



**The Adrian Empire
Imperial Estates Meeting
July 27 and 28, 2019
Agenda**

Published June 12, 2019

Prepared and submitted by:

Edelinne d'Orsay, Imperial Chancellor

Elizabeth Blacksword, Deputy Imperial Chancellor

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. SIGN IN.....	6
II. CALL TO ORDER.....	6
III. ROLL CALL.....	6
IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES.....	6
V. REPORTS	6
VI. CROWN BUSINESS.....	7
CRB1. Charter Amendments.....	7
CRB2. Removing July IEM Schedule Restrictions.....	8
CRB3. Updated Steward’s Manual (IEW-3).....	8
CRB4. Amend the Structure of the Governing Body.....	8
VII. CHANCERY BUSINESS.....	9
CHB1. Court Reports.....	9
CHB2. Consideration of Acceptability of Imperial Crown Contenders.....	10
CHB3. Election of the Board of Directors.....	10
VIII. OLD BUSINESS.....	10
OB1. Amend November IEM Schedule.....	10
OB2. Standardize the Lengths of BoD Terms of Office.....	11
OB3. Remove Requirement for Written Proxies.....	12
OB4. Standardize Requirements for Knight’s and Journeyman’s Judges.....	12
OB5. Clarify the Scoring of Arts Entries.....	13
OB6. Clarify or Amend the Requirements for Garnering a Masterwork.....	14
OB7. Further Clarify the Awarding of a Masterwork in Tournament and/or War.....	15
OB8. Reference Rather than Restate Masterwork Requirements.....	16
OB9. Clarify the Requirements for a Successful Arts Entry.....	16
OB10. Expand Arts Manual Article V to Include Uncontested Wars.....	17
OB11. Clarify War Judging Procedures.....	17
OB12. Reduce Minimum Age for Rapier Participation.....	18
OB13. Resolved: New platform for file storage.....	19
OB14. Resolved: Overhaul Rolls & Lists database.....	19
IX. NEW BUSINESS.....	20
NB1. Revision of the Imperial Calendar.....	20
X. DISCUSSION ITEMS.....	21

D1. Independent Judiciary.....21

D2. Role of the Board of Directors21

XI. NEXT MEETING OF THE IMPERIAL ESTATES21

XII. ADJOURNMENT21

GENERAL MEETING INFORMATION

Location: La Quinta – Las Vegas Airport South, 6560 Surrey St, Las Vegas NV 89119

Date and Time*:

	TBD	BoD Meeting
Sat, 27 July :	8:30 – 9:15	Sign In
	9:30 – 5:00	Imperial Estates Meeting
Sun, 28 July:	9:30 – 5:00	Imperial Estates Meeting (as needed)

Airport:

Shuttle service from Las Vegas McCarran International Airport (LAS) to the hotel

Reservations and Rates:

To reserve a room, please call 702-492-8900 and request the group rate for the Adrian Empire. Please do not wait to the last minute to make your reservation! **All reservations must be made by June 26, 2019.**

Room Rate: \$94/night + tax

*** - All times are local time (PDT)**

Legend:

~~Deleted or replaced text~~

Added or new text

(Requirements for actions and approval)

Chancery notes, comments, and explanations.

Author's commentary

Imperial Crown commentary

Requirement for Written Proxies (Lex Adria Imperium, Article VI.H.)

It is the right of any member entitled to a vote to give a written proxy to any other Adrian member attending the meeting.

1. Written proxies are effective when presented to the Chancellor.
2. The proxy-holder may present a copy to the Chancellor when signing in for the meeting, or
3. The proxy-granter may mail or electronically submit a copy to the Chancellor, provided it is received at least 72 hours prior to the meeting.

If a proxy is not presented to the Chancery Office by the end of Roll Call, the vote will not be counted.

AGENDA

I. SIGN IN

II. CALL TO ORDER

III. ROLL CALL

A. Seating of qualified members and written proxies

B. Petitions to waive as per Article VI.E.6.

(Requires 2/3 to approve.)

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. Approval of the minutes of the March 2019 IEM

(Requires majority to approve.)

V. REPORTS

A. Executive

1. Crown(s)
2. President and Board of Directors

B. Ministers

1. Archery
2. Arts and Sciences
3. Chancery
4. Hospitaler
5. Joust and War
6. Physicker
7. Publishing (includes Imperial Webmaster, Chronicler, etc.)
8. Rolls and Lists
9. Sovereign of Arms
10. Steward
11. Other Officers

VI. CROWN BUSINESS

CRB1. Charter Amendments

Chancery Note: These listings are based on the Membership Summary as of the date of publication.

A. Consider reducing the following Chapters in status due to insufficient numbers:

1. Kingdom of Esperance (*Requires 2/3 to reduce*)
Current membership: 54
2. Archduchy of Glynmore (*Requires majority to reduce*)
Current membership: 22
3. Duchy of Burgundy (*Requires majority to reduce*)
Current membership: 13
4. Duchy of Connacht (*Requires majority to reduce*)
Current membership: 19
5. Duchy of Lancaster (*Requires majority to reduce*)
Current membership: 11

B. Crown announcement regarding formation of Shires

1. Shire of Wrenbury
Current membership: 11

C. Crown decision regarding Shires with fewer than 5 members:

1. Shire of Beauwood
Current membership: 2
2. Shire of Gloucester
Current membership: 1
3. Shire of Murrisk
Current membership: 4
4. Shire of Normandy
Current membership: 1
5. Shire of Sherwood
Current membership: 11

D. Announcement of Chapter elevations pre-approved in March 2019

1. Wolfendorf elevated to Duchy
Current membership: 23
2. Alhambra elevated to Duchy
Current membership: 46
3. Gaelacia elevated to Duchy

Current membership: 25

E. Elevate the following Chapters in status:
(Requires majority to approve.)

None received.

CRB2. Removing July IEM Schedule Restrictions

(Requires 2/3 to approve.)

Modify Lex Adria Imperium VI.A.1 as follows:

“1. Imperial Estates Meetings shall be held:

“a. The first Saturday (and the day after) of November

“b. During the month of March

“c. ~~The third Saturday (and the day after) of July~~ During the month of July, but not on the first weekend of July”

AND Modify Lex Adria Imperium VI.E.5 as follows:

“5. Meeting Date, July

“The Imperial Estates shall meet ~~on the third Saturday of July (and the following day)~~ in July of every year, at which time they shall conduct appropriate business, including but not limited to: ...”

Tabled at March meeting. Discussion points included possibility of considering other weekends, month of August, proposed calendar revisions, and need to accommodate financial deadlines as well as Chancery deadlines.

CRB3. Updated Steward’s Manual (IEW-3)

(Requires majority to approve.)

*Updated manual **DRAFT** published separately; old version posted separately on Agenda/Minutes page for comparison. Draft is subject to ongoing revisions by Chancery to address typographical, grammatical, formatting, and legal consistency errors prior to July meeting date; please check back periodically for updates.*

CRB4. Amend the Structure of the Governing Body

(Discussion automatic. Requires 2/3 to consider and 2/3 to approve.)

Modify Lex Adria Imperium and other related references in law to weight the number of Estates Minor representatives on the Imperial Estates according to Chapter level:

ARTICLE VI. MEETINGS OF THE GOVERNING BODY

A. IMPERIAL GOVERNING BODIES; SUMMONING MEETINGS

The governing body of the Adrian Empire is the Imperial Estates (composed of the Imperial Estate, the Estates Royal, the Estates Major, and the two senior landed Estates Minor from each ~~Chapter~~ Shire or Duchy, three senior landed Estates Minor from each Arch-Duchy, and four senior Estates Minor from each Kingdom.)

D. CHAPTER GOVERNING BODY; SUMMONING MEETINGS

The governing body of a Chapter is the Estates. This body shall be composed of:

Estates Royal (King/Queen, Prince/Princess, Archduke/Archduchess, Duke/Duchess, Viceroy/Vicereine⁵)

Estates Major (Lord/Lady Protector, Count/Countess Royal, Marquis/Marquise, Count/Countess, Founder, and Third-Level Knight)

Estates Minor (~~Count/Countess~~, Baron/Baroness, Second-Level Knight, Household Lord/Lady)

Other amendments, including definition of “Count/Countess” in Lex Adria Article XI and definitions of Estates Major and Minor in the Glossary of the Lex, will be made accordingly for consistency.

Author’s Commentary: This proposal will increase member representation:

Shires will retain 1 or 2 votes (1-2 estates minor); Duchies will retain 3 votes (Crown and 2 estates minor, and may form a County as well); Archduchies would add 1 estate minor and any Counties formed; Kingdoms would add 2 estates minor and any Counties formed. All members would retain one earned personal vote (no matter how many times they earned it). This approach rewards chapters that feudalize. A 50 member chapter could be represented by a Crown, a March, a County, and an Archduchy's 3 senior estates minor, as well as retired Imperial and Kingdom Crowns, K3s, and Founders.

Authors/Sponsors: HIM Desmond Wallace; HIH William Baine

VII. CHANCERY BUSINESS

CHB1. Court Reports

A. Judicial Courts

None received.

B. Civil Courts

Judgment from present matters to be submitted for ratification in November.

CHB2. Consideration of Acceptability of Imperial Crown Contenders
(Requires majority to find acceptable.)

Letters of Intent have been published by the contenders.

A. Sir Eric McKiver and Dame Etoile de Manchou

B. HIH William Baine and HIH Mary Elizabeth

CHB3. Election of the Board of Directors
(Requires majority.)

Current voting members of the Board of Directors: *(Expiring members highlighted.)*

Treasurer	Lawrence Moura	Imperial Crown Appointed
Region 1	Leslie Burgess	Expires Nov. 2019
Region 1	Judith King	Expires Nov. 2020
Region 2	Lindsay Oleson	Expires Nov. 2019
Region 2	Ashton Worrall	Expires Nov. 2020
Region 3	Sara Huizenga	Expires Nov. 2019
Region 3	Thomas Wilson	Expires Nov. 2020
At Large	Brad Sawyer	Expires Nov. 2019
At Large	Jeff Kout	Expires Nov. 2019

Chancery Note: As no letters of intent to serve on the Board of Directors were received, the emergency nomination procedure will be followed and nominations will be taken from the floor at this meeting and reviewed at the November meeting. See Bylaws, Article V, E.1.a. Note that Region 1, 2, and 3 BoD members serve 2-year terms, while At Large BoD members serve 1-year terms.

VIII. OLD BUSINESS

OB1. Amend November IEM Schedule
(Requires 2/3 to approve.)

Modify Lex Adria Imperium VI.A.1 as follows:

“1. Imperial Estates Meetings shall be held:

“a. The ~~first~~ second Saturday (and the day after) of November

“b. During the month of March

“c. The third Saturday (and the day after) of July”

AND Modify Lex Adria Imperium VI.E.3. as follows:

“3. Meeting Date, November

“The Imperial Estates shall meet on the ~~first~~ second Saturday of November (and the following day), at which time they shall conduct appropriate business including but not limited to: ...”

Authors’ commentary: This will ensure that the November IEM will no longer conflict with Halloween.

Authors/Sponsors: HIH Gabriele Silverhand; HG Edelinne d’Orsay

OB2. Standardize the Lengths of BoD Terms of Office

(Requires 2/3 to approve.)

Modify Bylaws Article V. as follows:

“A. Number of Directors

“The number of Directors shall be nine. Two shall be at-large Directors, who shall be elected annually by the Imperial Estates from the membership at large for 1-year terms. ~~Each may be reelected to one successive term.~~ The Imperial Steward shall serve as Treasurer and may serve successive terms (as this is an appointed position by the Imperial Crown).

“ ...

“B. Term of Office

“... Directors shall be elected at the same meeting designated for determination of qualification and acceptability of Imperial Candidates (July). ~~Directors may succeed themselves once.~~ A Director may be removed prematurely by action of the Imperial Estates, the action of a duly convened Imperial Court of Justice, or by a unanimous vote of all other Directors (so long as the Board has more than two members). ...

“ ...

“Directors may serve for a total of 4 consecutive years, regardless of whether this is as a Regional Director, or a Director-at-large. The Imperial Chancery shall ensure that members nominated for a position on the Board of Directors shall fit into this restriction (i.e.: a member who has served for three consecutive years is not nominated for a 2-year Regional Director seat).”

Authors’ commentary: Because BoD terms are currently limited by a number of terms, a Director-at-large is limited to a maximum of two years on the BoD, while a Regional Director is able to serve for four years. An alternate interpretation of the current law would enable a member to serve on the BoD continuously, alternating between Regional Director and Director-at-large every two terms, since the two positions are defined differently. This is because of the verbiage used: "successive term" and "may succeed themselves". This

modification removes the ambiguity and limits directors to a total of four contiguous years on the BoD, followed by at least one year off of the BoD.

Authors/Sponsors: HG Callon Bryncorey; HIM Babette Bryncorey; HIH Gabriele Silverhand; HRM Faye O'Draig

OB3. Remove Requirement for Written Proxies

(Requires 2/3 to approve.)

Amend Lex Adria Imperium VI.H. Proxies as follows:

“It is the right of any member entitled to a vote to give a ~~written~~ proxy to any other Adrian member attending the meeting.

“1. ~~Written p~~roxies are effective when presented to the Chancellor.

“2. The proxy-holder may ~~present a copy to~~ notify the Chancellor when signing in for the meeting, or

“3. The proxy-granter may mail or electronically submit a copy to the Chancellor, provided it is received at least 72 hours prior to the meeting.

“4. The Chancellor may still require written proxies for members who are asking the Chancery to carry their proxy vote.”

Authors' commentary: The Empire of Adria is an honorable society. Members of the Imperial Estates are the embodiment of the Empire and its honor. A Knight of the Empire who says she or he is holding a proxy vote for a member estate should be taken at their word.

Authors/Sponsors: HG Callon Bryncorey; HIM Babette Bryncorey; HIH Gabriele Silverhand; HRM Faye O'Draig; HG Tailan Bran McNeil

OB4. Standardize Requirements for Knight's and Journeyman's Judges

(Requires majority to approve.)

Amend IEW-1: Manual of Arts and Sciences, I.E.2, as follows:

“2. Requirements:

“All shall participate and be qualified at a judging collegium for the current version of the Arts and Sciences Manual. When a member has not entered an art or judged an art for one full year, the member will re-qualify themselves with the Minister or Deputy of Arts and Sciences before judging at tourney or war. A judge may be authorized to judge by the MA&S based on experience outside the Adrian Empire. The MA&S must inform them of the basic rules and procedures described herein prior to judging.

~~“a. Knights' List:~~

~~“i. Knight Robe or higher or~~

- ~~“ii. Experience judging at least three Journeymans' List tournaments~~
- ~~“b. Journeymans' List:~~
- ~~“i. • Expert (who has a masterwork or makes a living or as a degree with an art) or higher, or~~
- ~~“ii. • Master with experience scribing at least three tournaments, or~~
- ~~“iii. • Member of the chivalry/Royal Crown who has been qualified by the MA&S to judge”~~

Authors' commentary: There should be no difference in judges between the two lists because there is no difference in judging the two lists (remember, the Journeyman's list has a lower total score to garner a tourney win). Once a prospective judge takes the collegium, which is still required by Article I.E.2, that judge is qualified to judge both lists. Article VII.B.11 states that serving as scribe for three qualified arts judges shall replace the requirement for taking the judging collegium. This change is not intended to replace that.

Authors/Sponsors: HG Callon Bryncorey; HIM Babette Bryncorey; HIH Gabriele Silverhand; HRM Faye O'Draig

OB5. Clarify the Scoring of Arts Entries

(Requires majority to approve.)

Replace IEW-1: Manual of Arts and Sciences, IV.C.8, with one of the following options:

Option 1:

“The three scores closest to the median score shall be averaged to arrive at the final score. In the case where two outlying scores are equidistant from the average score, the lower of the two scores shall be thrown out and the remaining scores averaged to arrive at the final score.

“Examples:

“28, 29, 30, 31 > drop the 28, average score is 30

“29, 29, 32, 32 > drop a 29, average score is 31”

Option 2:

“The three scores closest to the median score shall be averaged to arrive at the final score. In the case where two outlying scores are equidistant from the average score, the higher of the two scores shall be thrown out and the remaining scores averaged to arrive at the final score.

“Examples:

“28, 29, 30, 31 > drop the 31, average score is 29

“29, 29, 32, 32 > drop a 32, average score is 30”

Authors’ commentary: There is currently no guideline on what to do in this case, so this is open to Interpretation by the Imperial or local Crown, Imperial or local Minister of Arts and Sciences, and the person running the Arts at a Tourney or War. This ambiguity could also result in projects at the same tourney or war being scored differently. This ambiguity should be clarified one way or the other so that projects are scored the same. At this time, the Ministry of Arts and Sciences prefers Option 1.

Authors/Sponsors: HG Callon Bryncorey; HIM Babette Bryncorey; HIH William Baine; HG Edelinne d’Orsay

Chancery note: Other applicable sections of the Arts and Sciences Manual, such as V.D.10, will also be updated to reflect this change.

OB6. Clarify or Amend the Requirements for Garnering a Masterwork

(Requires majority to approve.)

Replace IEW-1: Manual of Arts and Sciences, III.C.1.a.ii, with one of the following options:

Option 1:

The entry receives an average score of 30 or higher with at least three scores equal to 30 or higher.

Option 2:

The entry receives an average score of 30 or higher with at least two scores equal to 30 or higher.

Option 3:

The entry receives an average score of 30 or higher with at least one score equal to 30 or higher.

Original text to be replaced indicated in red:

“1. A Masterwork is awarded under two conditions:

“a. In tournament an artisan’s entry may be awarded a masterwork if:

“i. The entry fulfills all of the requirements.

~~“ii. The entry receives a 30 or higher by three or more judges.~~

“b. An artisan successfully completes a Masterwork project.”

Authors' commentary: This should remove any ambiguity in how Masterworks are awarded. These three options cover all possible ways that a Masterwork can score over 30. Option 1 is the most restrictive and Option 3 is the least restrictive ($32 + 29 + 29 = 90$, which is an average of 30). At this time, the Ministry of Arts and Sciences prefers Option 2.

Authors/Sponsors: HG Callon Bryncorey; HIM Babette Bryncorey; HIH Gabriele Silverhand; HRM Faye O'Draig; HG Tailan Bran McNeil

OB7. Further Clarify the Awarding of a Masterwork in Tournament and/or War

(Requires majority to approve.)

Amend IEW-1: Manual of Arts and Sciences, III.C.1.a, to add the following:

“iii. This Article shall determine if a project is a Masterwork (or not) before considering Article V.D.10 (the 5-point spread). If this Article awards the project a Masterwork status, the three closest scores that make the project a Masterwork are averaged to arrive at the final score.

Example 1: 29, 30, 30, 36 (as the law currently stands):

The 29 is dropped and the average score is 32.

The 29 is dropped because the other three scores are 30 or higher, in compliance with Article III.C.1.a.

Example 2: 29, 30, 30, 36 and OB6 Option 2 passes:

The 29 is dropped and the average score is 32.

The 29 dropped because the average of 29, 30 and 30 is less than 30, but there are still three scores at 30 or higher.

Example 3: 29, 30, 32, 36 and OB6 Option 2 passes:

The 36 is dropped and the average score is 30.3.

The 36 is dropped in this case because OB6 Option 2 allows one score to be less than 30 as long as the average is above 30.

Authors' commentary: If a project is judged by four judges and receives these scores (29, 30, 30, 36), current rules dictate that the 36 is thrown out, and project receives a 29.67 as its final score, which is not a Masterwork. With this modification of the rules, the 29 would be thrown out and these scores would result in an average score of 32 ($30+30+36=96$, $96/3=32$), which is a Masterwork. The rules already state that if a project is awarded a score of 30 or greater by 3 or more judges, then it is a Masterwork. This clarification merely brings the Masterwork decision to have precedence over the “all scores within 5 points and the three closest scores averaged” decision.

Authors/Sponsors: HG Callon Bryncorey; HIM Babette Bryncorey; HRM Faye O'Draig

OB8. Reference Rather than Restate Masterwork Requirements*(Requires majority to approve.)*

Amend IEW-1: Manual of Arts and Sciences, IV.E.3:

“3. Masterwork

“A Masterwork is awarded ~~for those pieces that score 30 or higher by three or more judges~~ in accordance with Article III.C.1.a.”

Authors’ commentary: Instead of restating the Masterwork requirements, this section should reference the earlier section that states what the requirements are.

Authors/Sponsors: HG Callon Bryncorey; HIM Babette Bryncorey; HIH Gabriele Silverhand; HRM Faye O’Draig

Chancery note: Other applicable sections will be incorporated by reference as they are identified.

OB9. Clarify the Requirements for a Successful Arts Entry*(Requires majority to approve.)*

Amend IEW-1: Manual of Arts and Sciences, Article V: Contested Wars:

“E. AWARDING WAR POINTS

“1. War points will be awarded in accordance with the scenario and Lex Adria.

“2. ~~All entries in the Journeyman’s List with a final entry score less than ten (10) will be removed from the lists. All entries in the Knight’s List with a final entry score less than fifteen (15) will be removed from the lists.~~ All entries in either list that receive an Authenticity score of zero (0) will be removed from the lists in accordance with Article II.A.2. These entries will not count in the point totals for the contenders. Any list with all entries removed will result in no war point being awarded.

“3. Group entries count only as one entry in the point totals.

“4. There will be no points awarded if there are none to award.

“5. If there is a tie, the point will be split.

“ ...

“G. ARTISAN AWARDS AT WARS

“1. ~~All apprentices and journeyman, who compete upon a list, and whose entry receives a final entry score above 10 shall receive one war participation point.~~ All entrants who compete on a list, and whose entry receives an Authenticity score greater than zero (0), shall receive one war point.

“2. ~~All masters and Knights, who compete upon a list, and whose entry receives a final entry score 15 and greater, shall receive one war participation point (Repealed)~~

“3. All artisans who compete upon a list shall receive a maximum of one war participation point (which is not the same as a monthly participation point).

“4. A masterwork can be awarded for each entry.”

Authors’ commentary: The artisan is currently subjected to two litmus tests for a successful entry, authenticity greater than 0 and a minimum final score (10 or 15, depending on the list). This item removes the need for a minimum entry score, and relies solely on the Authenticity score to determine if the project should be judged. A simple project with minimal documentation could potentially receive a score that is less than the current "minimum scores" but as long as the project is authentic, it should still be allowed to contribute to the overall war score. Also, with the introduction of non-judged arts, which does not require judging in the first place, there should not be a minimum score placed on the entry in the second place, other than the Authenticity score, of course. Also, the local Crowns, in conjunction with the local Minister of Arts and Sciences, determine if a non-judged entry meets the authenticity requirement.

Authors/Sponsors: HG Callon Bryncorey; HIM Babette Bryncorey; HIH Gabriele Silverhand; HRM Faye O’Draig

OB10. Expand Arts Manual Article V to Include Uncontested Wars

(Requires majority to approve.)

Amend IEW-1: Manual of Arts and Sciences, Article V: Contested Wars:

“V. ~~Contested~~ Wars”

Authors’ commentary: These requirements should apply to all wars, not just contested wars. As an alternative, I would cooperate with a request to add a note that uncontested wars can be run a bit more “loosely”

Authors/Sponsors: HG Callon Bryncorey; HIH Gabriele Silverhand; HRM Faye O’Draig

OB11. Clarify War Judging Procedures

(Requires majority to approve.)

Amend IEW-1: Manual of Arts and Sciences, Article V: Contested Wars:

“D. War Judging

“...

“10. The three closest scores will be used for average and the fourth score will not be used.

“11. The MA&S shall discuss with the judge any score that differs by more than five from the ~~other~~ average score ~~used with the judge, who.~~ The judge shall have the opportunity to adjust the score to be more in line with

the other scores ~~or that judge will be replaced by two new judges and the same criteria shall be applied.~~

“12. If the MA&S and the Crown feel that one of the judges is biased or unreasonable, two additional judges may be selected to judge the piece.

“~~13. Neither the MA&S nor the Crown~~ No one, other than the original judge, may change or “adjust” arts scores.

“~~11.~~ 14. Any changes to a score must be initialed by the judge and a notation of the reason for the change shall be made.”

Authors’ commentary: The existing Article V.D.10 contains several items that are not related and should be separated into their own bullet points.

Bullet 10: This line is subject to change by an item of business in the March, 2019 IEM Agenda.

Bullet 11: Rearranging some words in the first sentence. I am also suggesting that the last half of sentence 2 in new bullet #11 is redundant. Just because a judge refuses to modify a score does not mean that judge is biased or unreasonable. If the judge can back up the reasons for the difference in score, then that score should stand on its own without being re-judged, especially if there are more than three judges. However, Bullet #12 states that an unreasonable or biased judge can be replaced by two new judges. If a judge is unable or unwilling to provide valid reasons for the difference, I would call that unreasonable and/or biased.

Bullet 13: I realize that no one other than the MA&S or the Crown would likely attempt to modify scores, but the reality is that no one except the judge should modify scores, and this bullet should reflect that. Otherwise, should we have to say “... MA&S, IMA&S, Crown or Imperial Crown...”? This small change covers everyone that can now or will in the future think they have a right to change a score.

Bullet 14: This is the existing Bullet 11, renumbered to fit in the new list.

Authors/Sponsors: HG Callon Bryncorey; HG Edelinne d’Orsay

OB12. Reduce Minimum Age for Rapier Participation

(Requires majority to approve.)

If passed, this proposal will amend IEW-17 Combat Manual to reduce the minimum age for participation in rapier combat, as well as combat archery in rapier scenarios, to 13 years.

Option: The authors request immediate implementation upon approval.

Authors’ commentary: At this time, the minimum age for combat is 12 for shinai. With Rapier being a minimum of 14, the member has no room for advancement or improvement of skill for a two year period. It is discouraging for the new young members to be stalled at this point.

After speaking with other combatants as well as several parents, we believe with proper training, equipment inspection and proper adherence to the rules of combat this would not be detrimental. For consistency, we include the combat archery for rapier as well. This amendment is for rapier only. It does not have any impact on synthetic wasters or cut-and-thrust.

Authors/Sponsors: Dame Katelyn, KPr; Sir Alaric Thorne, KCh

OB13. Resolved: New platform for file storage

(Requires majority to adopt as resolution.)

We need a new platform in which our old Yahoo!-based files can be stored, maintained, moderated, and readily accessed by all of the members of Adria, the separate Chapters, guilds, and interest groups.

Authors' commentary: Early in the history of Adria, it was decided to use Yahoo! for communications and file storing for the various groups within the Empire, a task that Yahoo! was designed for and for which it worked very well for years. Recently, however, support for and within Yahoo! has degraded to the point that it is no longer deemed viable. Some groups have switched to using Facebook (FB), but, while FB is very good about message sharing, it was not designed for, and therefore does a relatively poor job of, sharing, organizing and maintaining files including records, reports, and documentation. A new system is needed to replace the file-sharing functions from Yahoo!; one that will provide long-term storage and organization with some degree of supervisory control, transferable ownership, is readily accessible by large groups of selected individuals at all times, and has a low cost (is free).

Authors/Sponsors: HG Gregor Pent Graf vonSchongau; HIH William Baine

OB14. Resolved: Overhaul Rolls & Lists database

(Requires majority to adopt as resolution.)

We need to form a committee to establish a new Rolls & Lists (R&L) database in a standard, commercially-available database management system (DBMS) that can be maintained by multiple persons simultaneously over an extended period of time.

Authors' commentary: The current R&L database, while it works well, has several problems, primarily difficulty in maintenance and updating the structure and capabilities and occasionally in establishing access. The problems are a result of the database being proprietary with only one person capable of performing maintenance and administering the database. We need to form a committee to:

- *Determine the requirements for the database;*
- *Determine the structure of (design) the database;*
- *Select a commercially available DBMS that can be supported & maintained by multiple individuals simultaneously,*
- *Determine where and how to “house” the system*

The committee members should be people who are experienced with database design, implementation, or maintenance, or are familiar with the current R&L database. At least 2 members should be familiar with implementing databases over/via the Internet.

It is understood that the committee will take at least 4 months to make a recommendation to the Estates on which DBMS should be used, and that it will take up to 1 year (perhaps as much as 2) to create and implement the database including transferring all of the information from the current database.

Question: Are there any other groups/organizations that are currently or might be interested in using a similar system?

Authors/Sponsors: HG Gregor Pent Graf vonSchongau; HIH William Baine

IX. NEW BUSINESS

NB1. Revision of the Imperial Calendar

(Discussion automatic. Requires 2/3 to consider and 2/3 to approve.)

This item was tabled in March for further discussion. Several alternatives to the current Imperial Calendar have been proposed, and are illustrated in Appendix A. Please refer to past minutes for discussion notes.

Option 1:

- In-Person Imperial Estates Meetings in January and July
- Imperial Wars on Memorial Day and Labor Day weekends

Option 2:

- In-Person Imperial Estates Meetings in April and November
- GoToMeeting Imperial Estates Meeting in August
- Imperial Wars on Memorial Day and Labor Day weekends

Option 3:

- In-Person Imperial Estates Meetings in March and November
- GoToMeeting Imperial Estates Meeting in July
- Imperial Wars on Memorial Day and Labor Day weekends

Option 4:

- Keep as normal except change March to GoToMeeting

Authors' commentary: A Facebook poll indicated that the majority of members prefer keeping the Imperial Wars on Memorial Day and Labor Day weekends. The Option 1 calendar keeps the July IEM, although the dates for this meeting can be fluid within the month to adjust for conflicts with large local demos. The Option 2 calendar moves the IEM out of March, which is traditionally a terrible traveling month for all areas weather-wise, and removes the summer IEM in favor of a GoToMeeting IEM. The Option 3 calendar is the current calendar but with the substitution of a GoToMeeting for the July IEM.

Authors/Sponsors: HG Tailan Bran McNeil; HIH Gabriele Silverhand; HG Anne Bryce of Kincaig; HG Uther von Hopf.

X. DISCUSSION ITEMS

D1. Independent Judiciary

Input is sought from the Estates regarding the present and possible future embodiments of our Judiciary, with respect to establishing and maintaining its independence from the Crown.

D2. Role of the Board of Directors

The present role of the Board of Directors is ambiguous. Input is sought from the Estates regarding the restoration of powers to the Board of Directors, re-naming of the Board of Directors to “Advisory Board,” and other related topics.

XI. NEXT MEETING OF THE IMPERIAL ESTATES

November 2-3, 2019

Location TBD

XII. ADJOURNMENT

