## 1. Meeting Opened

* It was determined that quorum was present.
* Meeting declared open at 13:21
* **Attending:** Doug Burbidge (chair), Jack Bridges (Treasurer), PRK (elected board member), Sarah Parker (elected board member; until 14:26), Anna Hepworth (administrator), Steve McGlone (elected board member; delayed in traffic), Lexi Hemsley (elected board member; delayed in traffic, arrival 13:55)
* **Apologies**: Dave Cake (overseas)
* **Brief appearance (observer)**: Frames (application for funding)
* **Minutes from meeting** of 2014-12-06**:** errors in treasurer’s report. These were noted on the paper copy of the previous minutes. Minutes passed with these changes

## 2. Matters arising from the previous minutes

* Doug has not checked whether the Battye library records correctly represent the donated 2008 and 2009 SwanCon items
* Draft AGM minutes have been forwarded to Samara; Doug has not heard back nor followed up on this. This needs to be resolved in four weeks so that they are ready to go out with the AGM notification two weeks before the con
* Cathy has followed up on the teacher’s pack with Fe Waters. Fe would be okay with doing something about it – no details; but really she thinks that we need to leverage a heap of experience in the community in order to develop age appropriate materials. Cathy will follow up with other members of community, and organise a panel at SwanCon.
* SwanCon 2014 paperwork had not been received prior to the meeting, therefore has not been taken to accountant. When Lexi arrived, zie had the appropriate paperwork.
* SwanCon 2015 paperwork has been received by WASFF treasurer (for 2014 expenditure), also not gone to accountant – Jack would prefer to take all to the accountant in one go. Now that he has all the 2014 calendar year paperwork, it should be going to the accountant within the week.
* Logo – there has been a logo presented to us by Amanda Rainey. See below – CSC chair’s report.
* Doug did not follow up with Gina Goddard re: mumfan – more information required on the nominee
* Application for grants – Cathy was going to set up a ‘step 2’ guideline – “now that we haven’t rejected you out of hand, here is the next step – provide a concrete plan.” Cathy suggests that we need to use these first couple of applications as an exercise in working out how we run these grants. The first is the stage that we already have – “Does this fit our Charter”. Step 2 requires a basic budget, say 6 high level line items. Cathy says not only are we bogged down on getting information to make decisions on and give reports back to AGM on what we did; but we are also bogged down with respect to how we make those decisions. This is about the protocol of how do we do this in future. There is also – how are we going to respond to the two that we have on the table at present. Now that we have applications we haven’t rejected out of hand – what now? We need to be serious about giving money before we ask to too much more work.   
  Doug – do we have to ask for that up front? we need a concept of how they plan to spend it up front.   
  Cathy – once we get rid of the definite nos, before we make the final grant decision, we need to know how they plan to spend the money so that we know that it is going to fit the charter. Fill in this form (to be made) and then if we are still in agreement that it fits our charter, the money goes out.
* Local film makers – Doug has been in touch since the Kickstarter failed. The project is still going ahead, and Jesse is still seeking funds. Jack and Cathy have put together a requires for further information which includes both positive and negative example answers [Jack to provide this as an appendix to the minutes]. Cathy suggests sending a copy of this (with any amendments that are required so that it fits our charter) to Jesse so that we can make a final response on his funding. TO DO – Doug will contact Jesse with the next piece of paperwork, deadline is for next WASFF board meeting if it is to be approved promptly
* Game designers - Frames directly approached Jack regarding the progress of the funding application, Jack fed back a response, Frames has since sent through a more detailed application.   
  Doug – one of the original issues was the amount that artists were being paid, and this has not been addressed. Jack – we need to check that the artists are happy with the deal – it isn’t whether we are happy, but whether the artists are. Cathy – we need to know more about the model – we need to be able to report to our constituents that we aren’t funding an exploitative project. Jack – if he is offering profit sharing, and the artists are aware of this, then there isn’t an issue. TO DO – Doug to follow up on this issue; either we can do that during this meeting if Frames becomes available, or fast enough for Frames to get the necessary information/clarification about artists back to us to make the decision at the next board meeting.
* Aurealis awards – Doug has been continuing this conversation. The Dec 6 2014 email from Dirk had an attachment which had not been read; Dirk sent a reminder Jan 21. The document in question is a 7 page ‘partnership agreement’, which Doug will forward to the WASFF board list, so that there can be considered discussion. Expected time to agreement – one week. At which point, Doug can sign it in the presence of any witness, as it only requires one signature.

## 3. Correspondence

* Jan 17th: Request for us to advertise a crowd-funding group. As this did not meet our charter (based in California) and it appeared to be a generic canvassing email, no response was sent.
* Applications – Frames (in discussion with Jack) has provided further paperwork for his grant application.

## 3.1. Matters arising from correspondence


* Frames was available for Skype discussion, so the funding application was discussed. Doug questioned the payment for artists, given the number of cards and the funding amount. Frames reply: The original design had 200 cards, while the newer design has fewer; the preliminary estimate was $15 per artsheet, while the current is $15-$25. This is simple artwork. Doug queried the workload – say half an hour for this? Frames agreed that this was only simple artwork, so probably less than half an hour. Doug – so, more like $30 to $50 per hour. PRK – is that outright purchase? Frames – that is still negotiable, if they want to licence. Frames – we were looking for local artists, but haven’t had much luck with finding any portfolios online. However, because we aren’t finding many we may have to approach international artists. Doug – thanks Frames, we will get back to you later. Also, apology for the slowness of previous response.

## 4. Report from chair

* As already mentioned, several tasks outstanding
* Since the last meeting – some bookwork with Jack, a feCaw tasks that weren’t matters arising.
* This is an indication that Doug is starting to weary of being WASFF chair, so we should start thinking about appropriate handover – not necessarily next year, but in the next few. Cathy then thanked Doug for work done in the position, and brought up the topic of succession planning, as something that has been done in the past, and is worth continuing to do. Cathy also pointed out that this is part of the bigger discussion on volunteer burnout without the community.
* Brought up the funding application for the game designers, in light of the additional information: What more do we need to know? Cathy – given that we now know how the money fits in, and we were asking because it fit the charter well, and we have a potential budge, I think we are good to go. If we are all happy that it fits the grant structure, then we should say yes. PRK – can we put strings on the expenditure? Cathy – the budget structure already has timelines on it. Steve – can we put caveats on local artists. PRK – this is where I was going with this. I want the money spent on local. Anna – if they are stuck – should WASFF help. Cathy – if they can’t get local artists, come back to the board. Steve/Doug – we aren’t requiring that all the money go to locals, just the $500 we are spending to go to locals. Steve – can we add to that that it must be brought to SwanCon/Genghiscon? Cathy – yes this fits the charter, because while GenghisCon isn’t WASFF it is still in the community; we could have a WASFF event at a GenghishCon.
* Looking at the budget request from Frames, they have requested money to partially offset costs of $690 for artists; $125 for printing. Given that we have another grant, we are happy to give $500, with the stipulations that this is 1. to pay for WA artists and 2. that they are to bring at least one version of the game to a WASFF event. If they are having difficulties with either of these, we would like to hear about it sooner rather than later. Cathy – would like to emphasise that we are pleased to be funding this and fostering SF related activities in our community.
* Doug moves that we grant Frames et al to the tune of $500 for local artists for his project; seconded Jack. all in favour. carried.
* Cathy – yay! our first grant sorted! has taken some time, but very happy with the outcome. Depending on how it works, we might be interested in showcasing this. Jack – we should make a fuss about it. It won’t be ready for this con, but maybe next? Steve – can we do something to advertise it? Anna suggests that they might put artist call out in the con bags/con book
* Steve – has wasff put anything in the con bags? Cathy – the grant applications went in the con book. PRK – we should send that to them again. Cathy – I’ll do that, and make sure that it goes in the con book. Anna – in a previous year we have produced a ‘what does WASFF do’ flyer. Cathy – can you send that around, so we can see if it is worth updating. Anna - will Do. Jack says – there is money allocated for printing this year, which would more than cover that. Cathy – we should have a stack of free floating grant applications as well as in the book.

## 5. Treasurer’s report

* Bank balances as at 14 Feb



* None of the remaining SC2014 cheques have been presented.
* The bulk of the hotel deposit has been paid, we are going in to SwanCon with money
* We now have a budget template to hand on to the next convention. At the moment there are comment boxes all over the template (also on the 2016 budget), full of snark and commentary. These comment boxes are scheduled to be turned into a wiki page. Jack – we would like to turn this in to auto-fill, but needs Lexi’s help. The numbers are purely speculative, but at least give some ideas. Doug – this gives treasurers a starting number, and if they vary it, then at least they know where to justify changes, and where they have to find the ‘real’ numbers. Jack – with Lexi’s help, will make it bigger, better, stronger. PRK – Sarah pointed out that we don’t have a line item for on line adveristing. Jack – marketing: adverts – covers this. The comment box makes it all clear. PRK – change name to online adverts? Doug – if the convention wants to place a real world ad – does it come out of here? PRK – oh, ok. Doug – nothing the board needs to do with this, we just have a thing for future con treasurers. Cathy – is it on the wiki? Jack – it will be when the comment boxes are more coherent/usefully presented. At this moment, at least it exists!
* have received SC 2014 and SC 2015 books for the 2014 calendar year. Not done – changed the signatories on the 2016 SC account from what was the 2014. However given that Jack and Lexi are both signatories on this, not actually a problem per se, just not optimal.
* Doug – hat swapping still the plan? Lexi has another year of uni plus moving house. however as the handover was going to happen at the AGM, this should be sorted a bit. So, yes, that seems to be the plan.

## 6. Administrator’s report

* I wrote and sent minutes to Doug; read emails on both WASFF list; no other tasks.

## 7. CSC Chair’s report

* Doug has mentioned much of this – a lot of things have come together.
* logo – Amanda has presented two options of logo, with examples of how it would be used. General feedback from CSC was pretty ecstatic. Amanda does not want this forwarded at present, as only draft. CSC was unanimous on liking it. Some discussion of fonts. Amanda will be back with the finalised logo and style guide. So, we need to talk about what we are going to do with the logo.
* SC 2014 – was waiting on books to go from Lexi to Jack
* SC 2015 – Kat has requested that Steve Griffiths be appointed as co-convenor; she was needing the extra coverage. CSC has approved that. Various con items are well under way (awards; Tin Duck nominations are out; art show person; t-shirt design; public draft on program at most 2 weeks). Current membership (end dec) 133. Have not been able to apply for grants based on concom workload. Looking at the budget, given that the venue was cheaper than budgeted, they will still come in on budget, therefore CSC has recommended that they actually focus on the con. Nat con have been making grumbles about the lack of communication, Samara is now on that list and dealing with it.
* Sarah Parker – as programmer for 2015 – reports the program should go live in 7-14 days; she needs to know about WASFF items. At this point the AGM, the teacher pack panel are the only items
* SC 2015 – does not have an existing supporting membership category. This is required for Ditmar voting under the NatCon Ditmar regs. Doug has asked what an attending should cost. PRK – suggests that we leave it up to the concom. Continuum had supporting/junior of $35.   
  PRK – moves motion – “That the WASFF board approves the Swancon 2015 committee to sell supporting memberships at no more than $50”. Anna second. all in favour. carried.
* SC 2015 – have suggested that they would like the WASFF 40th anniversary money to go towards the masquerade and the family program. they haven’t said specific numbers. do we want to push for a specific event. they have asked that we contribute to the masquerade, such as food and drinks.   
  Anna – I would rather have something that is badged separately, such as a pre-masquerade cocktail/snacks/cake hour. Jack – what about Friday night?   
  PRK – they were suggesting the Saturday because that is the big night.   
  Jack – does our ticketing specify that we actually get more people on a Saturday? the data is available, has anyone checked? [delegates Lexi to look in. PRK – do we have Sunday and Friday day memberships].   
  Cathy – it’s a birthday party, right? PRK – do we care whether it is any specific day? Cathy – don’t see a preference either day?   
  Lexi – from being on the front desk – Friday brought in the most cash from memberships but Saturday was very close to that. which means that there were enough people on the Saturday that didn’t come on the Friday that the revenue matched, given that some of the Friday memberships were full membership (there are a few full on Saturday).   
  Cathy – sounds like it is fairly thinly sliced.   
  PRK – should we go back to the committee and tell them that we want a separate event, and then they schedule when it works.   
  PRK – budget?   
  PRK – start with $4000 as a possible budget, given that is has both a 4 and a 0, and this is the 40th….   
  PRK – if we want something that is more than get the hotel to supply food, we will have to do it.   
  Anna – I’m happy to put my hand up for this. If we do a cupcake party.   
  Jack – we could also do a somewhat free bar.   
  PRK – we should look at sandwiches and sausage rolls, which the hotel can put on, and make them happier about the cakes.   
  Cathy – so should we make a tentative budget for $4000. we should consider inviting non-attending members of the community.   
  Steve – we need to get the advertising out soon. Cathy – logo goes on the cake.   
  PRK – will go back the 2015 committee, in an afternoon, so that it is a family friendly event. Get them to come back with a time that we can then use for invitiation.   
  Doug – Sarah is blocking in the program Right Now, send something to her now.   
  Jack – could do this before the 2016 launch.   
  Lexi – why is the launch happening before the masquerade?   
  Jack – testing out the idea of more people, so that we get more time.   
  PRK – has contacted Sarah Parker and Steven Griffiths.   
    
  Doug – motion moved – that WASFF budget $4000 for a “40th Birthday Party” at SwanCon 2015. Seconded Cathy. Approved  
    
  Lexi – concerned about how much this is.   
  PRK – some years back when we did this, about $1500 was spent, scaled to present money, that would work as $3000.   
  PRK – we don’t want the bar tab to run out before everyone has had a drink.
* PRK – other request was $500 to beef up the family stream.   
  Anna – why are they asking for this? Why aren’t they valuing the family stream enough for it to already be in the budget.   
  Cathy – don’t they already have a line item?   
  PRK – they have one for panels/workshops which has been used in the past.   
  Doug – the idea of calling it out as a specific item is a good one.   
  Cathy – what is it that they want to beef up.   
  PRK – it was an ad hoc request.   
  Steven – we need details;   
  Anna – not willing to go near it without more details.   
  Cathy – we are supportive of the family stream,   
  Steven – should be a regular item.   
  Jack – they only had $250 for panels/workshops, which had we worked out that that also covered the family stream we would have worked out what was not being covered.   
  PRK – feed back a) what do they want the money for b) what has happened to the existing items c) what have they spent the existing $250 line item for panels/workshops on.
* That is it for 2015. 2016 have confirmed their international and fan guests. National guest in discussion. There is also a sponsor who is interested in sponsoring another international guest. This is still being explored. May be details in the budget that are explained by this.
* SC 2016 – have a budget that the CSC have reviewed and likes. forwarded it via email last night, and people are now arguing about it. Main conversation has been about advertising. Sarah Parker has suggested that the GoH prices shouldn’t go backwards and thus should be $60.   
  PRK – generally in agreement.   
  Jack has modified both the 2016 and template budgets.   
  PRK – the key point – the conservative budget predicts a loss of $1800; the optimistic a surplus of $3500 – we expect reality to be half way between them. Conservative assumes no fundraising, few to none interstate members because they are all at the natcon, etc.   
  Doug – looking for ratification from the board; given yesterday’s ratification by the CSC.   
  Jack – changes the bottom line to a loss of ~$1500 and a surplus of ~$3800, assuming we sell 30 tickets.   
  Doug – if no other commentary.   
  Lexi – one question – the figure for grants coming from the grant just talked about.   
  Jack - The assumption is that they are only offsetting the airfare. Thus there are accommodation costs to be covered by the committee. Depending on the exact amount of the airfare and the exact grant, this may be   
    
  PRK – move that the board accept the Swancon 2016 budget as presented with the discussed amendment. Seconded – Jack. everybody in favour, motion is carried.
* Last thing for 2016 now that the budget is approved. Venue – looking at the pan pac again. verbal indication that the hotel is willing to change the dates on the existing contract. do we want to move at a board level that we are happy with that.   
  PRK – would be good to go to the launch with a venue sorted.   
    
  General discussion – we are happy with the committee to go ahead with a venue contract that exactly matches the 2015 contract with the only changes to be to appropriate dates for the second year.   
    
  Doug the other thing – Jack has spoken to Stefan so that he can have the right books for the guests. Tim (White Dwarf) has not been previously interested in this information, so it is no longer standard practice to offer them.
* treasury sub-committee – Jack has already covered the budget template. we hope that it will go a long way to addressing the angst and stress for preparing a new budget. Jack points out that 2016s budget went through with one revision at CSC and one at WASFF board level – this is markedly better than previous years.
* programming subcommittee – meeting Right Now
* the idea of a marketing person separate from the convention committees– CSC like this as an idea, but don’t have anyone/can’t find anyone. plan is to try a similar process with the budget template, involving experienced people, so that there is a marketing template – what needs to be on the flyers, when they are needed by . This is definitely a next year thing, not this year.

## 8. General Business

### 8.1 panels @ SC2015

* agreed on – AGM, teaching panel, birthday party
* Cathy – should we do one that talks about WASFF business, about the grants, getting people involved. Anna suggests that we have some kind of ‘meet and greet’ meal – such that the WASFF board go for a meal, and then just make it an open thing.
* on a related note – Jack suggests that we need an identification item. Anna facetiously suggests hats. Lexis says sashes. General discussion says ‘badges’. Jack suggests the new logo. Should say “WASFF board”. Anna to look at options. Artifactory (as DoomCon did) might be an option – ask John Parker if he has the contacts? 10 for $50 seems reasonable.
* Cathy says that what we want is something that identifies us, but not necessarily any events.
* back on the topic of a meal with the WASFF board – Cathy suggests Monday. Anna says – that will have the new people on the board. PRK suggests the Grosvenor. Jack approves, in that the food doesn’t make him sick. Cathy fine with a pub. Doug posits difficulty with booking for uncertain number. Jack flags the NatCon business meeting as an issue. Cathy suggests that we wait until the program comes out. Booking can be done later.

### 8.2 Succession planning

* Cathy – useful to have a conversation for people who might be a good match for roles.   
  Doug – Sarah, PRK, and Dave's three-year board terms are up. Sarah is not planning to stand for re-election. Dave is willing to stand if there is no-one to fill his place. PRK is of the opinion that he has another term for him.   
  Anna – we need to consider younger individuals.   
  Cathy - yup.   
  Doug – we never leave this to chance. Several individuals were proposed by members of the board, both as people to approach now, and people who might be suitable in the future. In particular, people who might be good to take on chair after a year on the board were discussed.
* Anna suggests that we specifically invite people to be on the WASFF list, so that we are hearing a wider range of voices.   
  Steven suggests that this should be on the flyer.   
  Jack – is there a join link on the website.?   
  Anna – do we care about who applies?   
  Jack – rather than who joins, we have a ‘misbehave and we kick you off’.   
  PRK – yes, there is a link to how to subscribe, under the contacts.   
  PRK – it should be in the con book, should be mentioned in the lunch.
* PRK – digressing to the 40th birthday party – who is responsible. Anna puts her hand up.

### 8.3 Tin Ducks

* What age people are allowed to vote? There was a vote from a pre-teen member last year, which was not counted, given that the current rules don’t allow for that. One of the reasons is that for other voting things is that people can demand a list of people who voted on a motion to call.   
  Current rules state: “6.13 Eligible voters for the Tin Duck Awards are members of the current WA Regional Science Fiction Convention, including attending and supporting memberships.”  
  Because of this, we allow that members aged 18+ can vote. So, we would need to change the wording to be ‘members and teen attendees’ can vote in the Tin Ducks to allow for 12+ kids to vote.   
  Thus we would need to change “teen attendees do not have voting rights at general meetings” and we would also need to add in a detail in the Tin Ducks voting section. Doug and Anna to formulate a motion to this effect.

Next meeting – scheduled for 2pm Sunday 22nd March.

Meeting closed at 16:56.