## Meeting Opened

* It was determined that quorum was present.
* Meeting declared open at 13:14.
* Attending: Doug Burbidge (chair), Jack Bridges (treasurer), Anna Hepworth (administrator), Cathy Cupitt (elected board member), Dave Cake (elected board member), Lexi Hemsley (elected board member), PRK (elected board member), Sarah Parker (elected board member), Kat Griffiths (Swancon 2015), Stephen Griffiths (Swancon 2015)
* Apologies: Steven McGlone (elected board member)

## Previous minutes

* Dave had tendered apologies.
* Cathy tenders apologies post facto, having turned up on the wrong day.
* Minutes accepted with above changes.

## Matters arising previous meeting minutes

* Doug still hasn't done the Battye library submission. Carried forward again.
* Doug to deliver draft AGM minutes to Samara: still in limbo. Doug to follow up.
* In camera matter discussed further.

## Online votes

* That the SwanCon 2015 budget be approved – declared passed on July 30th.
* That the 2015 Pan Pacific venue contract be approved – declared passed on September 25th.

## Correspondence

* We received some emails from school kids – hasn't been followed up because we aren't sure what was happening. Cathy suggests that we might create a pack of things (targeted at teachers) that can be sent out as a response to these kinds of enquiries. One option might be to workshop this at SwanCon, using the teachers in the community. This might be something that we can be proactive with it, outreach to the community. Say, double sided A4 sheet. Possibilities – Kristian Lie, Kate Williams, Liz Grzyb, Gina Goddard, Ian Nicholls, Sue Ackermann, Desiree Heald, Fe Waters, Julian Ackermann, Kitty Byrne. [Sarah Parker tenders her apologies.]
Some of these people are primary teachers –are we better off getting two items, for different school levels? This is not a SwanCon aspect, but more the part of the remit of WASFF of promoting SF in the community.
* RoboFair – has been forwarded to the 2015 concom, for them to deal with as appropriate.

## New discussion

* Steven (and Kat) brought up the idea of there being a community grievance person. Suggestion is that this might be something that is appropriate at the con level organisation, and therefore is a conversation to be had at the CSC level.

## Swancon 2015 report

* Hotel contract – still to come is an amendment that waives bump in/out fees ($480 per bump in/out event - Thursday, Monday, market day).
* Additional information has been provided in emails that they will give advice on what the fee variations mentioned in the contract refer to – mostly CPI adjustment. Request is that any changes be provided to the con com before the convention starts.
* Access to the space will only be changed if there are major problems (burst pipes, etc.), not due to other people having access to the function space.
* There won’t be a charge for AV if we have people on the ground doing the AV, but if they or their on site company have to be involved, then they will charge.

## Chair’s report

* Nothing specific to report.

## Treasurer’s report

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Account** | **Account Number** | **Current Balance** |
| WASFF account | 451533495 | $3,843.57 |
| SwanCon 2014 | 451535781 | $19,636.94 |
| SwanCon 2015 | 451539752 | $19,434.99 |
| High Interest | 505487641 | $20,345.84 |

* SwanCon 2014 account has not been swept yet – Lexi reports that there are ≤5 cheques not yet cleared. Jack requests an estimate of the total, and will sweep the rest.
* Accounts – We have dug ourselves out of the hole that a few loss-making conventions in a row had put us in.
* Discussion – what might we do with money if this con performs well and we then have more money in the bank? Currently, we have been spending money on 'business as usual'. Is it possible that we run something that other than raising funds, we look at an awareness raising event. Another alternative is to spend money on marketing.
Could we run a WASFF party at SwanCon 40 to thank people? One option is to book a space, and start planning. What we spend depends on the financial situation.
Another alternative is to do something along the lines of a con suite, or revisit the fruit bowl idea.
* Handover of WASFF treasurer, given that Jack is going to be SwanCon treasurer – need to have someone else in the supervising role. Lexi is still on track to take over as of next SwanCon, but requests that there be a long lead-in time, so that zie isn't left floundering. Given that WASFF runs on a calendar year, when the end of year wrap up starts, Lexi and Jack will work on this together.

## Administrator's report

* Minutes went to Doug quickly, he dealt with them after that.

## CSC chair's report

* SwanCon 2014: waiting for a wrap up. At the CSC meeting tomorrow, hoping that Samara is going to have update from Lexi, and that this will be reported on tomorrow. So, down to the wrap up of the books, which is going on a little long, but as Lexi was away, not a problem.
* SwanCon 2015 – hotel contract is now done, at a great price. Committee seemed concerned at how long this took. Checking the timeline – other than getting back to them faster, there isn't anywhere obvious that things could have been done faster. This will be discussed tomorrow to see if it possible to identify where things could have been done better – were there times when both parties were waiting on what they thought was the other group to do something, etc.
* SwanCon 2016 – NatCon is in Brisbane, and they are running over Easter. This may mean that we don't run SwanCon over Easter. They have been in touch.
* Sarah: However, if we don't run over Easter, we can't run at the Pan Pacific, and we need to think about whether or not we are going to be running in conflict with the Brisbane con.
* There would be quite a community response to having one year at the Pan Pac and then heading back to the Ibis.
* PRK: If we do run simultaneously, we need to be supportive of them, and we might be able to run concurrent events.
* Sarah: Staying with Easter – we would have a good reason for not moving, because of the cost [~$15,000 to us].
* Jack: Even if we are a smaller con, assuming that the con is properly run, we won't make a loss using the Pan Pacific over the Easter.
* We are in a 'can't please everyone' situation, need to make the best choice. Probably need to talk with Brisbane – good if we can get their ‘blessing’.
* Cathy: Another advantage to staying at Easter is the consistency, in terms of the message about what we are. Anna: And the 'tradition' of running NatCons at Easter is very much weakened. PRK: hasn't happened since 2006, and the NatCon that year was Brisbane as well (and they didn't use the whole weekend).
* Cathy: Is this something that we need to take to the wider community?
* Sarah P will take this back to the SwanCon 2016 committee/Izzy.
* Cathy: the landscape is so different from the way that things were a decade ago.
* PRK – logo – discussion with Amanda from Ravens – she came in and outlined what we want the logo for, why, what the target is. She has come back with a draft brief – this has been circulated (very brief). CSC will be discussing this tomorrow. Feedback from the board would be great.
* Cathy – like that the strategy is for community outreach rather than focused on the in-group. Like that it takes away from some of the reinventing that is happening year to year. There is some unnecessary repetition in the draft – bit of roughness that could do with being removed. Style guide is a great thing – let people have creative fun, rather than requiring them to think about details such as the font.
* Sarah – price weakness – Comic-Con and Supanova are not real alternatives. They aren't the same thing.
* Cathy – this is something that we need to put in the plan, so that people on the outside can see that they aren't competitors, because from a brief look it seems that we really are.
* Doug – the draft talks about expo style conventions.
* Cathy – doesn't say that we don't want to be in the mind; we want it to be clear that people get something different from a SwanCon
* Doug – but it's so hard to tell people what a SwanCon is without actually making them come to a SwanCon.
* Cathy- story about someone coming in at lunch, when it was quiet, and they walked in, declared it boring, and left. Which really, timing is relevant.
* PRK – next step is to source someone to provide it. Likely to be Amanda from Ravens, unless there is someone we can get a quote from. The brief is being paid for separately, and it would good (due diligence) to show the brief to more than one person who will have ideas.
* Cathy – can we ask the wider community. Even if we get crickets, we have at least consulted with the community, and there might be people interested/competent.
* Dave – quite a lot on for tomorrow!
* Cathy – is tomorrow the review for the structure? PRK – yes. Going to start by looking at the tension with 2015 first, and then if there is time/energy/etc look at the structure – what is working, what isn't? Is it the structure that is causing problems, or is it the people? The treasury group is working really well, but the rest not so much – is this an aspect of the structure? In particular, is it the structure that is inhibiting?
* Anna/Cathy – is part of the issue the generational change? Is there pushback from people who have come in from the previous system, or is it the people who haven't been involved and don't get how difficult things were. General discussion, no conclusions (PRK might be able to report back).
* Cathy – as a community organisation, we need to represent the community. And as we reflect on the way that things are run, things do change and grow. The structures don't need to be set, as we aren't a big corporation. Each group leaves a legacy of changes for the next group.
* Dave – at the WorldCon level, you distinguish between the things that cons can do differently that will add value, and those things where what is in place has developed with lots of experience to do something well.CSC should be doing roughly the same thing – “here is a recipe of what works” [Cathy – “here is a flag for where it isn't”], and here are things that we should be changing so that it doesn't get stale. At present, CSC isn't doing a great job of organisational memory and knowledge transfer.
PRK – trying to get the red book running again.
Dave – frustrating when things get sorted, written down, and then ignored. CSC needs to do a more active job of that. The bit about the roles of the individual conventions can then be settled, so that they get a useful pile of information – not a rule, not rigid, but need to have a good reason to change some things, while other things are about what you want.
* Sarah – can we hire someone one day a week to do some of this?
Jack – we can't afford that.
Dave – maybe we could run a few session to run through this, get a facilitator.
Sarah – get food provided, which might get more people involved.
* Sarah – why don't we have checklists of things.
Doug – on the vague to do list – compose emails to all the 2015, about where the knowledge base info is.
Cathy – maybe what we need is a short brief with links to the wiki. Then maybe they will ask things.
Lexi – will people read it?
Doug – this is exactly the sticking point.
Cathy – people need to work out that it is relevant. If they don't know this, then why should they care?

## General business

* PRK – have been talking about getting a group committee together for a Perth WorldCon. Waiting to see how NZ were going for 2020. They appear to be going full steam ahead. PRK is suggesting 2025 as a good option – this would be the year of the 50th SwanCon. Couldn't run it as SwanCon 50 really, but this is something for later. Various people have been involved in these discussions.
* PRK – can WASFF get involved in the bidding process, or should there be a separate bank account/everything?
Cathy – in terms of the charter, that would be reasonable.
Dave – from the WorldCon perspective, it would have to be separate once it gets to the WorldCon level, with different legal structure, but the bid is theoretically working.
* PRK – it would be great to run SwanCon 50 as the WorldCon.
* Cathy – if the bid runs under the auspices of WASFF, then it will have been the equivalent of the worldcons worth of work for that year.
* Doug – what is the benefit to WASFF of giving the WorldCon bid a bank account?
PRK – continuity. While the individuals are optional, the bid will have some strength to it.
Dave – we then have some oversight of the money.
PRK – also says that this means that we sanction the bid.
Cathy – does this include use of our insurance?
PRK – not really, as not running events.
Dave – at this point we are all about the awareness of the possibility, rather than the actual organisation.
* Cathy – are there detriments to WASFF?
Dave – at the moment the awareness raising aspect. But when we get into the proper bid process, in the 5-3 years before (and the last two years) then it is quite expensive as have to have a presence at the WorldCons, and at as many regional cons as possible. Committees might be putting money .
* Cathy – will people be asking WASFF for money?
PRK – likely. Might be for running significant events.
Dave – this is a difficult situation for an organisation like WASFF, given that what is effectively is being asked for is a large sum of money to buy booze. Would raise awkward questions.
* Anna – at first response, I would rather not have anything to do with it.
* Cathy – there are some good reasons to get involved, given that it might raise awareness.
Anna – how?
Doug/Cathy – media response.
Cathy – get some feeder interest.
* PRK – from a governance perspective, I'd rather have WASFF or similar doing oversight, so that there is a layer of responsibility. Don't like the idea of getting a bank account to take people's money. We have WASFF – why isn't this something that we take responsibility for?
* Cathy – if we do this, and then the bid falls through, what do with any money still in the bank account?
PRK/Sarah/Dave – no formal rules because not yet a WorldCon, so we could make our own choice. could go towards another bid, or some other event, or something.
Cathy – so if there is that money, can it be used for other projects?
PRK – would want it to be something WorldCon related.
Sarah – could send people to WorldCon!
* Doug – timeline?
PRK – no urgency. Would like to take pre-supporting memberships at SwanCon. Doesn't have to be 2015, but it would be good, given that 10 years, and this will be the nat con. Definitely need this running by Kansas in 2016. Needs to be fully running by 2020, so that it can kick in to high gear at that point. The first five years is about gaining some money, building teams and networks.
Dave – this year the people running active bids – long slog through the con, with parties every night. This was even though the parties were in a specific area, rather than a hotel suite.
* PRK – it would be nice to have a bank account by the end of the year, and definitely by SwanCon assuming that it is something WASFF is involved with.
* Doug – we will need a motion, and some thinking about where the money will go. Please bring a motion back to the next meeting.
PRK – fine.
* Some discussion of the practicalities in terms of the way that it runs in the community.
* Doug asked if there was any other general business? There was not.

## Next meeting date

* Proposed for Saturday 6th December – PRK will be in Perth, although Dave is uncertain as to availability. May be available Sunday, in which case we can consider changing.

Meeting closed 15:21.