

**AGA Board Meeting**  
**1/29/2017**

**Attending**

Samantha Fede (recording secretary)  
Diego Pierrottet (Eastern Region)  
Gurujeet Khalsa (Eastern Region, Chair)  
Martin Lebl (Central Region)  
Chris Kirschner (Western Region)  
Andrew Jackson (Western Region)  
Lisa Scott (Central Region)  
Bob Gilman (Executive VP)  
Andy Okun (President)

**Absent**

Edward Zhang

Called to order at 8:03 pm EST

December minutes: minor changes, Chris moves to approve, andrew jackson seconds, minutes approved

1st item: Code of Conduct document submitted by Lisa.

DP: Great document, a little confused as to the purpose -- some overlap with tournament rules.

LS: History- started working on this project Aug 2015 after a harassment issue at the 2015 congress. Drafted by Lisa Scott, Suzanne Pfeffer, Karoline Li

AJ: It may conflict with tournament rules in some cases

LS: We can change the wording, if it isn't clear

DP: Is that point etiquette rather than code of conduct? Does this imply these issues are more widespread than a few incidents?

GK: Lisa, is the point you're making that this is a gender sensitivity issue?

Lisa: Yes, but there are also miscellaneous conduct issues that there are no guidelines for

We didn't want this to just be a sexual harassment code; this needed to be a broader code of conduct.

[Andy Okun joins]

AJ: Suggests that the tournament rules and code of conduct guidelines are merged, and the Tournament Rules refer to the code of conduct. Specifically, refer to code of conduct in the tournament rules/guidelines and take specific language away from tournament guidelines

DP: I am more concerned that some of the listed rules are more about game etiquette, like how to hold the stones- choices of the player rather than actual rules. Perhaps structure it so that it is not about proper etiquette but about proper behavior. Events should be a safe haven, and the code of conduct should emphasize that.

AJ: Diego, as in, describe a positive standard of behavior rather than enumerate all negative etiquette offenses?

LS: We could merge 8 and 10. Seeing reorganizational things in writing would be easier. Are there anythings that weren't covered that we should add?

CK: What I'm hearing from everyone is that the general structure needs to be shifted, but that we don't disagree with anything in there. We cannot list all the specific behaviors that should be prohibited. Give organizers and directors the authority to deal with these issues when they come up.

AO: The distinct thing that the Code of Conduct must specifically list is to establish normative behavior to prevent slightly inappropriate or uncomfortable behavior before it becomes an issue.

CK: I don't object to a specific statement saying you will be warned if your behavior is bothering others.

LS: I think number 7 covers that; if it doesn't, we should change it so it does.

CK: It should slightly more specifically say "behavior that is disturbing to other people"

LS: I insist on specifically including statements like "no ethnic slurs". I think people might not know what that statement includes.

CK: I think that falls under my suggested statement.

LS: The phrase "included but not limited to" is part of that item.

BG: Behaviors that disturb others that the TD doesn't consider valid might not be acted on, so there is unavoidably some area of judgment

GK: This is not about simple “yes means yes” issues, it’s more complicated

CK: We should focus on empowering people to do something when these issues occur

AO: This isn’t just about empowering enforcement, but about establishing the expectations of behavior to have a good environment.

AJ: Referring back to the language on consent, the confusion comes back to the overlap between the tournament etiquette vs. safe space/ no-harassment policies.

LS: Suggests two sections: one for tournament etiquette and one for non-play behavior.

Chris: I object to having something people need to sign and agree with. Who’s ever been to a conference where you have to sign a CoC?

LS: Not sign explicitly, but distributed at sign up and acknowledged as rec’vd by the attendee.

DP: I see three documents here which should be distinct; Code of Conduct, tournament rules, and Game etiquette.

CK: We can have a checkbox on the congress registration website, no one will read it, but it does have a value because organizers can refer back to it.

LS: This is also about empowering people to report, because they know there’s a mechanism for reporting and consequences. People can report to me, based on my position as being the Coordinator for Gender and Go. Harassment at go tournament towards females is incredibly pervasive

DP: These aren’t just go related things, these are general world things.

AJ: But we should let people know that this is a safe place

GK: This sounds like two different issues- one for congress and one for standard one day tournaments

LS: That’s why it is only for implementation at AGA-Organized events. Smaller tournaments could choose to implement if they wanted to, it would be their choice

BG: We could first apply this to specific events, like Go Congress and Pro-qualifiers, and then expand it if needed.

GK: All AGA-rated tournaments should be inclusive and safe

LS: These issues do happen at smaller tournaments. But we need to have this as CoC rather than sexual harassment policy, because I think people of course don't think of themselves as harassers.

Bob: I don't think we should force local organizers to implement this.

LS: We need to balance the safety/emotions of our attendees with supporting AGA organizing.

Chris: This isn't unique to go events. Is the level of sexual harassment greater than in the rest of the world?

LS: Yes, and Samantha seconds that.

Chris: What about other events with similar gender differentials?

LS: This CoC was developed based on those that Conventions and other board game gatherings.

Bob: Do we want to say anything about this code in its applicability to minors?

LS: We have some language about appropriate behavior around minors.

Bob: What if minors are the people misbehaving?

LS: I tried to make that clear that same issues, verbal warnings, may need to rephrase

Chris: We need to focus on empowering organizers to deal with reports rather than condemning behaviors

LS: I disagree. Most people wouldn't report.

ML: By specifying these rules outside of playing areas, we are legally liable to deal with this, and we have no ability to police it, so we need to be careful.

Diego: I agree with Chris, we don't need to explicitly define behaviors.

AJ: I think we do need to explicitly define behaviors, it will help. Regarding Martin's point, I think we should refer to other organization's CoC and what they are able to say.

DP: We should give specific examples.

LS: That is how the language is in the CoC.

DP: We need to use empowerment language for the organizers

LS: Yes, we should have both. People should know how to report, but maybe they don't want to get involved in something bigger.

CK: We are dealing with a bigger issue, that is immensely difficult. We can't solve this.

LS: But we can make our organization better. How to get women to get involved in the AGA and playing go? Make this a safe place for women.

CK: We can work on this, but we have to recognize our limitations and the limitations of the people we're working with. But the desire to make these changes is good.

AJ: The first step is to have a CoC. It doesn't need to bring us into the realm of legal responsibility, it just needs to tell people to be on their best behaviors. It is not beyond our power to pass such a simple code of conduct.

CK: We need to record these incidents so we have information about it. We don't necessarily need names.

DP: It's a due process issue for me. How do we know the accusation is true?

AO: That is already addressed in the Code of Conduct.

Andrew: Let's make some effort to move forward. Action Items:

**Structural: Game etiquette vs. not game etiquette**  
**Information gathering – send out comicon, etc. Code of Conducts**  
**Implementation –**

**AI1: Move forward with revisions- Lisa**

**Lisa would like to get this information in 1 week**

**AI2: Additional work needed to gather information about other events- Lisa and Chris**

**AI3: Figure out how to implement the enforcement of this CoC- Lisa, Diego and Chris?**

Andy Okun: President's Report

- Urgent to find tournament coordinator to replace Cherry Shen
- Treasurer: Roy is continuing as acting treasurer and have not found a person who knows both go, tax returns, and bookkeeping to replace him. Est. 5-10 hours a week. Separate accounting/990s from bookkeeping and check-cutting to two volunteers can do them.

Gurujeet: Should we pay someone to do this for us? Is it cost effective?

AO: Probably not cheap. But if the board is willing, I can explore that possibility

LS: I think exploring the possibility just so we know makes sense.

AO: a tour group policy has been drafted. Should be an easier document to agree on, but please have a look.

Two things that are key choice to make:

1- Do we want to have a concrete thing like sending a deposit beforehand or not?

2- Are we aiming for this to be enforceable or are we using it as a way of setting expectations

Gurujeet: Do we have a copy of this?

AO: Lisa just sent out a copy of it.

Gurujeet: Next agenda item- offsite planning meeting?

AO: What do we think about having a board meeting only about long term planning?

Lisa: It's a good start, and if we decide to meet in person after that, it's okay.

Chris?: I don't think it would be enough

AO: The idea of meeting at congress is not valuable.

Gurujeet: I am in support of finding a weekend or weekday to get together in person and meet but I don't know how many others would be

Andrew Jackson: We could try to do a video meeting.

LS: Maybe we could set aside an afternoon and try to see if we can get a video conference done

Gurujeet: I prefer a weekend morning to meet

LS: We should also set our priorities to discuss two weeks before

Gurujeet: I'll start an email thread and we can figure out times that work.

Andy: I would also like to discuss the 50-state championship. The main issues are whether blitz should be included, residency rules, and AGA membership. Multi-state combinations?

Gurujeet: I support AGA membership requirements. I don't see a reason to make it harder with length of membership

Chris: I think that should be a state prerogative

LS: I think that's a good solution

BG: I'm all in favor of encouraging regional tournaments, but I'm not sure that a state championship is the best way to reach that goal. One of those is that we don't have state level structures right now. If we do this, I would be in favor of letting states combine.

CK: We need to give the states a certain amount of power, but a multi-state idea is certainly on the table.

LS: We should have language that collaboration is acceptable.

CK: It has to be brought to them as part of the conversation

LS: My main concern a month ago was that we be prepared to actually answer and discuss their questions, not just listen to them.

Bob: My main concern is that we don't have a structure at the state level

CK: the way we set the structure up was that they would set the structure up, and we would be available for the coordination. The structure that gets  $\frac{2}{3}$  of the chapters in the state agreeing would have their structure implemented.

BG:  $\frac{2}{3}$  of the states, not the members?

CK: That's the way we set it up, but we can check.

GK: Bob's point is a good one that I don't think we've addressed.

CK: If that's a concern, we need to address it. We said in the framework that there needs to be agreement among the chapters in the state.

GK: So how does a single chapter with a single member compare with a long-time chapter with many members?

LS: We could do it the way we do it for the assembly.

CK: This question has been raised before on the national level, but it has never been a major issue. We can also do it as Lisa suggests.

GK: Bob's comment that we don't have state organizations, we have chapters, is valid.

CK: It is valid, but the way we constructed the framework, it is based on agreement within the states.

GK: Does Andrew want to report about the web forum?

AJ: I don't know that web forum is yet at a point where the board needs to discuss it. Jonathan and I have been in discussion. I'm going to work on writing up some specifications to make it easier.

Bob: Haven't heard about our test game on OGS

AJ: We are still working on online ratings with OGS and KGS, and reports from their admins.

BG: There is consensus among the board that this is a good idea?

GK: I don't think anyone will disagree about automation. We want to get out of manual updates.

Chris: Do we agree this is an important project for Andrew?

LS: Yes, for Andrew in his other role.

Andrew Jackson: It's on my list of things to do.

CK: As a preliminary step, do you think it would make sense to write a stand alone program and distribute it?

Andrew Jackson: No, it doesn't. Makes more sense to have it as a web-based validator. We already have some validators from the crosstab functions, but i haven't evaluated their ability to be used for this.

Chris: I'd like for Edward to be here since it's his project, but should we ask Andy for budgeting for this.

BG: I would question whether we should budget before we talk to the chapters.

LS: I would disagree.

AO: The chapters have to know that we will give them some amount of support. We don't need to have budgeted it, but we need to approach them with something.

CK: We were thinking about giving each state a perennial trophy, that would have a plaque for the name of the winner. We could do this for \$100-\$150 per state.

GK: I'm not opposed to putting some money into funding it.

LS: I think putting something like \$5000 into it is a good starting point, and maybe put some more money into it as it goes forward.

CK: I felt that it was important for the program to have these trophies around long term to show that it is sanctioned by the AGA.

AO: I think we have a general willingness to do some funding.

Next meeting on March 5th, 2017

LS moves to adjourn, AJ seconds. Meeting adjourned at 9:45 EST