Unfortunately, a couple of incidents showed that our contacts with the hotel reservations manager had not been communicated to the two hotels as thoroughly as we had expected, which meant that the hotel manager in one of the hotels was angered by our registration desk taking up about 10% of his hotel lobby and by all the people staying in the lobby. Interestingly enough, the other hotel managed to find beds for the people and their lobby was mostly empty during the whole day, so we believe this was to a large extent due to staff incompetence that our participants suffered for. One of the reception staff of the hotel verbally abused and physically assaulted two participants on Sunday. We managed to calm the situation down and moved the participants to the other hotel, because we felt it was the only way for them to enjoy the tournament after that occurred.

We had been told room parties were not allowed by the hotel staff and adopted a policy that any room producing party-like sounds audible in the corridors was breaking that rule. Those parties were broken up and/or asked to be quiet. This was usually no problem, but on one occasion, the breaking up of a party resulted in participants disturbing one of their neighbours for the rest of the night and the next morning. We apologised profusely to the lady in question (not a participant). No damages had resulted from the activity (apart from the costs of flowers for the victim). We did not take action against the participants in this case, because we had no explicit proof it was them or the people from that party but not the hosts of the party. In the future, however, we recommend hosts to make clear that if people at a room party cause trouble, the residents of that room are responsible. We did not do so explicitly and therefore decided not to take action.

## ***Logistics***

Our Org Comm consisted of 8 people who were involved with Euros since at least January 2010, and another 8 people who were responsible for a specific task during the tournament but usually started slightly later (or carried less responsibility). The Org Comm consisted of members from ASDV Bonaparte (Amsterdam), the Utrecht Debating Society, the Leiden Debating Union and Cicero (Tilburg). We had around 60 volunteers. This number was sufficient for the tasks at hand, but did mean that a lot of volunteers made incredibly long hours, at least 13 hours a day. Our volunteers were members of all Dutch debating societies, one third was from Bonaparte, about one third were from high school debating, many of whom were under 18, the rest were from other Dutch Debating societies, those mentioned above, and NSDV Trivium (Nijmegen), Erasmus Debating Society (Rotterdam) and GDS Kalliope (Groningen). Euros has enabled us to finally bridge the divide between high school debating (set up by one company and in a completely different format from all other debating in the Netherlands and from WSDC) and student debating. We hope this will mean that first year students with debating experience are more likely to continue debating in university than they have been in the past.

We had to decide in January that our budget did not allow for a six-day tournament (including arrivals day) and cut the tournament to five days (from the 12<sup>th</sup> until the 16<sup>th</sup> instead of the 11<sup>th</sup> until the 16<sup>th</sup>). We debated long and hard, and continuously on whether this would mean cutting the eight round that we thought was necessary to ensure the quality of the break. The final decision was made only a few weeks before the tournament. It was a hard decision because we knew it would be a heavy load of debating for the first day, with four open rounds and introductions, which would mean only few people would be able to enjoy the final debate or have enough energy to do anything else afterwards. The latter proved true, as only 100 people showed up at the social. Still, we felt that the quality of the debating side of the tournament was more important than the energy levels of our participants on one day. We are glad though that future hosts are willing, and most importantly, able to extend the tournament with a day, as we believe that would be better for everyone involved (including Org Comm not having to continuously rush people everywhere).

We had great pre-tournament communications with our bus company, Arriva. It became clear during the tournament, however, that the bus drivers were not always properly instructed, or had failed to read (or understand) their instructions properly. In addition, all of our busses for Tuesday evening (the day the Dutch football team was hailed for its almost-victory in the city centre) had been requisitioned by the municipality, which Arriva solved by organising a different set of busses. Overall, however, this meant that several bus drivers did not know which routes they had to drive, that busses did not always show up on time (and sometimes too early), and that we ended up paying some 3,500 Euros more than we had agreed to before the tournament (we talked this down from 4,700 Euros). The bus company was still the cheapest by a mile, if we had chosen more comfortable coaches, we would not have been able to get away with paying around 16,000 Euros for all of our transportation costs for five days, but would probably have spent around 35,000 Euros. This was a sufficient cut in costs for us to decide in favour of less comfortable (and more crowded) busses.

## ***PR***

Euros received a lot of media attention in the Netherlands, thanks to our own efforts at promotion, but also to a number of useful contacts of other debating organisations that we could employ. Four out of nine national newspapers (65% of the Dutch market) covered Euros, many with articles covering half or a quarter of a page. There was a two-minute report on the semi-finals on public television news. We sincerely hope that this will enable debating societies in the near future to reach out to more people, and be more effective in fundraising.

Most final rounds were broadcasted live through the internet, this was unfortunately not possible for the final. All of those videos are still available online at [Vimeo](#) except for one open and one ESL semifinal. During the tournament, the number of onlookers was between 150 and 350 for the preliminaries and around 400 to 500 for the quarters and semis. The number of views has by now risen into the thousands. Our [website](#) links to these and other videos as well as pictures of the tournament. The website received around 4000 unique hits per day during the tournament, which may be useful information for future fundraising efforts. It should be possible to get a higher number than that if more effort is put in internet reporting from the tournament. We had set up a cooperative effort with Achte Minute for that, but it would probably have been better for clarity's

sake if those reports had been present on our own site as well. The website will continue to be online for at least another year.

We did not spend a whole lot of money on PR, mostly because printing is incredibly cheap. Our promotion campaign took place primarily through posters, printed media and the Internet, for which we designed our own videos. We did not publish on television or radio much, mostly because that would have been very expensive, whereas returns would not have been very high. Instead, we chose as many ways to get free publicity as we possibly could, for example by getting ourselves on all sorts of (cultural) agendas and in newsletters of likeminded organisations.

## ***Money***

Almost all of our income besides registration fees has come from subsidies and grants. Only three funders, the Universiteit Leiden, DIV and the British Council had a commercial goal when they funded us. We provided DIV with a “debate mediator” and two speakers to entice their members into discussions at their annual fair (they are a company developing improvements in record keeping), the British Council promoted its IELTS tests to probably interested students, while the Universiteit Leiden promoted its masters programs. We found that we were too late to apply for most EU funds, as most of those have application procedures of over a year and deadlines only once or twice a year. We have created a document with funding deadlines which we have shared with the Council presidency and (potential) future hosts to save others from the same disappointment. The same holds true for companies, by the way! Most companies decide their budgets for the next year by September, so it would greatly benefit future hosts to know earlier whether they will organise the tournament or not.

The main lesson we have learned from fundraising is that it is necessary to present debating in many different ways to grant funds, companies and other organisations. Our subsidies came from a fund that promotes knowledge about the EU among the Dutch public (hence our Speaker at the final and the focus on the EU in the ICC debate), a fund that promotes knowledge about international affairs and inequalities (to which we assured that we would discuss such issues in our debate rounds), a fund that promoted democracy (to which we explained the importance of debating for democracy), a cultural fund (to which we mentioned the age-old history of rhetoric and its links with theatre), several funds that stimulate the development of youth through non-traditional education or stimulate their participation in society. Some companies surely want to hear about how great debaters are as potential employees, but a great many others want to know more direct benefits, or want to link themselves to a prestigious event, or to an event that somehow improves the world. Thus, it is probably useful to have flexible sponsor acquisition materials. As usual, knowing people who know people is actually the most useful way of getting funding. Unfortunately, Dutch debating is relatively young (Bonaparte was founded in 1999) and we do not have a massive alumni network yet, nor are our alumni in a position to determine to what projects their companies give money yet.

We received positive replies to our funding requests in three ‘waves’: one was in the months before Newcastle and the month after, so June to September 2009. This brought our total budget from sponsorship to around 30,000 Euros (out of the 85,000 Euros we needed). We received another set of positive answers in December and early January, which brought our total budget for sponsorship

up to around 55,000 Euros. At this point we had to decide that it was impossible to hold a six-day tournament: we would be paying much more than originally expected for food (as we could not cater it ourselves as originally planned), and we did not have enough sponsorship yet. We were preparing for a very sparse tournament, with no frills apart from the championships dinner, and probably no socials in a rented location apart from break night and the final party. Then we received another set of positive replies in April. The total became 107,000 Euros (we received the last 3,000 only two weeks before the tournament) which would have meant a luxurious six-day tournament in our original budget. This was not wholly true, however, as we found that we had not taken into account several major costs back then (including renting laptops, taxi costs, hotel rooms for volunteers that needed to stay in the hotel).

We could probably have run a six-day tournament in the end, but are happy we ended up with a five-day tournament, as it would otherwise have been tight in all spots and without any of those things that usually make a tournament a good experience for all (like free coffee and tea, snacks, etc). Only if we had raised the registration fee by twenty Euros would we have been able to do the same with six days. We felt that we could not do this on such short notice (a few weeks before registration opened).

Our expenses broadly consisted of accommodation, excursions, food and drinks, locations, socials, other tournament costs and VAT costs. The unexpected costs have been categorised and will be mentioned when discussing the main expenses.

The accommodation costs consist of the hotel costs for debaters, judges and CA team, but not volunteers and Org Comm during the tournament (and for CA team and some judges doing ESL tests for the day before as well). We were able to negotiate a discount with the hotels: we paid a discounted percentage of the normal (non-summer prices) for the hotel rooms we were using, in exchange for paying for almost all of the rooms in advance. The first advance payment was done in December through a loan from the university and a second payment after we received registration fees in April. The exact discount was 13% on all rooms paid in advance up and above the normal group discount.

The excursion costs consisted of lunch and entrance tickets. We made some “profit” on those excursions, because we had changed the programs rather shortly before the championships and had not budgeted everything correctly. The gains, however, were not larger than the expenditure on the Vondelpark picnic, where most people on the excursions ended up anyways.

The costs for meals and drinks show the separate costs for meals and for personnel. As mentioned above, we had around 1500 Euros costs more than expected due to people taking more than 3,50 for breakfast and lunch on the first day. The Free University was kind enough to subtract all the meal vouchers we did not use on that day from those costs, which we had originally agreed would not happen. Thus, the final costs were lower than we had feared.

We had originally intended to cater breakfast and lunch ourselves, which would have saved money and would have been able to offer more food. We were not allowed to do this by the Free University – even though it had been allowed at earlier tournaments hosted in the same location. The snacks we provided were not allowed either, which is why we provided them in debate rooms to make them

harder to detect. We computed the lunch and breakfast vouchers value on the basis of what would probably be eaten at a Dutch tournament, assuming some of the more expensive things were taken away. Most of the problems with going over the maximum were related to taking some of the warm meals, as well as taking (more than one) soft drink. We chose to have rather basic facilities available and offer the potential for extras to all who wanted them, instead of paying for extras that a whole lot of people would not make use of. Instead, we chose to spend a rather large part of the food budget on the championship dinner, which cost as much as all the food and snacks for two days. This was, by the way, the cheapest option we could negotiate on the canal boats.

The location costs were intended to be none for the preliminary days and only costs for the finals. Due to some confusion, however, the Free University equally assumed that, whilst they would pay for the locations and personnel costs, we would pay for all the other extra costs involved (tables and chairs for the info desk, wifi passwords, signs – which we were forced to rent). Given the fact that we had quite a substantial amount of money left over and we wanted to continue our good relationship with the Free University, we eventually settled for a compromise, which meant that we paid about 4,242.86 Euros more than we had originally expected to.

The socials costs have been kept as low as possible, as we, for a long time, appeared not to have sufficient money to provide lots of (more) basic things to people. We only offered free drinks at the final party, Championship dinner and the opening debate. We had originally intended to offer one or two free drinks at break night as well, unfortunately, communications with Panama were already rather tense and they had failed to organise this before the evening. At the night itself, we were mostly concerned with trying to find out why drink prices were higher than originally agreed, why we could not let people out and how we could get the location to be less stuffy, so we had no opportunity to do so. At the Melkweg final party we distributed two vouchers for drinks to each participant. Unfortunately, someone managed to steal around 300 vouchers )and must have gotten really drunk'. We decided to buy new vouchers to replace the stolen ones, which cost 750 Euros.

The tournament costs are broken down in a number of categories. The transportation costs were significantly higher than expected, not only because we used more taxis than expected but also because the bus company charged more than originally agreed and because our rented van suffered an accident on the last day of the tournament which meant we had to pay damages of 620 Euros.

The judges costs consisted mostly of waiving reg fee for selected judges (and the CA team and tabber), although the category waiver also covers some travel reimbursements. They were lower than originally budgeted as we found many people willing to accept partial waivers or travel reimbursements. The other CA team costs are things like travel costs and phone bills for the CA team.

Communication costs, besides renting a couple of walkie talkies, were the acquisition of cheap mobile phones and Dutch sim cards for our CA team and other people who performed tasks for us but weren't Dutch so that they would not have massive phone bills. Most of our promotion was free, we did however spend money on flyers and posters which were distributed by a professional company all over the city. In addition, we paid money for a few advertisements in local news media. The livestreaming costs were the costs of one hotel room for the duration of the tournament and a few days before/after.

Volunteer costs were spent on clothing and one team-building event, as well as travel reimbursements for those not from Amsterdam. Most volunteers stayed with members of Bonaparte, some stayed in the hotel as they were responsible either for the night watches or for the morning busses. The organisation costs include all the information updates we provided to participants (apart from those in the tournament package), as well as the rental of printers and laptops and the acquisition of office supplies (paper, cartridges, lots of useful things like tape and scissors, two printers when we realised we did not have enough). In addition, it consists of the costs to register our foundation Amsterdam EUDC 2010 and the banking costs, as well as the expenses Org Comm made for Euros, which include some travel costs in the Netherlands and phone bills for the week of the tournament. The largest part of this budget covers the costs to travel abroad to a number of tournaments to promote the bid and/or learn from other organisations. We had agreed the latter costs would be for the persons making them unless there would be money left from unexpected costs.

The VAT costs (BTW) are something we were rather put down by when we found out we had to pay them. It had taken us a few months and lots of help from law graduates and students to figure out how to apply for not needing to pay VAT on the grounds of being a form of charity. Unfortunately, our application failed, and we had to pay taxes over all our income except for those that were clear subsidies with no duties in return from our side. Technically we paid as much VAT on our expenses side as we would have to pay on our income side, so we could cancel the two out, but unfortunately some of those expenses were in the 6% category (while we needed to pay 17%), while some other categories all things dealing with restaurants, clubs and café's) could not be used to cancel out the income side. Hence the amount of money we had to pay in value added taxes. VAT costs are taken off income expenses and commercial sponsorship

Our **budget** was checked by the current and two former treasurers of Bonaparte. The income and expenditures sides should probably speak for themselves for the most part. There was a difference of around 55 Euros between the books and our realisation which we could not explain. In addition, there were receipts missing for a number of payments. Those were 1,396.90 Euros for the Kosher food and around 400 for smaller payments that were made. We were only able to check our books in June and then were not able to retrieve these receipts.

Although Newcastle announced it had around 2,500 pounds left, we only received around 1,000 Euros before the tournament and decided not to ask Newcastle for the rest of the money. We passed on the IOU from Newcastle to Galway, since we thought it would likely be cheaper to transfer money to Ireland from the UK, while we did not really need the money. In addition, we have sent 3,384.30 Euros to Galway from our own account, which leaves us with around 200 Euros which we will use for some remaining banking costs we are expecting and keeping the website online for one more year as well as miscellaneous costs we had not thought about yet. This is 154.30 Euros in the realisation because of the above mentioned discrepancies between our budgeted and actual expenditures.