

December 10, 2014

Attending:

- IQA - Harrison Homel, Matthew Guenzel
- Australia - Hannah Monty, Eva Alexandra
- Belgium - Zoé Miniconi
- Benelux - Nick poland Klaveren
- Germany - Paul Wespatat, Nina Heise
- Italy - Michele Clabassi
- Mexico - Alberto Santillan
- Norway - Elisabeth Ingeberg Jørstad, Kai Shaw
- Quidditch Canada - Tegan Bridge, Brian Gallaway
- QUK - Robert Barringer, Tom Heynes
- Spain - Gabriela Benejam
- Turkey - Alper Erişen
- USQ - Alex Benepe, Alicia Radford, Sarah Woolsey

[IQA Congress Contact Sheet](#)

Agenda:

- 1. Presidential Resignation Announcement (regular business)
- 2. Presidential Election (regular business)
- 3. Secretary Election (regular business)
- 4. Constitutional Review (Quidditch Canada and Italian Quidditch Association)
- 5. European Committee (Italian Quidditch Association)
- 6. European Quidditch Cup / European Games (Italian Quidditch Association)
- 7. International Refereeing Certification (Italian Quidditch Association)
- 8. QDI Committee update (Italian Quidditch Association)

Notes:

- 1. Presidential Resignation Announcement (regular business)
 - Matthew stepping down as IQA Congress President for personal reasons.
- 2. Presidential Election (regular business)
 - No advance emails expressing interest.
 - People who are interested declare and make speech, do vote at the end of the meeting.
 - Interest in running?
 - Brian Gallaway (Quidditch Canada)
 - Sees priorities for group:
 - Nominations committee together so there is a board of trustees in place. Hard to get things done with big group that meets infrequently (Congress).
 - Get events committee in place and moving forward.

- Move towards incorporation, consider getting committee together to consider various locales and best options.
 - Policy development, other administrative work.
- 3. Secretary Election (regular business)
 - No advance emails expressing interest.
 - Someone to help record notes and keep Congress running smoothly.
 - Same election process as President.
 - Interest in the position?
 - No formal interest expressed.
- 4. Constitutional Review (Quidditch Canada and Italian Quidditch Association)
 - IQA Constitution Draft - [document](#)
 - Two documents sent via email:
 - IQA Constitution Draft - Suggested Changes
 - IQA Structure
 - Explanation of proposed changes
 - Main changes are to article 6.2, added article 6.7, and changed 19.1, remaining changes related to QDI
 - Original relationship between Congress/Board/Executives was confusing, change proposed to make it more linear
 - Change in structure document
 - Board now elected by Congress instead of elected within the board
 - Addition: if Board is not in place or cannot function, Congress takes on their responsibilities
 - Removes note that Board gets a veto over changes to the constitution
 - Since $\frac{2}{3}$ requirement already required of Congress
 - Change to give Board accountability to membership
 - Discussion of proposal
 - Harrison: want to discuss the relationship of the Board to Congress & relationship of the Board to the IQA in general
 - The Board is very much an entity that worries about the business side of things in nonprofits
 - Responsibilities generally financial, business planning, broad vision in a practical non-sport based way, which is basically also Harrison's job as well
 - Not related to making the vision/goals of the sport, which is what the Congress does
 - Primary Concerns
 - Congress's role - concerned with quidditch, the sport, managed well
 - Board - make sure business of IQA is managed well
 - Board would bring people with those specific skills, as many of the members of Congress do not have that experience and mindset

- Makes more sense longterm in both senses to have the separate/independent, but working together
- Brian: agree with purpose, but not the ending on how the board is created
 - Do not want the Board to elect themselves - want nominations committee within the Congress
 - Membership nation needs to have a say in who is on the board
 - Even if given slate of nominees and approving the names
 - Issues of having Board not elected with members in different countries?
- Harrison: In doing research on incorporation, it is a fairly common practice for the Board to be a relatively independent body
 - Discussed last meeting that anyone who had any relevant people, relationships, ideas for Board members to reach out to Harrison as a suggestion on where to look for those members
 - Happy to discuss the process and continue to formalize it
- Alicia: There are several different ways to incorporate a nonprofit
 - In the US, there are two main ways that are legally sound:
 - Member corporations (homeowners association, chambers of commerce, etc.)
 - people pay in to be a part of, where they often elect who sits on the Board of Directors; have big pool of people to draw from
 - Nonmember corporations (ex. what USQ is)
 - Board is self-perpetuating: when there is a vacancy, the Board creates a process to find and bring on new Board members (still very transparent)
 - It is very difficult to find Board members, especially with a larger group like Congress
 - Limited effectiveness in finding people to take the sport to the next level if we don't have the input from professionals
 - The constitution will become an incorporation document, too, the legal document that makes the IQA exist, and it doesn't make sense for the board of trustees to not be able to alter it
- Brian: It would make sense to have people on the Board forming large part of nominations committee
 - No accountability to member nations if Board self-perpetuates and also has veto power
 - Not comfortable in a new organization handing off responsibility to a few people and hoping they do what all the member nations would like
 - Want Congress to be able to give okay or not okay (accountability mechanism) of Board nominees

- Prefer simplification of organization structure
- Alicia: the process should have transparency with Congress
 - Dangerous to start off thinking the Congress & Board will be an “Us vs Them”)
- Harrison: transparency is definitely important in general, and a big priority!
- Brian: right now we are a member corporation, funded entirely from national bodies
 - Functionally, the funding is from the membership
 - Not anticipating problems with the Board, but don't like setting it up with no accountability
 - Don't expect issues, and foresee most of the decisions of the board being approved
- Alicia: legally we are not considered a member corporation, it has a different meaning
- Alex: if the Congress controls who is on the board, then Congress is essentially controlling all of the IQA
 - Harrison mentioned bifurcation: two separate groups working together
 - This would have more of a balance of power
 - At the end of the day, no matter how much you write the bylaws, the groups are accountable to each other
 - If change to Congress overseeing Board, then there is no accountability there for Congress
- Michele: understand points of bifurcation of powers, but we are doing this for our members
 - Congress needs to come first with Board supporting it
- Kai: agree with Brian, Congress needs some control over Board of Trustees
 - Shouldn't have too much say over the day-to-day of the Board
- Harrison: Michele said that we're not running this to perpetuate a business, we're running this to perpetuate a sport
 - True, Congress needs to focus on that, it's what we're empowered to do
 - However, our ability to do that effectively will not happen if the business side of things is not run effectively
 - The business underpins everything
 - Funding is coming in exclusively from members now, yes (and hoping to have other sources moving forward), but what is done with the money is the business side of things - a separation, and a crucial portion
 - Need the business part of things run by experienced people as effectively as possible

- This is common business practice across the world, and other quidditch organizations have also been moving this direction as well
- There is a lot of business precedent for having a separation here
- As someone who is new to business management, would feel more comfortable working under the best practices possible, rather than doing something else
- Follow what we know has worked to make sure we know the business is in good hands - that's crucial, and not everyone in Congress has that experience
- Managing the sport is not new territory, managing the business is
- Kai: questions for Harrison
 - How would the work of the Board of Trustees be hurt by having to have new members approved by Congress?
 - How will requiring approval from Congress hurt the recruitment process?
 - Don't foresee a practical effect on the Board if requiring approval from Congress
- Harrison - will slow down the process and makes it a bigger conversation
 - This body does not meet on a very regular basis (currently once quarterly, constitutionally required twice a year)
 - Hoping the Board meets more regularly, constantly looking for people, vetting people, and making sure we have the best people
 - Waiting that long if we have a need or a particularly good candidate is unnecessary, including calling an extraordinary meeting of Congress
- Elisabeth - what if it is made clear that Board suggests new Trustees, just has to be approved by Congress, however they may start working right away if necessary, and voted on Congress at the next meeting?
- Brian - like Elisabeth's suggestion is a way of getting around delay issue; concern about independence of board? give the Board a longer term
- Harrison - at this point, it's very recruitment focused, not a lot of interest in us outright
 - Asking people who are very busy in their other professional lives to be part of something they're not necessarily invested in
 - If we convince successful people with business experience to join Board, they start doing it, then we're in a position where Congress disapproves and we have to then turn them away, that is unprofessional
- Brian - that seems like an unlikely scenario, if we have good people why would they not be approved?
- Was constitution previously approved?
 - Never fully approved?

- Passes
- 6. European Quidditch Cup / European Games (Italian Quidditch Association)
 - For holding events at this level, what are the ground rules?
 - Congress according to constitution is in charge of determining system, but it is not detailed
 - Discussion
 - Elisabeth - want European Games when there aren't Global Games, impractical to have to go through Congress every time
 - Harrison - hiring an event manager for just this purpose
 - Want to hire on a rolling basis for events as they happen, vs standing people; have a couple people in mind for standing positions, but would want primarily rolling
 - Ex: for European Games, temporary positions
 - Job descriptions would go through administrative side (ex Harrison)
 - Is a motion necessary?
 - Want to formally approve that we (the IQA) are running the event
 - Games between two member nations need to follow rules/guidelines of IQA (rules, safety standards, etc) - doesn't mean IQA is directly managing each event
 - If managed between 2 governing bodies (ex USQ and Mexico), it'd be an IQA event for intents and purposes
 - Motion to run the European Games as an official IQA event
 - Discussion
 - Sarah - are we voting for this to have an IQA seal of approval, or to be directly managed by IQA staff hired in the events department?
 - Michele - the motion was nonspecific, so it'd need to be discussed further between the European Committee and the executive team
 - Brian - could give power to committee & executive team to decide this on their own without voting
 - Matthew - should this be a discussion with those individuals, not at the Congress level?
 - Harrison - the European Games will move forward in the interim, want to make sure that we (the IQA) have the authority/permission to be directly involved in managing that event
 - Matthew - motion made was left to hang, if not withdrawn needs a vote
 - Motion withdrawn
 - Conversation to be had outside of this body
- 7. International Refereeing Certification (Italian Quidditch Association)
 - Proposal from Michele - we need an international standard
 - Suggestion: hire IRDP for the remainder of the season
 - Note: Michele is currently part of IRDP

- Brian - could use term “national body” and have a looser definition for nation
 - Would generally want to avoid multiple member bodies within one country
 - “League” as a term implies something different
- Matthew - the meaning of terms means slightly different things in different countries
- General agreement against the term “league”
- Kai - how is it determined what regions are permitted to be included as separate members if they are not an independent nation (ex Catalonia & Spain)?
- Harrison - typically we've been recognizing the quidditch realities on the ground
- Brian - most organizations like ours would vote to admit new members if ruling needed (ex Benelux together, a region as a separate member)
- National Governing Body as new term - no opposition
- Motion: change 'leagues' in const to ' national governing bodies'
 - In favor - Australia, Mexico, Norway, Spain, QUK, Italy, USQ
- Players metric vs teams metric
 - Sarah - concern of use of players instead of team as a metric
 - This is a vaguer metric - how is it determined? only official members or all players? What if no individual membership? Differing membership requirements between countries? Verification of self-reported numbers?
 - Brian - reason for proposed change is partly to be in line with other leagues, teams is vaguer
 - Ex: Ultimate lets you be on multiple teams so players is more specific
 - Sarah - how many leagues have individual membership? do we have better data on number of teams?
 - Data on individual players?
 - Yes - QUK, QC, Australia, Italy (no team counts, only individual memberships), USQ
 - No - Norway (#s but not details),
 - Sarah - Do many players in quidditch play on multiple teams?
 - Michele - proposal to fade out from teams to players
 - To grow as an association, need to move to counting players
 - Hannah - players is forward thinking
 - Sarah - there would then need to be standardization on who could or could not count as a “player”

- Michele - this is the same exact difference in counting teams
- Brian - it's harder to cheat based on player count than team count
 - Can't verify numbers, would still have to trust our member countries
- Alicia - need to have definition of what "member" means
 - Ex: USQ has 4k dues paying members, but hundreds/thousands more who do play but don't pay dues
- Brian - if they don't pay dues then they're not a member of your organization, and not counted
- Michele - agreed on needing guidelines for counting membership
- Presidential Election
 - Each nation votes together [ex NGB name: position (number of votes)] as either Yes (in favor), no (against), or abstain via private chat to Matthew
 - Vote: Brian as new President of IQA Congress
 - Approved - all 15 votes in favor