

Detailed responses to Board member Statements

Another document deals with these issues much more briefly, and another responds to each of the individual statements in a general way.

Contents

Failure to restrain E-Journal publication of link to NAMT report (BO, JS)

Management of Fujitsu 2002 (BO, CD)

No confidence vote (BO)

Failure to follow Board direction (BO, CD, DD)

Filling the Ing Chair position (BO)

Planning and management of Pro competition event in 2003 (BO)

Resistance to budget revision for Fiscal Year 2004 (March 1, 2003 – February 28, 2004) (BO)

Management of request to provide a candidate for the Women's Baduk Championship. (BO CD)

Claim that I was "considering lines to take in declaring the APGA to be an illegitimate organization" (BO)

NOTE: The following includes, and roughly follows the outline, of Bob O'Malley's statement. Portions of his statement are included here to provide context for the responses. The initials in parenthesis indicate the people taking definite interest in that issue in their individual statements.

Failure to restrain E-Journal publication of link to NAMT report (BO, JS)

Mr. O'Malley says "Disagreements, mismanagement, and taking direction that was not from the board led to a motion on a vote of NO CONFIDENCE on April 6, which missed passing by one vote (3-3). details that went into this vote included intentionally taking action in a direction that ignored explicit instruction by the board. To me, the most offensive thing was not that Chris had with clear sight ignored an explicit direction by the majority of the Board (put the Feng Yun report on an unlinked FAQ page and let it go with absolutely no attention brought to it) and chose to then allow it to be posted in sensational style on the E-Journal, no, the offensive thing is what Chris said when he was asked why he allowed it when he was given such clear instruction to *downplay* it. He said

"...you didn't tell me to not put it in the E-Journal..."

Which part of downplay was not understood, I do not know, but this is verbatim from the person who was supposed to be leading the AGA.

What part of "downplay" means absolutely prohibit?

We now have several versions of this incident. It is remarkable to see such a strong statement from a person who was not involved in the communication, directly contradicting the statements of those who were. Dave Weimer has reported to the Board, and is clear in stating that the instruction did not include a requirement to prohibit publication. My report at the time, confirmed by Chris Garlock, was that I had conveyed the instruction almost verbatim to him, and told him to use good journalistic judgment. The statement that it was "posted in sensational style on the E-Journal" is simply incorrect - a fact verifiable by looking in the archive. For the record, I posted as instructed, though I had opposed doing so. Had I been given an explicit instruction to prohibit publication, I would have conveyed that, as I in fact conveyed the instruction to "low ball" it. (My recollection of the term used.)

Management of Fujitsu 2002 (BO, CD)

Fujitsu 2002 began with a request to the NAMT Committee to provide officiating services. Chendao Lin, the Chair, indicated he would talk to the committee about it. Some 6 weeks later or so, he indicated they would not do so. However, a member of the committee offered to do it. I also received other encouragement to go ahead. The plan was presented to the Board, and passed over the objections of Chendao, who felt that the TD was not going to follow through. Despite my strong instruction to follow normal NAMT methods, in practice, this instruction was not followed. I acknowledged Chendao's assessment had been correct in that respect. No player was omitted. Though one was not invited in a timely manner, the error was discovered in time to correct the oversight. I think it is reasonable to point out that while I certainly had management responsibility, as President, it was not my intention to disregard the protocols as approved. Rather, it was the TD, who failed to follow the established protocols as instructed. This can certainly be characterized as a management error, but not as refusal to follow direction.

Failure to follow Board direction (BO, CD, DD)

Repeated statements that the President was refusing/resisting doing as he was being directed to do are fundamentally unanswerable without a statement of what the direction (being refused/resisted) was. I suspect that this often reflects resistance to the advice of a single or small group of Directors rather than the whole Board. When the President receives conflicting advice, some will inevitably feel theirs was not taken.

Resistance to budget revision for Fiscal Year 2004 (March 1, 2003 – February 28, 2004) (BO)

It is a bit hard to figure this one out. We had a projected budget for FY 2004 beginning March 1, 2003, published in the annual report. I received no request to alter it until after the NAMT committee Chair reported that they would not manage the NAMT for 2003. At the March meeting, I was requested to provide a reworked budget, and some specific breakdowns of expenses in various areas of concern. These were provided in a timely way to allow discussion at the following meeting. I may well have said something at the time about the appropriateness of reworking a budget after the beginning of the fiscal year for which it was made; but that hardly constitutes resistance.

Filling the Ing Chair position (BO, CD)

During that time I interviewed at least 8 individuals. As this is a high profile position, I approached well known people first. Some were interested but took some time to consider if they were willing to involve themselves at that level. Some talked with others to get more of an idea of what would be involved. After more or less hesitation, all declined. I reported these difficulties to the Board, and advertised in the E-Journal, with the result that we got George Zhou, who has performed excellently. The statement that there was resistance is incorrect.

No confidence vote (BO, CD)

The no confidence vote was taken at an unannounced closed meeting at which I was not present. I had provided an account of the incident, and was aware of the fact that a meeting would occur to discuss my management of the E-Journal with respect to printing the reference to the NAMT report. I was not then or ever informed that any other issue was raised. Nor was there any formal instruction or warning given. This was a single issue, over which the Board was closely divided. The motion failed. The actions that led to it has not been repeated, and I responded with a clear statement of how such a situation would be managed in the future to avoid such misunderstandings.

Planning and management of Pro competition event in 2003

Lets be clear about the planning, or lack thereof. The Board's action, or lack of action, with respect to allowing use of funds for this event, and allowing discussion with the pros about alternative approaches to Internet competition, made planning far in advance practically impossible. Speaking of resistance, this was extreme, but it was Board members resisting the orderly progress of a common activity, not the President.

It is true that there were serious concerns about running the pro event at the Congress. But it cannot be said that there was a lack of communications. There were many emails, individual calls, and phone conferences with the entire organizing committee. Had there been less obstruction, the need to have all competition at the Congress would not have arisen.

It was a tough fight, but the project was authorized in the end. What is this "resistance to coaching" about? Going forward with an admittedly narrowly obtained authorization hardly constitutes resistance. Continual opposition to executing the normal affairs of the organization, such as running a pro tournament each year, is resistance.

Management of request to provide a candidate for the Women's Baduk Championship. (BO CD)

Normally, a simple request to provide a candidate for an international tournament would not require notification of the Board. In context, there was urgency to get moving as time was short and Board interventions tend to be long. More pertinently, associated issues required my immediate attention and time, and I frankly did not see a reason to invite a series of arguments and extraneous discussion on various issues. Some feel I should have immediately turned it over to the APGA. I felt that such second guessing of the inviting organization was inappropriate -- they do know of the APGA after all -- so it was reasonable to think they knew what they were doing, and were doing so with due consideration. Furthermore, my first action was to initiate contact with potentially eligible pros. Thus, while the contact was not at an official level, it was certainly not circumventing or avoiding the APGA in any way.

Mr. O'Malley says "... Mr. Kirschner intentionally disregarded the practice and history of AGA/APGA interactions in the steps he followed between August 17 and September 20, and brought the board in only as everything was falling to pieces ... this end result caused by the initial actions of Chris Kirschner in mid August."

It is grossly unclear what has fallen to pieces, or what actions might have caused that. The Hankuk Kiwon informed me of their change, and I immediately initiated contact with Jujo to confirm and acknowledge it.

Mr. O'Malley asserts existence of prior policy. "... when international organizations would request a selected candidate, if it were an Amateur/Professional mix the AGA would assist in the selection, and if it were a Professional determination, then the APGA would perform the selection."

This policy is news to myself and former Presidents. In practice, we have never made these decisions. The sponsor decides with whom they wish to work, and how. Our option is to accept or decline. To my

knowledge we have never declined. The Board has had considerable time to create such a policy, but has not. In general, I felt that if we get a request, we should act on it. I have for many months identified working to develop a closer and better relationship with pros as a primary objective. Early in the year, the Board agreed, and mandated development of a strategic planning document to help move that process forward, but its appointed committee (John Stephenson and Chendao Lin) failed to work on it. Subsequently, I requested Chendao to work on it in his capacity as Pro Liaison. This too was never started much less done, although early on, the President had provided a framework identifying various areas that we needed to consider in such a plan.

Mr. O'Malley goes on to assert that I was "... now promoting the arbitrary story that Mr. Jiang had at whim selected Ms. He to represent the APGA in Korea. This based on not talking with Mr. Jiang, or Ms. He, or Mr. Cha, etc. It should not be too difficult to speculate on who he *did* talk with, and it puts an amazing spin on the significance of motivation of the "Friends of the AGA" chain letter, at least for some of the original signers."

I have little idea what this "amazing spin might be put on the significance of motivation of 'Friends of the AGA' chain letter" might be. Mr. O'Malley's speculation has obviously run wild. He has here, and elsewhere, dragged the business of others into this highly charged discussion. Of greater concern is that this is grossly inappropriate, and indeed is harmful. It would extend that harm to respond other than by saying that his assumptions are (in so far as I think I understand them) not correct.

Claim that I was "considering lines to take in declaring the APGA to be an illegitimate organization" (BO)

I am deeply offended by this suggestion. The idea has indeed been drifting around for some time as idle conversation, but has not to my knowledge been proposed by anyone on the Board, and certainly not by me. On the contrary, I have noted to the Board that such an approach would be tantamount to a declaration of war, and that we should try to avoid rather than promote it. I have also stressed time and again that the current stresses should be relieved through communication, negotiation, and agreement rather than declaration, demand and confrontation. The Board effectively prohibited any such efforts.

Mr. O'Malley claims hearing an amazing comment requiring immediate action to remove me. Heard? From whom? Certainly not me. The subject didn't come up at the Board meeting, and we haven't spoken elsewhere for quite a long time. Not since the Congress, I think. If it is email, we should have a suitably discreet quote describing intent as described above. But there is none such. Had there been, I have no doubt that we would have seen it by now.

Chris Kirschner

206-579-8071 Fax: 425-806-0250
Home: 425-806-0250