



ICYPAA Advisory Council Board of Directors Annual Business Meeting Minutes

August 17, 2017 @ 8:00 AM CDT

1. Opening
2. Roll Call
 - a. Present: Lauren, Lindsay, Talbot, Darren, Ian, Stacy, Mike, Joel, Trey, Rachel, James, Jackie, Spencer, Phillip, Shannon, Chris
 - b. Absent: none
3. Elections
 - a. Chair Lindsay
 - b. Co-Chair Phillip
 - c. Treasurer James
 - d. Secretary Trey
 - e. Archivist David N. (ATL 2009)
4. Review & approval of minutes from May 21, 2017 Quarterly Business Meeting
 - a. Questions
 - i. None
 - b. Approved by Unanimous Consent
5. Reports
 - a. Chair – Lauren (see Report A)
 - i. Q: Is this the most pre-registrations ever? 2200?
 - ii. A: Maybe. Miami was close.
 - iii. Q: Our hotel room block was 2401 at 55% attrition and our performance is 2404. Looks like the Hotel Chair killed it.
 - iv. A: ICYPAA has performed very well with hotel room nights in the past two years. Cheers to the hotel team
 - b. Co-Chair – Lindsay (see Report B)
 - c. Treasurer – Talbot (see Report C)
 - i. Q: In your experience, is the \$55k prudent reserve adequate?
 - ii. A: Not sure. We will refer to finance committee to consider.
 - iii. Q: The \$30k for the AC spend will get spent this weekend?
 - iv. A: Yes.
 - v. Q: The Host Committee has \$20k in one account and \$7k in another. It looks like they are financially healthy going into the conference.
 - vi. A: Seem to be yes.
 - vii. Q: This appears to be evidence of prudent planning and appropriate custodial oversight. Cheers.
 - viii. A: Why are you being so nice? Must be the dog.
 - d. Secretary – Darren (see Report D)
 - e. Archivist – Kirk (see Report E)
 - f. Hotel & A/V Subcommittee Chair – Lindsay (see Report F)
 - i. Late game Hotel A/V drama: \$50k of Union shadow labor stuff. Despite all of our communication attempts, a bunch of problems never the less. Result -- we are giving up rigging. House system for voice aspect of main meetings. Miller doing video and dances.



No video on Sunday. No live stream on Sunday. We will see tonight at the meeting. The overflow will also be an issue to manage.

- ii. Q: Miller is video only in main sessions?
- iii. A: Yes
- iv. Q: This situation is frustrating and disturbing. The way the hotel handled this situation. We will address this with corporate Hilton before we sign another contract with them. This is not in the spirit of building a long term relationship with us.
- v. A: I've talked to the GM of this hotel. We are supposed to talk today. Certainly this warrants a call to corporate.
- vi. Q: How much of the missing AV can be recovered if we have enough money this weekend?
- vii. A: Some can happen if a lot of people show up and we are flush. Rigging is probably gone. It's a fluid situation.
- viii. Q: How much of this is on the hotel? On us? On Miller?
- ix. A: We all have a part in this. We always try to do our best. Our error was not to specifically understand "union shadow labor" as opposed to all other types of labor.
- x. Q: if we aren't happy with the dance or speaker sound, what do we do?
- xi. A: If we use Miller, it's gets really expensive due to shadow labor stuff. We will see tonight. PSAV is slow. Not sure what they can do for us at the last minute.
- xii. Q: Do we run this by our attorney?
- xiii. A: We could. Let's see how it plays out and decide what to do.
- g. Bid Development Subcommittee Chair – Trey (see Report G)
 - i. Q: Why did so few bids do a one-on-one?
 - ii. A: Some of them think that it makes them look bad.
 - iii. Q: Do we make them do the agenda?
 - iv. A: Yes
 - v. Q: Maybe this is part of what is making them nervous? Are they trying to game us?
 - vi. A: We should try to have a standard agenda that bids can use.
- h. General Service Subcommittee Chair – Ian (see Report H)
 - i. Q: What happened to the concepts study?
 - ii. A: Lack of attendance. If people want it, go for it. Unless it's well supported, it's not worth the effort.
- i. Finance Subcommittee Chair – James (see Report I)
- j. Tech Subcommittee Chair – Rachel (see Report J)
 - i. Q: Is there a plan to go to a different company for the website?
 - ii. A: We didn't want to initiate anything that obligates the future tech committee. We do think we should either move on from eMarketed or improve our relationship with them. GoDaddy and other vendors we need to address also. The next Tech committee should look at that.
 - iii. Q: How many double charges did we get?
 - iv. A: Tons
 - v. Q: Is that on eMarketed or another vendor?
 - vi. A: It was an eMarketed thing at first, but then it turned out that TotalApps has a bug with Safari browsers. It's been a mess, but is hopefully handled.
- k. Ad Hoc International Participation and Communication Subcommittee Chair – Jamie (see Report K)
 - i. Q: Have we put the I back in ICYPaA?
 - ii. A: We are trying
 - iii. Q: Is ISMYPAA ready to take over the self-organize?
 - iv. A: Not really, not yet.
 - v. Q: What can we do to get the How To Start A YPAA doc out into the world?



- vi. A: Maybe a Mail Chimp campaign. We should look into that.
- I. Ad Hoc Structure Subcommittee – Lindsay (see Report L)
 - i. Thoughts on making this committee a permanent committee? It seems like there's always work.
 - ii. Probably best if it's an ad hoc.
6. New Business
 - a. Motion A (Structure)): Update the ICYPAA Facts, Aims, and Purposes (FAP) document (see redlined document).
 - i. Rationale: Round 1 of the ICYPAA Advisory Council Group Inventory on January 8th, 2017 included these topics: Unity/Morale, Purpose/Authority of ICYPAA as an organization. At the following Operating Committee during review of discussion points it was decided to ask the ad-hoc Structure Committee to review the FAP document.

During the committee's review, it was noticed that the FAP document includes other information that is also maintained elsewhere including the Host Committee Responsibilities, Advisory Council purposes and Bid Requirements. The ad-hoc Structure committee felt that the FAP document should be updated to align with its title along with making the Council documents more efficient as a whole.

The updated FAPs document includes sections describing the ICYPAA Advisory Council, the Host Committee, and Bid Committees along with hyperlinks to the other relevant information (i.e. Advisory Council Bylaws, HCRs, Bid Requirements, and ICYPAAU).
 - ii. Questions
 - iii. Discussion
 - Can we please change the title. FAP doc is a bad title
 - Works well
 - iv. Friendly Amendment
 - To change the name of the document to Statement of Purpose
 - Not accepted
 - v. Vote
 - Yay = 15 Nay = 1 Abstain
 - Passed
 - b. Motion B (IPCC): Carry over the ad-hoc International Participation and Communications Committee another year with the primary purpose of coordinating the next ISMYPAA.
 - i. Rationale: ISMYPAA is in its third year of fruition. While the International Participation was larger in this year than any year before, it is this committee's opinion that ISMYPAA still needs the backing of the ICYPAA advisory council in order to proceed in bringing the message of Young People in AA to the international community. There was a post-ISMYPAA planning meeting that was attended by several of the consistent and regular international participants along with a trustee of AA's general service board in which the discussion indicated the group would like the IPCC subcommittee to bring this motion to the next ICYPAA advisory council business meeting.
 - c. Questions
 - i. Q: So this motion comes from the group of people who are involved in ISMYPAA
 - ii. A: Yes, they want us to continue to host/support ISMYPAA for the time being.
 - iii. Q: Why do they still need us?



ICYPAA

International Conference of Young People in Alcoholics Anonymous
P.O. BOX 22987, DENVER, CO 80222 WWW.ICYPAA.ORG

- iv. A: if we tried to hand it off this year, we would be handing it over to 1 person. They want it to continue, but it still needs ICYPAA
- d. Discussion
 - i. Great that the IPCC is taking their cues in this from the ISMYPAA organizing committee. If they see the need, we should meet it.
 - ii. Super amazing. ISMYPAA is so cool.
 - iii. Great work. Try to have it become self-sufficient. Who could do it?
 - iv. ISMYPAA was started in a context of bitterness around ICYPAA claiming the international without doing any thing international. If the tone has changed now and the ISMYPAA community wants our continued support, great. If there is a need here, let's keep meeting it. If/when the democratic things happens and the participants want to take over, great, then we let it go.
 - v. We should see a timeline of when it can become self-organized and self-sustaining.
 - vi. We should make a list of the specific steps that need to happen for self-organization.
 - vii. Plan towards a shared organization at first, possibly? Representatives from different international YPAAs?
 - viii. I've been on the committee all three years. We have had progress every year. We should keep building it. It will evolve into what it needs to be.
 - ix. Excited for the committee next year to keep working on this. It takes time to build things.
 - x. In Support. Whatever it takes to stand on its own we should do
- e. Vote
 - i. Yay: 16 Nay 0
 - ii. Passed Unimously

7. Discussion Points

- a. Discussion Point A (Structure): In your view, what are the benefits, purposes, and intended outcomes of ICYPAA's Non Discrimination and Anti-Harassment Policy?
 - i. To protect our attendees
 - ii. To protect ICYPAA
 - iii. To respond to obvious behaviors that are totally unacceptable.
 - iv. To move us out of the time when all of these issues were handled secretly, without the full council being informed.
 - v. To handle the obvious creeps who come to ICYPAA to prey on people. The recent complaints don't rise to the level of seriousness that the policy was created to handle.
 - vi. To provide a safe conference. An environment for spiritual growth and not let harassment impinge on that.
 - vii. The policy protects us legally, but also spiritually.
 - viii. Protecting the board from legal concerns, but also the attendees. Hopefully it functions as a deterrent to some people. So that people know they are protected.
 - ix. Legally and socially it's important that we try to make ICYPAA a safe place and be clear about what behavior is unacceptable.
 - x. To have a standard about how to handle situations that endanger the conference. We need to sharpen our investigation process.
 - xi. Serve to support the concept of unity. You can't do these things in our environment because these actions hurt people. The legal responsibilities are serious. We used to have known perpetrators in attendance at ICYPAA.
 - xii. We should reach out to people who can help us. GSO. Alanon/Alateen Family Groups.
 - xiii. That people know we are considering these issues means that some folks feel after, and others know that if they behave poorly, there will be consequences.



- xiv. Protect ICYPAA inc. Protect our attendees. We can't use the policy for punishment. We have to act to protect our members.
 - xv. The purpose is clear. The benefits: it keeps the attendees safe. It protects the board. It's a deterrent to those who may attend our conference.
 - xvi. Round 2
 - xvii. We need to do a better job of making sure people know what they are signing up for. We need to do something about this.
 - xviii. We need more people to see it. We thought people would have to click a box when they registered. Did that ever happen? Do people know about it?
 - xix. Maybe dumb it down a bit, have a version that is simpler and clearer for the attendee. We can do more to communicate.
 - xx. Take us out of the dark ages. ICYPAA won't be a place that is a shield for criminality. We need to AA up the process. We have become too much CSI and not enough AA.
 - xxi. The policy gives us guidance. It gives us a process.
 - xxii. The policy holds us accountable to handle these issues transparently -- these issues have always been with us, but they were handled in the darkness, secretly. Now we have a record and a history that can be learned from minutes and facts, rather than rumor.
 - xxiii. Alanon has documents that has guidance in them.
 - xxiv. This outlet to discuss what's going on is great, but leads into the scope conversation. The fact that there will be an investigation provides comfort that did not exist before.
 - xxv. People are driven away from AA all the time based on behavior of members that are unsavory. People try to hide behind the 10th tradition. We shouldn't judge people, but we should take appropriate action to protect our attendees.
 - xxvi. Let's get the word out about the policy and register the acknowledgements. My fear will treat it like a software update.
- b. Discussion Point B (Structure): What are your thoughts about the scope of the NDAH policy as it currently reads?
- i. Round 1
 - ii. The scope should be at ICYPAA, the AC and Host committee, and those people only. The policy is clearly stated. The online stuff is difficult. Different groups we don't manage, no. Do we not look at certain complaints?
 - iii. Not sure what to say. It seems like a grey area. Do we need more clarity around scope?
 - iv. Scope. To or by all these people. But IN ICYPAA environments? We can limit our scope. But don't over limit, then you maybe can't act when you need to. You need to be able to make judgements. Maybe it's not supposed to be easy.
 - v. Persistent direct unwanted contact is the key for me. Maybe we should filter the complaints better? Maybe we need an internal standard.
 - vi. The scope feels too broad. The policy has been weaponized. The scope should be limited so that we don't have to be the AA police.
 - vii. I can't find a precedent in AA with a policy implemented like this one. The state/venues etc. usually have the responsibility to handle this. If we investigate and find no violation, then something happens, what do we do? Are we liable?
 - viii. We need to handle the business of ICYPAA. The flexibility of the policy might mean it's not consistent. It's so subject to the individual, it won't be clear.
 - ix. I like the scope, it should be broad. We utilized this policy to make difficult decisions without resorting to an emotional response.
 - x. Having a hard time thinking about the scope because of the recent set of complaints. Internal standard to filter is a great idea.



- xi. We are hesitant to up front say -- this is outside of our umbrella. We end up investigating everything. We should go with the current policy and just tell people that if it ain't in an ICYPAA environment, it's not our issue.
- xii. The scope is fine in the document. The discretion the OC has is checked by the full council. To me this is ok.
- xiii. We are an informed group conscience. We should never turn our back on someone who says they feel unsafe at ICYPAA. IF there is a better process, let's improve ours. But we have a mechanism for this and we need to use it.
- xiv. This policy can seem like a bunch of legal bullshit. Our scope isn't problem. Interpretation is the issue. We need to get a conscience on how to interpret it.
- xv. How far is our reach? Only at our events? We can't protect people all the time. If we do have a broad policy, and the attendees do file a complaint, what message are we sending.
- xvi. What does ICYPAA do in its official capacity. That's what this is about. ICYPAA doesn't handle anything outside official ICYPAA stuff.
- xvii. Round 2
- xxviii. People insulting each other should not be what this policy handles. There should be grades of seriousness that we can determine.
- xix. I'm uncomfortable with the internal filter issue. IF we have a filter mechanism, we can have a bad filter. I'd hate to see a future council leadership decide not to take action on harassment complaints because they personally didn't think it had merit.
- xx. If we keep it the same, we are opening ourselves to a lot of effort on claims that might not have merit.
- xxi. How do we keep this policy from becoming a runaway train? The broadness vs the constraint on the policy is the concern.
- xxii. The policy seems to force us to consider every complaint of everyone even involved with ICYPAA. I don't think that's good for us. Some subtle changes could help us.
- xxiii. I've never been harassed or assaulted physically or sexually. I was bullied as a kid. How do I recognize that with making these judgements. I don't know what it's like to be a victim of these behaviors.
- xxiv. We can tweak the document until the end of time. It will never be perfect. The scope consideration shouldn't be about how many reports we got. IF we have a lot of harassment, there should be lots of reports.
- xxv. What people get comfort from is that we have a place for them to go for a process to take place. That in itself gives comfort. Even if it doesn't fall into our arena, they still get to file a complaint and be heard. This access to protection is important in and of itself.
- xxvi. I apply home group thinking. If this happened at a home group, it would get handled. The bogus reading of the 3rd and 10th traditions to hide bad behavior does not trump unity in tradition 1.
- xxvii. I'm not clear yet. I'm uncomfortable with us having this authority.
- xxviii. Round 3
- xxix. I would like us to consider having the Communication Guidelines updated and extended to apply to the Host Committees.
- xxx. We either need a limited scope or clearer criteria about how we decide which complaints merit attention.
- xxxi. I'm leaning more towards trusting us to make good decisions on a case-by-case basis. But it's unprecedented in AA as far as I know.
- xxxii. This feels black and white. Unless we leave this exactly how it is now, we will become rigid. We could make small tweaks without ruining it. Take our the subjective part that can be applied unilaterally at will



- c. Discussion Point C (Finance): That a change to the bylaws be made to clarify spending policies, related to spending beyond budget, and that that change ask subcommittee chairs and officers to use discretion and enable the treasurer to serve as a check on any above budget spending
- i. Questions
 - What is the budgeting problem we are trying to explore?
 - None really, But the bylaws are unclear about budgeting
 - ii. Discussion
 - The subcommittees don't have established budgeting mechanisms. But maybe they should. Maybe each subcommittee should have a standing budget so that they can do little things related to their area of service. Not sure how much of this should be in the bylaws though.
 - Make sense to me. What would the dissenting opinion be? Why did someone want hard limited on spending?
 - In support of the concept. What is the actual change to the bylaws?
 - The treasurer is always a check and balance on spending anyway.
 - We do look at the treasurer's report quarterly, and the full council can check that work.
- d. Discussion Point D (Bid Dev): What should be done with ICYPAA University going forward? We have had the same Bid Requirements for 3 years and have 3 years of recordings of ICY U sessions covering these same Bid Requirements in various ways. Should we continue to present on Bid Requirements in ICY U, revise the program and how, or terminate/postpone ICYPAA University Program?
- i. Please don't get rid of this. It took so much work to get it up and running. To give the information to all the bids equally is very important. We have about 3 bids right now that understand the business of ICYPAA, but after that, we're doomed. Recast the content in a way that engages the current new bidders more. Think totally differently about it.
 - ii. As a bidder, we felt that we needed to dial in just to check a box with AC. It was helpful at first but then we didn't learn much after the first year or two.
 - iii. I appreciated it as a bidder.
 - iv. It helps good bids become ready. It doesn't seem to capture the new bidders very well. We are losing them early in the learning curve. Do something more engaging. Maybe read fewer slides. Put the bidders into a more interactive position.
 - v. We aren't trying to eliminate it, but we maybe need to get a way from bid requirements. Maybe letting the bids drive the process. We will need help to make this happen. Can we go a completely different direction?
 - vi. The one-on-one sessions can be better. Maybe do one with each bid committee -- proactively? We schedule them. Tweak format so it's about them bringing the content.
 - vii. Innovate or die. We should focus on the individual webinars with content for that bid committee. Give them what they are asking for. Find out where they think they are. All pointed towards helping make bids stronger. Drive engagement with our bidders. Ask our bidders what they want.
 - viii. We could always change the bid reqs again to throw them off. Haha. Of course the older bids won't keep coming. It's boring. It's just about looking good to us, it's not participation.
 - ix. I learned something every year, every session. It makes me sad. We let it become stale. We need to recycle it. It's work. We should be communicating what we want them to do. The new bids needed to be on ICYPAA U. They didn't use the resources and they have terrible results. It doesn't need to go away. The full council needs to get more engaged and take more responsibility for refreshing the content.



- x. We had 3 ICYPAA U's with no questions. 3 out of 9. It was weird. Bid Dev should look at driving communication took the bids that will incident interaction with us. Relationship building with AC.
 - xi. Rather than do one every month, do a one-on-ones.
 - xii. ICYPAA U is important but needs an overhaul. Help the ones that are trying to get better quickly.
 - xiii. We could involve the host committee in some way. Have the winning bid chair come talk about a successful bid. "How they did it."
 - xiv. Interactive. What do they want.
 - e. Discussion Point D (Finance): In preparation for next year's budgeting, which will begin following this meeting, we would like to remind everyone of the budgeting process we presented to Council
 - i. No discussion
 - f. Discussion Point E (Operating Committee): Should ICYPAA form and express collective conscience on General Service Conference Agenda Items?
 - i. When we are asked to develop a conscience, who would we be representing? We all have GSRs, so double representation would be weird. It would be nice to have increased interaction with the GSB.
 - ii. We keep in touch with our delegate and a lot of this is news to us. When we are asked to weigh in, sure. But we shouldn't be positioning ourselves as an authority.
 - iii. Yes I think we should. It depends on the case and what is being asked. Do we have the time to weigh in on these matters? Should someone represent us in this way? The OC? The General Service Chair? It needs to be specific, case by case.
 - iv. If we are asked.
 - v. We could do more harm than good by engaging in this. GSO might love our thoughts about these things.
 - vi. YPAA.info is a dead sight.
 - vii. Yes, when we are asked. Or when the agenda item affects us or our attendees. I think there's an opportunity to put some life into the ICYPAA Forum around this. We could collect information from our attendees on GSC items at the Forum.
 - viii. If we are asked. The questions would need to be specific and direct. We report to the body of ICYPAA.
 - ix. No. My voice is already heard through. My GSR and the service structure where I'm from. IF we are AA, then we should use the AA system, which is the GSC structure.
 - x. If GSO asks us. There are 90 agenda items. To go off on all of them that would be ridiculous. The floor action didn't make sense because the guy didn't understand ICYPAA or YPAA.
 - xi. We should never do this and we should make a policy that says we don't.
8. Announcements
- a. Next quarterly business meeting: TBD
9. Closing