

Minutes PDGA Europe Board of Directors teleconference 28th August 2018

Start: 20.07 GMT+1 / End: 22.07 GMT+1

Prepared by Laura Nagtegaal

Invitees:

*	Name	Status	Representing
TC	Terry Calhoun	present	PDGA Europe Board of Directors
NH	Natalie Holloköi	present	PDGA Europe Board of Directors
EK	Elaine King	absent	PDGA Europe Board of Directors
RK	Richard Kollar	present	PDGA Europe Board of Directors
SS	Seamus Scanlon	regret	PDGA Europe Board of Directors
KW	Kajsa Wickström	present	PDGA Europe Board of Directors
JC	Joe Chargualaf	present	PDGA Executive Director
BH	Brian Hoeniger	present	PDGA International Director
LN	Laura Nagtegaal	present	Interim PDGA Europe Administrator

* Initials used throughout minutes.

Quorum (no rules set for quorum. Assumed at 50% = 3): Quorum present.

Welcome (KW)

Approval of Minutes (KW)

No Minutes to approve were submitted.

Moving next meeting date (KW)

Please consider moving next teleconference date from September 11th to 13th.

EDGC Committee nominations and vote (RK)

RK EDGF elected four candidates for the EDGC Committee, PDGA Europe needs to choose three more.

Quickly introduces four candidates: Emile Barbe (CH), Lydie Hellgren (NO/DK), Larry Labond (US), Aleksandr Makarov (RU).

Emile and Lydie were recommended by RK; TC recommended Larry. Aleksandr was forwarded by EDGF, as fifth and not-elected candidate.

Good to have different opinions and backgrounds.

LN good to have that yes, but please inside Europe, as this is most explicitly a European event.

RK expresses preference (Larry, Lydie) and suggests others should follow his recommendations

All four candidates and their pros/cons are discussed.

Action point: RK to set up voting document

Committee Document review (RK)

LN reiterates Liaison position, and why that position in each Committee is necessary for good governance, and how this needs to be done by design (ie. appointed BoD members) rather than by chance (BoD members being elected in Committees).

RK suggests changing ratio Disciplinary Committee from 1 PDGA Europe & 4 EDGF to 4 PDGA Europe & 1 EDGF. Makes sense, as disciplinary cases will be almost exclusively regard PDGA sanctioned events.

RK Initial Chair of each Committee should be appointed by the 'leading' Board (eg. PDGA Europe and EDGF, each Committee has an odd number of members, with 'leading' Board being represented by the majority number), and chosen from the members representing that organisation. Election of following Chairs needs to be regulated within Committee.

LN why should initial Chair be picked from the members representing the 'leading' Board? Why not appointing

the best Chair from the full group of members?

LN Liaisons position is once again discussed. And the importance of appointing one BoD member (and once applicable, a Staff liaison) for each organisation as BoD liaison per Committee, permanently.

To both oversee and report Committee's work, and when needed, but hopefully rarely, cut short a project that can not be executed (either financially, or clashing with BoD's intended direction).

NH why "paint the evil on the wall" There may not be any need for this.

LN it's not a case of assuming the worst will happen, and that people need to be called to attention.

Nevertheless, it's better to be prepared for the unforeseeable than coming up short-handed when most urgent. Why not make the design with built in redundancy and oversight. Exactly this is what I applied in my previous job every single day.

'Permanently' is in principle for the duration of that BoD member's tenure, but doesn't need to be.

Appointing permanently rather than temporarily, to not have 1 different liaison every few weeks, because a different BoD member wants to listen in. This will be very disruptive for the work flow process and continuity within that Committee. Asks JC to chime in, to explain exactly how Board (and Staff) liaisons work at PDGA HQ, and why.

KW agrees. **RK** disagrees.

Committee structure document foresees in each BoD having the OPTION to appoint up to 3 non-voting people to take seat (temporarily) in a Committee.

RK sees appointing only one BoD liaison as limiting that BoD's power.

BH asks JC to chime in on how liaisons work at PDGA HQ.

JC explains.

RK Any BoD may decide against appointing a liaison.

Other Committees (existing and future) are briefly discussed in ratio and name

BH connected to Legal Committee, brings up insurance policy issue, and how a pan-European insurance will be hard to accomplish, and instead may need to rely on National Association's insurance policies.

LN raise minimum age of Committee member from 16 to 18? Consensus is to not change this.

Action point: RK to set up voting document

Conflict of Interest in Competition Committee (RK)

RK Competition Committee member possibly running an EPT event, is this a Conflict of Interest?

KW is that member allowed to review/vote own bid?

BH said member is SS, both Competition Committee Chair and Board of Directors member.

KW feels highly uncomfortable discussing this topic as SS is not present to present his viewpoints.

NH and **BH** agree.

LN conflict of Interest? Really?!? Then any Competition Committee member potentially has this Conflict of Interest by being connected to an EPT/ET event. Including myself, having been personally and financially invested in several ET events over the years.

RK LN has no Conflict of Interest.

LN anyway, currently the Competition Committee is involved in setting up EPT/ET standards, but shouldn't this Committee's main concern lie with setting Competition Standards across Europe? eg. deciding on smoking policy, application of Competition Manual, mandatory (current) membership?

RK asks TC to be liaison for Competition Committee

BH there is no urgency to do so

LN Until SS actually submits a bid for an EPT event he is personally involved in, AND that bid gets reviewed AND approved, there is not even a Conflict of Interest.

RK wants TC to already get access to files and discussions to read up, to not waste time while Committee Structure document is approved by both Boards (PDGA Europe & EDGF), and then officially appoint TC as liaison to the Competition Committee.

LN strongly objects to RK suggesting TC gets access before officially being appointed as liaison. This is setting a dangerous "Big Brother" precedent in governance. Even more so, as SS himself is absent in all this.

More so even, because RK getting TC to put SS back in his place may be abuse of power in a personal disagreement between RK and SS.

BH left meeting.

NH we need to take a break, and let this sink in. We can not be forced by RK to make a decision on this topic.

RK asks once again to give TC access to communication in Competition Committee to prepare.

KW both upset about how the discussion is still continuing, and tired after a long day, postpones any decision-making on this topic, adjourns the meeting.

Arrangements for in-person meeting

postponed until next teleconference