

From: WNGGA@[REDACTED]  
To: wngga@[REDACTED]  
Subject: RE: review and next steps  
Date: Sun, 01 Feb 2004 01:52:26 +0000

Hi Alan,

Just to follow up on your reply.

What you said about the core committee doesn't address the questions I raised.

(1) Has this core committee been chosen for Orlando 2005? If so, who is on it (other than myself and Huw)?

(2) What is the relationship between the core committee and the Orlando 2005 program committee? How are the responsibilities divided between them? This and the preceding question are pressing, because the first planning meeting of Orlando 2005 will take place on March 6.

(3) Not really a question here- we need to draw up a document like the old "Rules and Regulations/How to Host a National Gymanfa" that outlines the process for organizing the event according to the new structure and procedures. We need this clearly spelled out, both for future members of the BOT and to ensure that everyone is on the same page.

Logo: There is no argument about the need or importance of the logo, and what you are saying regarding the logo being available in different formats is understood. The problem is rather a practical one- we simply don't have the logo on any formats (such as tif) that can be used by anyone on the Buffalo committee or HQ. If someone from the Richmond committee has the logo in tif format, email it to me and the problem is solved. This too is a pressing matter as the Buffalo registration booklet and form is past due. This is not due to the logo of course, but once the info is compiled the program booklet will be produced quickly whether we have the original artwork for the logo in a useable form or not (ie., I will scan the logo from a Richmond program if necessary).

Electronic lists: The files are not on the association computers. If you can send them as email attachments, that would be great.

Website: The only thing I know is that the update for Buffalo has not been done. This may be due to the fact that the registration information has not yet been produced by the Buffalo committee. I will check up on this but I just wanted to confirm that David Williams is the right person to talk to about updating the site. As for updating the NAFOW site, I am not sure if it will be difficult or not to edit with basic software like Netscape composer, Pagemaker, ect. For example, those programs may not have the same fonts, ect. I will look into it.

Def/Strag  
Plan

From: "Ellis, John" <ellisj@comcast.net>  
 To: "Lynn Owens-Whalen" <lowens-whalen@comcast.net>  
 Cc: "Alan Upshall" <aupsh@comcast.net>, "Briggs, Jan" <nbriggs@comcast.net>, "Gerri Baker Parry (E-mail)" <gbaker@comcast.net>, "Jones, Geraint Herbert" <megh.jones@comcast.net>, "Jones, Keith Davies" <kjones@comcast.net>, "Pepper, Sheila" <shenkenpe@comcast.net>, "Richard Baskwill" <rbaskwill@comcast.net>, <wngga@comcast.net>, <huw.williams@comcast.net>, <buck@comcast.net>, <cwhclay@comcast.net>, <WNGGA@comcast.net>  
 Subject: RE: review and next steps  
 Date: Mon, 2 Feb 2004 14:49:59 -0500

Thanks for the reply and clarification, Lynn. Its good to get these things ironed out. I have a couple of questions and comments, which I will make in the order as they appear in Lynn's email-

Lynn indicates that the NAFOW core committee (as per the NAFOW Strategic Plan) is the same as the Orlando committee that has been appointed by the president from the BOT. I think there is still some confusion here. The NAFOW core committee passed in Stratford as part of the strategic plan is only composed of four people (two of them being the executive director and the treasurer) while the Orlando committee appointed from the BOT currently includes six members (not including the executive director and treasurer). Furthermore, the core committee in the Strategic Plan sits for a three year term, while the appointed Orlando committee appears to be specific to 2005. I think this needs to be clarified.

I would not favor uninviting anyone or complicating matters with any group or entertainer already contacted by Lynn and Alan about participating in Orlando. However, I do think that any such contacts and/or developments need to be identified and discussed with the appointed Orlando committee as a whole as soon as possible. Perhaps this could be the thing to get the Orlando committee rolling. My main concern here is that everyone on that committee knows what has been done (or is being done) and what needs to be done. I should also be added to the names mentioned by Lynn as sitting on the Orlando 2005 committee, as the executive director sits on all committees ex-officio (as does the president) but also due to the role played by HQ in registration.

The difficulty with the treasurer serving on the four member NAFOW core committee (as per the Strategic Plan) is that the term of the treasurer does not correspond to the three year stint of the core committee, necessitating a change in the personel of the committee

after its first year. Rather than being staggered, perhaps the term of the core committee could correspond with the terms of the president, vp and treasurer, thus ensuring continuity.

I have had contact with Jan Briggs and she has indicated that she is happy to serve on the Orlando committee but declines the position as chair. So, someone else needs to be approached about chairing the committee asap.

I think we definitely need a document spelling out the guidelines, rules and procedures for organizing a NAFOW and that this should be

done by the NAFOW Strategic Planning Committee.

I certainly agree that the NAFOW committee should take on the production of the registration booklet, program, ect. For Buffalo, I am merely helping out of necessity- no one on the committee has the skills or software to do the work and no arrangements were made to have a professional do it.

There may be some difficulty in simply updating the NAFOW website from

year to year in its present form. I took a look at how this would work using Netscape Composer. In that web-writing software, most of the elements of the current website are uneditable- for example, the banner "North American Festival of Wales Richmond 2003" appears as a single image. You cannot edit the text to delete "Richmond 2003" and add "Buffalo 2004". All you can do is delete the entire image. We may have different results if we use a different software program like Microsoft Frontpage or if we have someone who can write HTML code directly, I don't know. If this is a problem, a new website could be created using "user friendly" software like Composer or Frontpage that could be edited from year to year with little trouble.

John Ellis

Del/Strat  
Plan

From: "Lynn Owens-Whalen" <lowens-whelen@ric[redacted].ca>  
 To: "Ellis, John" <ellisj[redacted]>  
 Cc: "Alan Upshall" <aupshall[redacted]>, "Briggs, Jan" <nain[redacted]>, "Gerri Baker Parry (E-mail)" <gbakerp[redacted]>, "Jones, Geraint Herbert" <megh.jones[redacted]>, "Jones, Keith Davies" <kjones@[redacted]>, "Pepper, Sheila" <shenker[redacted]>, "Richard Baskwill" <rba[redacted]>, <wngga@[redacted]>, huw.williams[at]net, buck[redacted], cw[redacted]@net

Subject: Re: review and next steps  
 Date: Mon, 02 Feb 2004 09:19:13 -0800

"Ellis, John" <ellisj[redacted]> writes:

>1) NAFOW core committee: There is some confusion over the four member  
 >NAFOW "core committee" and how that will work. At present, there is a  
 >committee for NAFOW 2005 in place consisting of Jan Briggs, Trudy  
 >Howells, Ann McFerrin, Myfanwy Davies, Alan Upshall, Lynn Owens-Whalen  
 >(ex-officio) and John Ellis (ex-officio) (a chair has not yet been  
 >appointed but should be forthcoming soon). This committee was  
 >appointed by the President as part of the regular committee  
 >appointments. How does this committee square with the four member  
 >NAFOW "core committee"?

The committee is the core committee for Orlando. This is no different that the Richmond 2003 and Buffalo 2004 committee in that the role and the appointments are made in the exact same way. The difference between Richmond and Buffalo is that the Richmond committee included three BOT members ..... Alan Upshall ( who was President and then Past President and

was not ex officio ), Lynn O-W and Gerri Baker Parry. ) The other members of the core ( we called it the organizing committee ) were not members of the BOT but were expected to be members of the WNGGA. In Buffalo, all members of the core organizing committee happen to be BOT members but I think it is possible that this happened because of the 75th anniversary. So, Orlando ..... Jan, Trudy, Ann, Myfanwy, Lynn and Alan have volunteered to be on the core organizing committee for Orlando. Therefore, I did what had happened before and appointed them. The purpose of this committee is the organization of Orlando and I wrote this in the descriptor for this committee. This, too, is what happened with Richmond and Buffalo.

We do have a problem if there is to be a change in mid stream. First Alan and I have been actively working on programme and we had better back up and uninvite people if there is a different group. If this is the case,

let me know now because sensing confusion, I am already delaying responses and this doesn't do much for our profile in Wales.

The NAFOW Strategic Planning Committee report passed in Stratford last year, outlines much of what is to be the future structure of the NAFOW.  
 >What are their respective roles?

To organize Orlando 2005.

>To my

>knowledge, the BOT has not established the core committee for 2005 or  
 >appointed the two members from the BOT to that core committee. When  
 >and how does this get established?

In Richmond through Committee appointments. I did indicate in the 'charge' of this committee that this was the case.

>Huw will no longer be the

>treasurer in 2005, so should he continue to serve on the core  
 >committee?

I believe that the BOT referred to the Treasurer, not Huw, so I would

expect that the new Treasurer would assume that role.

>We need to get the Orlando 2005 committee structure and  
>planning procedures nailed down as soon as possible as arrangements

>for the planning meeting in early March are underway.

Agreed. That is why I made sure that the committee was in place last September. My feeling is that the committee is not working together because there is no chairperson. I did approach Jan and asked her if she would co-chair but have not heard from her.

>The strategic

>planning committee should also plan on reviewing and revising the HQ  
>document, "How to Plan a National," based on the new structure and  
>procedures- as of right now, this outdated document provides the only  
>guidelines and timetable available for 2005.

No. This is the work of the NAFOW Strategic Planning Committee. At present there are three NAFOW committees ..... Buffalo, 2004, Orlando, 2005 and the NAFOW Strategic Planning Committee chaired by Alan Upshall.

>

>2) NAFOW logo: The NAFOW logo is great but there are a few technical  
>problems in its implementation. The only form of the logo that we

>currently have is in a format which is specifically for specialized  
>computer graphics programs. We at HQ do not have this program or the  
>expertise to use it. So, right now we don't have any method for  
>employing the original graphic art for the logo, short of turning over  
>all publication layout to a hired professional graphic artist which I  
>don't think we can afford. If the logo was supplied in a TIF format,  
>we could use it to make publications in-house with programs like  
>Microsoft Publisher. Buffalo does not have anyone with graphics or  
>desktop publishing expertise and so has asked me to do the layout for  
>their registration and program booklets with Microsoft Publisher,  
>which I am glad to do. The best I can do with the logo, however, is  
>to scan the image from the Richmond program and use the resulting TIF  
>file- an admittedly second best solution to using the original art work.  
>As for using the logo in stationary, ect., I am not sure it is wise to

>create too sharp a distinction between NAFOW and the WNGGA by having  
>separate stationary, documents, ect. NAFOW is the event but the WNGGA  
>is the organizing and sponsoring body, so shouldn't communications,  
>ect. be from the WNGGA rather than NAFOW? I also need to point out  
>the expense involved in printing two sets of stationary- its not a  
>major expense but given our financial situation we should be wary of  
>taking on additional "nickel and dime" expenses that duplicate things  
>we already have.

I think, John, that you have assumed a tremendous amount of work at HQ that should be done by the core organizing committee. Probably the unique circumstances of Buffalo had a lot to do with this but it nevertheless, should not be the blueprint for the future. Richmond looked after all of what you mention here and so should Orlando. Similarly, Richmond generated sponsorships for funding activities such as what you described above therefore, Ellis and HQ had no role in the areas that you are

referring to.

I will be blunt in saying that my concern is that we have a venue in Orlando with few if any individuals in the area who are willing and able to do what Alan, Gerri and I were able to do in Richmond and that is to be close enough to get a core of locals together on behalf of the WNGGA to put on the WNGGA. However, we have Orlando and we will have to figure out how to make it work. This will not be like either Richmond or Buffalo but it will have BOT members on the core organizing committee and this

committee will have to access local volunteers. I believe that the immediate need is for Jan who is on the ground in Florida to recruit 4 or 5 individuals from within a reasonable radius from Orlando to join Jan, Trudy, Ann, Myfanwy, Alan and I on the core organizing committee for Orlando.

>

>3) Electronic names list: I need some clarification on the >electronic names list mentioned. Are we talking about the lists of

>officers, board members, past presidents, executive directors, venue >chairpersons, gymanfa venues and directors?

I will defer this to Myfanwy.

>Unfortunately, we do not

>have these lists on our computers at HQ but they can be easily >replicated from the Richmond program. However, I wonder if the >printing of the historical lists (as opposed to the list of current >leadership) in the program brochure are actually necessary, >particularly in the light of Alf Reese's impending history of the >WNGGA which will contain such information for those who have an >interest. Perhaps these could be eliminated or reduced (perhaps a >list of past locations could be retained in the program to underscore >the longevity of the organization). Every page printed costs money. >Just a thought.

Absolutely .... keep the historical references such as locations. The WNGGA has a long, continuous and special role that provides us with 'roots' and considerable pride. Yeah, team !

>

>4) Festival insurance: We have currently carry all the forms of >insurance previously carried by HQ in its Minnesota location, >including general liability. We are also making arrangements for a >\$50 rider necessary for the use of Goat Island at the ceremony in >Buffalo. We will check to see if additional insurance is necessary to >cover the NAFOW itself.

Alan will be able to comment on this.

>

>5) Solicitation of host cities: As part of her committee >appointments, the president appointed a "future venue" committee made >up of Lynn, Alan, Huw and myself. Following discussion with this >committee, I mailed an invitation to a list of ten city convention >bureaus inviting them to solicit proposals from their area hotels for >the NAFOW in 2006, 2007 and 2008. The invitation included a specs >sheet with basic information on expected numbers, requirements, >generic agenda, ect. We have been receiving these proposals and will

>compile them into a comparative chart for the review of the Future >Venue Committee. These will be distributed to the Future Venue >Committee before the April BOT so that they can be discussed at the >meeting. The next step would be to narrow down the list to a few >cities. Given our experience with Orlando, the best thing to do is >then to ask for contracts to review from at least two hotels in each >city, putting them into a direct competitive relationship, asking for >djustments in the contracts and thus negotiating the best deal. Great. I have been wondering about this. Glad to hear that you have had favourable responses. The committee also has to set out important criteria to follow for selecting a site. I mentioned a concern above that I believe will have to be one of those criteria ( WNGGA presence and willing organizing people on the ground near the site )

>

>6) Website: The BOT decided that the NAFOW website would be

age

>transferred to the control of David Williams, who maintains the WNGGA  
>website. Does this mean that David will design the NAFOW website  
>based upon information provided by the Buffalo committee? I am unsure  
>what the current status of the website is but note that it has yet to  
>be changed from its Richmond form (although the WNGGA website have  
>some information on Buffalo from its pages).  
Alan can comment on this too but the obvious thing to do from my  
perspective is not to reinvent the wheel but to go with the site that has  
already been developed and simply update from year to year. That is what  
we had in mind when the 2003 web site was created. It was meant to be a  
WNGGA - NAFOW website ..... not a Richmond site.  
Knowing that the WNGGA is taking an active role in the NAFOW means that we  
need to be efficient at what we do. The web site is one example of this.  
I believe that Alan has suggested ways in which that web site can be  
transferred to future sites for its' use.  
>

>Yours truly,

>John Ellis

Thanks, John. I noticed that the email was sent to the Buffalo 2004  
committee but not the Executive which I think would benefit from this  
discussion. Therefore I have added them to the file.

Cheers !

Lynn

[ [Original View](#) ]

[Get Email](#) | [Message List](#) | [Compose](#) | [Folders](#) | [Address](#) | [Mailboxes](#) | [Options](#)  
[Help](#) | [Sign Out](#) | [Comcast Home](#)

]

Date

**Karen Ellis**

---

**From:** <Gbakerpa[REDACTED]>  
**To:** <lowens-whaler[REDACTED]>  
**Cc:** <rbask[REDACTED]> <NainTai[REDACTED]> <cwycla[REDACTED]> <culling[REDACTED]>;  
 <h.m.davies[REDACTED]>; <ellisjs[REDACTED]>; <edfield[REDACTED]>;  
 <sbfund[REDACTED]>; <berwynj[REDACTED]>; <megh.jone[REDACTED]>;  
 <kjones@c[REDACTED]>; <lewis[REDACTED]> <dmandry[REDACTED]>;  
 <ammc[REDACTED]>; <ghowellsmurphy[REDACTED]>; <shenpen[REDACTED]>;  
 <roscyn[REDACTED]>; <aupshall[REDACTED]>; <huw.william[REDACTED]>;  
 <WNGC[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Friday, February 20, 2004 10:46 AM  
**Subject:** Re:concerns

Dear All:

I have a few concerns. I have not weighed in on several of the emails that have been circulating this past month as I have been trying to catch up and get an opinion. Forgive me if I might be a little behind on a few of the conversations. I was unable to attend the BOT meetings in Richmond as I had conflicting responsibilities with the opening of the Welsh Resource Center, Marketplace and the storage areas each morning. So I thought that I needed to come back to the basics for some clarification as to where we are going or more importantly where we are beginning.

In my mind we have had so many changes as to how the WNGGA and NAFOW work in a very short time. We should be a bit careful to build a solid base and structure, fine tune a few of the kinks before moving on to more major changes and be careful not to fall under the weight of it.

Surely I am not the only one who is a bit confused about the new role of the BOT in planning the NAFOW and how it will all work. There needs to be careful balance since we are a board of volunteers who very probably are the folks who do quite a bit of volunteering locally as well. I speak only for myself when I say that I need to be able to see the whole picture clearly so that I can mesh it all together and follow through with what I say that I will do.

I am only now figuring out how I am best needed in Buffalo 04, I feel it is beyond me to be able to put my name down to commit to a volunteer position in Orlando 05 without a better understanding of the frame work we are building around and working within. It will also help me to avoid the situation that I had in Richmond. If the board members are running the Festival then who will attend the board meetings, how will the work be divided?

To put the idea of changing the date into the mix and take away one of the pillars that we know guarantees an audience (granted an aging one) is premature. Might it be prudent to put our energies into getting the new structure in place, a 'plan' we can physically look at and build around, up and running smoothly before possibly pulling the rug out from under us by making more changes than a volunteer board can realistically accomplish.

I am not against the change of date issue, for future discussion, it may make perfect sense some time down the road but I don't like gambling on blue sky. I find it difficult to commit to and work within a concept that I cannot grasp right at the moment.

Gerri Parry

2/20/2004