

**VATSIM Board of Governors
Quarterly Meeting Minutes - 18 June 2006.**

Present:

Roland Collins (RC)
Jeff Clark (JC)
Ruth McTighe (RMT)
Richard Jenkins (RJ)
Marv Thompson (MT)
Michael Zazula (MZ)
George Marinakis (GSM)

Absent:

Michael Bevington – proxy to RJ
Roberto Bazzano – proxy to GSM
Rob Phillips – proxy to RC
Lefteris Kalamaras – proxy to GSM

Richard Jenkins convened the meeting at 1814Z. Jeff Clark took the minutes.

Old Business

There was no Old Business

1.) Discussion of international & regional conventions

Mr. Clark reminded the BOG that they had recently voted to no longer hold international conventions and would leave further conventions to be organized by the Regions as they saw fit. Mr. Clark suggested that it would be prudent to provide the regions with some guidance with regards to fiscal probity to ensure that the organization as a whole would not become liable for debt run up by a regional convention.

Mr. Marinakis said that this was indeed an area the BOG should be concerned with. There were two possible ways to approach this – the first would be to put accounting measures in place, insisting on proper receipts being taken and financial reporting be made to the BOG. The alternative way to proceed would be to make clear that the convention was strictly a regional activity and that the BOG or VATSIM as a whole would take no responsibility for the regional event. Mr. Marinakis noted that insisting on accounting measures would not by themselves prevent someone from running off with any funds, and as we do not know many of the individuals in the regions, it may be more prudent to go for the second option.

Mr. Clark asked if we would need to put this understanding in writing to ensure we were protected?

Mr. Marinakis indicated that this would be the right thing to do, and that he would work on this.

Mr. Jenkins noted that even at the recent VATSIM convention in D.C., an individual signed the contracts, and that the organization as whole didn't sign it.

Mr. Marinakis noted that it would however be natural for members to seek compensation from the organization as a whole if they lost their money.

2.) Multiple logins for developers

Mr. Marinakis indicated that he wished to present a motion on behalf of Lefteris Kalamaras to allow developers working on current projects the ability to have multiple logons to network, as they sometimes needed to test their software on the live network. They would still need to obtain permission from Lefteris before they did it, but Lefteris wanted BOG permission to put these arrangements into effect. Lefteris indicated that he was aware that he would need to coordinate this with Michal Zazula.

Ms. McTighe indicated that she was in support of this idea.

Mr. Thompson suggested that there might already be special accounts in existence, which would help Supervisors know that these accounts were being used for this purpose.

Mr. Marinakis indicated that as the developers were working for us, that he was in support of the motion.

Mr. Collins suggested that when CZ was doing similar work that the BOG had already granted permission for this, and that the VP Development already had these powers.

Mr. Jenkins suggested that it would be better to have arrangements where the developer didn't need to ask Lefteris each and every time they needed to log in, but instead to grant a sort of blanket permission, and multiple accounts may not be necessary.

Mr. Collins suggested that the permission could be granted for each "situation" or "developer".

Mr. Jenkins suggested that we could put posts up on the Supervisors' forums notifying them of who is eligible to do this.

Mr. Zazula proposed that all developers be allowed multiple logons if authorized by VP Development, to clarify that the term "developer" wouldn't apply, for example, to a local website developer, but rather someone working for VATSIM.

Mr. Marinakis made the following motion: *"That the BOG hereby grants VP-Development authority to grant multiple logons for development purposes as he determines necessary."*

Mr. Jenkins seconded the motion.

Mr. Collins asked that the notification to the VP Supervisors be included in the motion.

Mr. Marinakis said that as Lefteris was already aware of that, he didn't feel it was necessary to specify how the notification was achieved.

Mr. Zazula suggested the motion be amended to say that the VP Development needed to notify the VP Supervisors, and that this amendment would be sufficient.

Mr. Marinakis then submitted an amended motion as follows: *“That the BOG hereby grants VP-Development authority to grant multiple logons for development purposes as he determines necessary, and that the VP Development is required to notify the VP Supervisors of developers with multiple logon privileges.”*

Mr. Jenkins seconded the amended motion.

The vote was as follows:

Roland Collins (RC) - yes
Jeff Clark (JC) –yes
Ruth McTighe (RMT) - yes
Richard Jenkins (RJ) - yes
Marv Thompson (MT) - yes
Michael Zazula (MZ) - yes
George Marinakis (GSM) - yes
Michael Bevington – proxy to RJ - yes
Roberto Bazzano – proxy to GSM - yes
Rob Phillips – proxy to RC - yes
LK – proxy to GSM – yes

With 11 votes in favour, and none against, the motion carried unanimously.

3.) Catalogue of running network scripts on network.

This item was deferred for subsequent discussion.

4.) Publication of VATSIM survey results.

Mr. Clark summarized the BOG's consensus on the e-mail list that it wished to publish most of the survey results, but that some wished to remove some references to IVAO/FPI before publication.

Mr. Clark made the following motion:

“That the entire document of completed survey results, as published by Jeff Clark to the BOG via email, be released to the Executive Committee, and that the EC is authorized to release portions of these results directly to their staff as needed for them to analyze the performance of their areas of jurisdiction, with the understanding that no staff member may make the results publicly available outside their line of authority.”

Mr. Marinakis suggested the motion was vague.

Mr. Clark said he would accept any alternative wording.

Mr. Marinakis indicated he had no problem releasing the entire survey to staff, and was unclear which portions of the survey were not to be released to the staff?

Mr. Clark indicated that personally he would prefer to release the entire survey publicly, but that some on the BOG had wished to restrict access to some of the statistics.

Ms. McTighe indicated that it would be limiting to say that the EC could only release “portions” and that the document only made sense when viewed as a whole. Further she suggested it would not be a big problem if IVAO got a hold of it anyway.

Mr. Jenkins agreed that he didn’t think that this would be a big problem.

Mr. Thompson concurred that it would be pointless to try to keep it a secret in any case as some staff were likely to also be IVAO members.

Mr. Zazula said he was interested in not making direct public comparisons with IVAO, and would prefer to present the whole report to staff but without allowing them to publish it further, and then to prepare a new summary of the survey without the comparison statistics for public consumption.

Mr. Clark noted that there were only a very few direct comparisons with IVAO, and that the only differences we found between VATSIM and IVAO were favorable to VATSIM in any case and nothing to hide.

Mr. Zazula indicated he would then be happy to publish it without restrictions.

Mr. Marinakis said that he didn’t feel there were any “state secrets” in the survey. No matter what we put out, IVAO would likely put it’s own “spin” on it anyway, and didn’t think it was a big deal to release it. He suggested two versions could be released – a full version for staff, and a summary version for public consumption, but that he didn’t think there was anything to hide. The important thing for our own staff was to make the numbers available to their staffs and they need to see the whole thing.

Ms. McTighe also agreed that a summary version would be useful. As we advertised the survey on AVSIM, Simflight, etc., it made sense to publicize our findings widely and this would assist that, as no one would want to slog through many pages of the unsummarised survey.

Mr. Thompson said that it would be a mistake to try to hide anything we did, and believed in releasing the survey widely.

Mr. Clark asked Ms. McTighe for help in preparing an executive summary document, which Ms. McTighe said she’d be happy to do.

Mr. Clark withdrew his original motion and moved “that the survey as published by email be released immediately to EC and staff mail lists, and that Mr. Clark and Ms. McTighe prepare a summary version for public consumption.”

Ms. McTighe asked if we could make the entire survey available for public consumption as well?

Mr. Zazula suggested it would be better to include a deadline for publication.

Ms. McTighe asked if it would be OK to have it out by July 8th?

Mr. Zazula said that would be good. He noted that some users have been asking where the results were.

Mr. Marinakis asked if it would be better to release both at the same time.

Mr. Clark withdrew his motion, and instead moved that “Ms. McTighe and Mr. Clark shall prepare an executive summary of the data to be finished by July 8th, and by that date both the summary and the full survey will be released.”

Mr. Zazula said he would prefer to avoid waiting 2 weeks to publish to the EC.

Mr. Marinakis said that the reason for this would be to have a complete package released at the same time.

Mr. Jenkins said he was fine releasing it to the staff straightaway.

Ms. McTighe indicated we could release to the staff now with an embargo, and with an explanation that it would be publicly released with a summary in two weeks.

Mr. Clark withdrew his motion.

Mr. Collins noted that he felt we now thought that we would release the full version publicly.

Mr. Jenkins clarified we would release the full version to EC and staff, with a note explaining that when we release the summary, the summary and the full version would be released to the public.

Mr. Clark moved that “we release the full survey to the EC and staff mailing lists at this time with a note explaining that we’re expecting them to not discuss the survey outside their staff now, but to wait for the release of the executive summary which will be released along with the full survey to the public by the 8th of July.”

Mr. Jenkins seconded the motion.

The voting was as follows:

Roland Collins (RC) - yes

Jeff Clark (JC) –yes

Ruth McTighe (RMT) - yes
Richard Jenkins (RJ) - yes
Marv Thompson (MT) - yes
Michael Zazula (MZ) - yes
George Marinakis (GSM) - yes
Michael Bevington – proxy to RJ - yes
Roberto Bazzano – proxy to GSM - yes
Rob Phillips – proxy to RC - yes
Lefteris Kalamaras – proxy to GSM – yes

With 11 votes in favour and none against, the motion was carried.

5.) Hit Squad Report

Mr. Clark briefed the BOG on the progress of the Hit Squad's first project in India.

Ms. McTighe said it was impressive what VATSIM can do when it puts its mind to it and asked if we were ready for her to disseminate publicity re: our efforts. Mr. Clark replied that it was now a good idea to start publicizing our efforts in India.

Mr. Thompson thanked the Hit Squad for their project and looked forward to seeing more along these lines.

Mr. Jenkins said he was impressed how quickly it was possible to put up a new division with such a strong team effort.

Mr. Marinakis noted that it was set up to be successful, as there will always be a fresh challenge to the members, as they move to new locations.

6.) Establishing Central and Regional Performance Targets

Mr. Clark summarized recent BOG discussions, which made it clear that the BOG wished to introduce more accountability and management to the organization. Mr. Clark indicated that he felt it was the key responsibility of the BOG to not only have “the big picture” but to also make sure that all the pieces of the organization were working as they should, and recent efforts have focused on seeing what works well and what doesn't work well. This motion makes it clear that it would be unfair for the BOG to make demands of people further down the chain of command without being willing to set targets for itself.

Therefore Mr. Clark moved that “*whereas the Board of Governors believes that it is the responsibility of all persons who take positions of responsibility to ensure the growth of our hobby, and that it is in the interests of the overall hobby that these individuals are given targets to try to achieve, and specific goals to work towards, the Board of Governors shall:*

- a.) Ensure that future job descriptions of members of the Board of Governors contain specific, measurable tasks to perform where relevant, and that each member of the Board of Governors shall be asked to report back to the BOG on their progress on a periodic basis.***

b.) Provide Regional Staff with regular reports on their progress in their important function of providing ATC coverage.”

Mr. Marinakis noted that some positions on the BOG might not easily be given performance targets.

Mr. Clark noted that this is why the language “where relevant” was included in the motion.

Ms. McTighe suggested that there may be other things that needed to be reported on, and not just achievement, for example, activity in the Membership department would be useful to know. Performance measures on routine tasks would be one kind of possible target, and delivery of new targets would also be useful. She noted that they have to do this at her office and that this sort of thing would be second nature.

Mr. Clark said that he didn’t feel it was the time to set out which BOG positions had which targets, but rather the purpose of this motion was to signal to the public that when we do our reorganization, our future job descriptions will contain these targets and that we intend to lead by example.

Ms. McTighe indicated that she liked the general principle – but noted that making targets public might cause stress for VP’s who weren’t meeting them. But on the other hand, some members feel the BOG is too secretive and making our targets more public would allow them to know how projects were doing.

Mr. Jenkins noted that our development efforts are in the public eye anyway, as our developers have their own websites and promote their own projects. However we might have other projects in other areas of the network that we may not wish to publicly set out.

Mr. Clark noted that the second subparagraph spells out, possibly for the first time, that the BOG expects the regions to provide widespread ATC coverage. While this may have been implied in the past, some people may have gotten the balance between quality / quantity wrong in the past, and we are now signaling that coverage is an important metric which will be reviewed by the BOG and by regional staff.

Mr. Zazula indicated his thanks to Mr. Clark for writing these motions as he felt they were needed, and worded in a way that he agreed with. He suggested that the motion specifies who would prepare the report.

Mr. Clark indicated that if the BOG reorganizes shortly, it might be better not to specify which VP produces the report at this time.

Mr. Collins indicated that he wished the motion to be expanded to include reports on all the services that the Regions provide, and not just ATC coverage.

Mr. Clark noted that as it was time-consuming to produce these reports that we would want to find people willing to produce them before we specified which ones we would produce. He preferred to leave the motion vague to allow the BOG to change which reports are produced over time.

Mr. Collins suggested an amendment to the last portion of the motion to read: “Provide Regional Staff with regular reports on their progress in their important function of providing ATC coverage and other services”.

Mr. Clark accepted the amendment to the motion.

Mr. Jenkins seconded the amended motion.

The voting was as follows:

Roland Collins (RC) - yes
Jeff Clark (JC) –yes
Ruth McTighe (RMT) - yes
Richard Jenkins (RJ) - yes
Marv Thompson (MT) - yes
Michael Zazula (MZ) - yes
George Marinakis (GSM) - yes
Michael Bevington – proxy to RJ - yes
Roberto Bazzano – proxy to GSM - yes
Rob Phillips – proxy to RC - yes
Lefteris Kalamaras – proxy to GSM – yes

With 11 votes in favour and none against, the motion was carried.

Mr. Clark then presented a motion on ATC Coverage Reports, and explained that as we take ATC coverage seriously, the BOG now expects the Regions to actively manage the growth of countries in their region. The motion introduces a mechanism of quarterly report to encourage regional staff to think about areas in decline.

Mr. Clark moved: “That the Board of Governors directs Regional Directors to use the data on their ATC coverage to identify those facilities where staffing is in decline, or are not growing sufficiently, and to take actions to improve their staffing, and to report back on a quarterly basis on their progress in improving ATC coverage for each ACC they are responsible for.”

Mr. Jenkins seconded the motion.

The voting was as follows:

Roland Collins (RC) - yes
Jeff Clark (JC) –yes
Ruth McTighe (RMT) - yes
Richard Jenkins (RJ) - yes
Marv Thompson (MT) - yes
Michael Zazula (MZ) - yes
George Marinakis (GSM) - yes
Michael Bevington – proxy to RJ - yes
Roberto Bazzano – proxy to GSM - yes
Rob Phillips – proxy to RC - yes

Lefteris Kalamaras – proxy to GSM – yes

Mr. Clark then introduced a motion to address the problem when Regional Directors “go missing” or are not fulfilling their regional commitments.

Mr. Clark moved that “That as the Board of Governors recognizes that in some unfortunate circumstances, the priorities of regional staff change, and their ability to manage the progress of their areas changes, the Board hereby amends paragraph 3.05 B, “Executive Committee – Authority and Duties of Regional Directors - Duties” to include a new subparagraph 9 as follows:

“9. Provision of ATC Services: A Regional Director shall ensure that his or her division puts into place policies and managers that provide the widest possible ATC coverage for the pilots of VATSIM, and shall ensure that no policy is put into place which adversely affects the overall staffing of the airspace delegated to them, or impedes the growth of facilities in their region. Furthermore, the Regional Director shall provide periodic reports to the Board of Governors, as directed by them, on their progress in helping ensure the growth of the facilities under their jurisdiction.”

Mr. Zazula asked what would happen if a Regional Director failed to follow the provisions of subparagraph 9.

Mr. Marinakis said it was a good question. Mr. Marinakis indicated that the language of subparagraph 9 was good, but that it might be good to modify 3.05(a) to give the BOG express oversight to ensure the RD’s fulfill their responsibilities in subparagraph (b), which would give us the authority to act if a Regional Director is not fulfilling his duties.

Mr. Collins said he didn’t have a problem with adding paragraph 9, but asked that the phrase “unfortunate circumstances” be removed as it was a bit “wishy washy”.

Mr. Clark indicated he was happy to withdraw that phrase.

Mr. Marinakis stated that it would be more appropriate to change the CoR not through a motion, but as these changes require a supermajority, through a formal document prepared by GSM, issued for comments, and then put up for a formal vote recorded by CERT. He asked for time to make appropriate changes and then to present it to the BOG for review and comments.

Mr. Zazula noted that as this motion was a part of Mr. Clark’s set of motions, it would weaken the entire package as presented by Mr. Clark.

Mr. Collins asked that motion 6 be amended to a motion to commission a new amendment to the CoR.

Mr. Clark withdrew his motion, and changed it to read that “The BOG requests that Mr. Marinakis prepare an amendment to the CoR which will make clear to Regional Directors that they have a duty to ensure that their regions provide ATC coverage and to provide periodic reports to the BOG as directed.”

Mr. Jenkins seconded the motion.

The voting was as follows:

Roland Collins (RC) - yes
Jeff Clark (JC) –yes
Ruth McTighe (RMT) - yes
Richard Jenkins (RJ) - yes
Marv Thompson (MT) - yes
Michael Zazula (MZ) - yes
George Marinakis (GSM) - yes
Michael Bevington – proxy to RJ - yes
Roberto Bazzano – proxy to GSM - yes
Rob Phillips – proxy to RC - yes
Lefteris Kalamaras – proxy to GSM – yes

With 11 votes in favour and none against, the motion was carried.

Lack of Promotions in some regions

Mr. Clark pointed out a recent discussion by the BOG on the low rate of promotions in certain regions and noted that the consensus was that the BOG wished to approach these RDs to seek their views on the problem and to suggest, but not dictate, possible solutions.

Mr. Clark presented a motion requesting that certain RD's be asked to consider restructuring of their training departments or possible creation of new divisions to remove training roadblocks.

Mr. Zazula noted that there were other divisions that had worse promotion statistics than the ones mentioned in the motion, and suggested that the motion be amended to make it relevant to all of these regions, so it does not single out a particular region or staff member as performing badly.

Mr. Marinakis indicated that while he agreed that certain regions had serious issues with promotions, it was important that RD's not feel singled out.

Mr. Clark accepted Mr. Marinakis' argument and indicated he would be happy to broaden the motion to include other regions. He also indicated that he was not dogmatic about the way to approach the issue, and that his goal was simply to ensure that a signal was sent via the BOG that certain regions needed to give serious consideration to their rate of promotions, and that a good mechanism for this would be to require reports on the regions' progress on that front.

Mr. Jenkins noted that in some regions, training was like a business that was not replacing employees as quickly as they left, and consequently overall ATC numbers were declining, as for every 5 controllers who left to pursue other hobbies we were only replacing 1 or 2. Mr. Jenkins noted that with regards to that, there was room for all the regions to improve.

Mr. Collins noted that a previous motion may be relevant and made the following alternative motion:

“That the BOG directs Regional Directors to use the data on the rate of promotions to identify those facilities where promotion rates were not satisfactory and to take action to improve their staffing and to report back on a quarterly basis on the progress made in improving promotion rates for each ACC for which they are responsible.”

Mr. Clark indicated that he would accept this alternative motion but noted that many on the BOG still had a concern about training in specific regions, and that while we may not need to deal with it through a formal motion, that someone from the BOG should still discuss the specific problem of these training departments with the relevant RDs.

Mr. Marinakis agreed that it was time for a frank discussion with the Regional Directors about these issues and that it would be better than a formal motion “from above.”

Mr. Clark seconded Roland’s alternative motion.

Mr. Zazula indicated he also wished to support the alternative motion.

Mr. Marinakis said he was still not convinced that the motion was the best route to go at this time, and that it was unwise to proceed with it at this time.

Ms. McTighe said she was still concerned about the best way to get a dialogue with the EC going. She noted that only 2 RD’s had posted in the newly set up BOG/EC forum, and was concerned that it seemed difficult to “get these guys engaged”.

Mr. Collins said he still felt that we need to get the motion up on the table to flag where we are going as an organization.

Mr. Clark asked Mr. Collins to again read his motion:

“That the BOG directs Regional Directors to use the data on the rate of promotions to identify those facilities where promotion rates were not satisfactory and to take action to improve their staffing and to report back on a quarterly basis on the progress made in improving promotion rates for each ACC for which they are responsible.”

Ms. McTighe said she agreed with the general principle, but unsure of the use of the phrase “unsatisfactory” as it was not clear how that could be defined.

Mr. Clark suggested the wording could be amended to read, “improve”.

Mr. Thompson concurred.

(At this time, Mr. Jenkins noted that Mr. Marinakis would have to leave shortly and that the meeting would lose its quorum at that time.)

Ms. McTighe suggested that the phrase “lower than average”, which was accepted by Mr. Clark.

The amended motion therefore read:

“That the BOG directs Regional Directors to use the data on the rate of promotions to identify those facilities where promotion rates are lower than average and to take action to improve their staffing and to report back on a quarterly basis on the progress made in improving promotion rates for each ACC for which they are responsible.”

Mr. Thompson seconded the amended motion.

The voting was as follows:

Roland Collins (RC) - yes
Jeff Clark (JC) – yes
Ruth McTighe (RMT) - yes
Richard Jenkins (RJ) - yes
Marv Thompson (MT) - yes
Michael Zazula (MZ) - yes
George Marinakis (GSM) - no
Michael Bevington – proxy to RJ - no
Roberto Bazzano – proxy to GSM - yes
Rob Phillips – proxy to RC - yes
Lefteris Kalamaras – proxy to GSM – no

With 8 votes in favour and 3 against, the motion carried.

Specific Problem ACC's

Mr. Clark recapped discussions on the BOG lists where we have addressed specific problems with specific facilities and suggested a motion which is intended to signal to the regions that we are expecting accountability from the Regions re: these particular problems.

The text of Mr. Clark’s motion was as follows:

“Whereas the Board of Governors believes that a key responsibility of Regional Directors and Regional Staff, including Training Staff and ACC/ARTCC teams is to provide the widest possible ATC coverage, and whereas the BoG notes that there are many areas where ATC coverage is in decline in areas where it was once widespread, or areas where it could be reasonably expected to be higher, the BOG require that Regional Directors shall prepare a report to the BOG, no later than 1 August, 2006, with responses to the following questions for each of the “Target ACC’s” listed below:

- 1.) For each of the “Target ACC’s”, what position restrictions are there which affect the ability of controllers to provide ATC coverage, and which of these can be removed to improve coverage?*
- 2.) For each of the “Target ACC’s”, what, in your opinion, is the cause of this facility’s low level of ATC coverage?*

- 3.) *What positive steps can be taken by your regional staff to improve the staffing in the “Target ACC’s”, and by what date will these steps be achieved?*
- 4.) *What impact has regional training policy had on the number of active controllers in the “Target ACC’s”, and what can be done to improve the number of controllers trained in this area?*
- 5.) *Which positions in this facility are currently unstaffed or understaffed (staffed by someone who does not frequently log in or do their duties?)*
- 6.) *Do these facilities have regularly updated websites, active forums, and publicly available charts, and if not, when does your region hope to have them established?*

“TARGET ACC’s” – Regional Directors shall report back on the progress of the following ACC’s:

<i>Europe</i>	<i>Asia</i>	<i>AME</i>	<i>N. America</i>	<i>S. America</i>
<i>France</i>	<i>Indonesia</i>	<i>Saudi Arabia</i>	<i>Toronto</i>	<i>Brazil</i>
<i>The Netherlands</i>	<i>China</i>	<i>Egypt</i>	<i>Memphis</i>	<i>Argentina</i>
<i>The Ukraine</i>	<i>Thailand</i>	<i>U.A.E.</i>	<i>Oakland</i>	

Mr. Collins noted that a motion would probably not be required, and that simply asking RD’s about specific problem areas would suffice.

Mr. Clark asked if Mr. Collins would be happy to ask the RD’s on the BOG’s behalf?

Mr. Collins said it was probably better to wait for the survey data to be released and then ask the questions later.

Mr. Clark agreed to withdraw the motion and to defer the matter to a later date.

Mr. Zazula said that he strongly felt that the issues brought up in the motion should not be dropped and needed to be pursued.

Mr. Jenkins said that it would be a good idea to bring these particular facilities up at a forthcoming EC/BOG meeting.

(At this time Mr. Zazula temporarily left the meeting)

Website

Ms. McTighe recounted that it has taken more time than expected to get the draft website up and running.

Mr. Jenkins noted that the developer hasn’t been allowed access to the databases and servers by Richard Critz, so is hampered in his development. He noted it has taken almost a year, and we may still have issues with different developers not wishing to

disclose code to other developers, which may raise other concerns, and has become frustrating.

Mr. Jenkins noted that there may be other individuals willing to help with websites, and if the present project continues to drag out, we may have to look at asking others to do a new website for us.

(Mr. Zazula then returned to the meeting).

Supervisors

Mr. Zazula moved that the following list of 43 names to be upgraded to the post of Supervisor:

Paul	Biderman
John	Holt
Craig	Batt
Matt	Kreilein
Karl	Kleiber
Coby	Landry
Jeff	Williams
Steven	Perry
Eric	Fortin
John	Golin
Scott	Thorpe
Jose Helio	Possebon
Daniel Villela	Teixera
Guillermo Utz	Horst
Rodrigo	Cabrales
Oswaldo	Rodriguez
Juan Pablo	Simonet Nadal
Chrisian Eme	Zanelli
Ivan	Quintana
Fred	Navarro
Lech	Koniec
Jerzy	Buczyński
Daniel	Gomes
Jan	Neslund
Simon	Irvine
Gareth	Williams
Antonio Martin	Gomez
Dustin	Watts
Donato	Torrese
Sabih	Gultekin
Daryl	Reilly
Andrew	Sheyback
Michael	Hermes
Juerg	Gaensli
Faruk	Baran
Christian	Sager
Stephen	Naughton
Florian	Harms
Krzysztof	Szerszeń
Seamus	O Gradaigh
Pedro	Fernandez
Ariel	Peraz
Carlos Andres	Moran Fernandez

Mr. Clark seconded the motion.

Roland Collins (RC) - yes
Jeff Clark (JC) –yes
Ruth McTighe (RMT) - yes
Richard Jenkins (RJ) - yes
Marv Thompson (MT) - yes
Michael Zazula (MZ) - yes
George Marinakis (GSM) - yes
Michael Bevington – proxy to RJ - yes
Roberto Bazzano – proxy to GSM - yes
Rob Phillips – proxy to RC - yes
Lefteris Kalamaras – proxy to GSM – yes

With 11 votes in favour and none against, the motion was carried.

At 1903Z, Mr. Marinakis left the meeting and the meeting no longer had the required quorum.

A brief discussion continued on website development, and BOG reorganization and the meeting was formally adjourned at 1916Z.

APPENDIX 1: Inter-Meeting Actions

On 19 March, 2006, the BoG voted unanimously to approve the minutes of the February 25th 2006 meeting, which were published on the VATSIM.net website.

On 20 March, 2006, the BoG voted unanimously to “approve amendments to Article II., §2.04 and Article III., §3.06 of the Code of Regulations as set forth in the email sent to the BOG on Monday, March 13, 2006 at 1420 UTC (920a EST U.S.).” The text of this amendment is available at:

<http://www.vatsim.net/archives/minutes/Mar06%20cor%20amendment.pdf>

On 17 April, 2006 the BoG voted unanimously to “approve the unrestricted use of VRC (new controller client by Ross Carlson) on our network.”

On 17 April, 2006, the BoG voted unanimously to “approve the license agreement for Virtual Radar Client (VRC).

On 06 June, 2006, the BoG voted on the motion “That the BOG will no longer organise an annual "International Convention", and that the regions are advised that if they wish to, they can organise their own "regional" conventions instead, subject to sufficient safeguards being taken to ensure fiscal propriety, the requirements of which to be outlined to the regions.”

The voting on the motion was as follows:

Jeff Clark	FOR
Michael Zazula	FOR
Richard Jenkins	FOR
Marvin Thompson	FOR
Lefteris Kalamaras	FOR
Michael Bevington	FOR

With 6 votes for the motion, and 0 votes against the motion was passed.