

Start and Ends:

1. Diplomacy Chronicle 3 was published by Mark L. French, 107 Victoria St., Scarborough, ON M1B 2J1 (the FIF Ombudsman) and is included with this issue (published by Kenneth G. Smith, Box 32, Station A, Ottawa, Ont. K1N 0T9). Comments on any aspect of the Chronicle are invited.

2. Randolph Smyth (the new NADF Ombudsman), John Leeder (former CO Ombudsman) and Rod Walker (former IDA Ombudsman) are now members of NACC, for lack of objections to their participation.

3. Note to John Leeder: don't worry about having to transfer Times discussions to the NACC. The NACC does not intend to monopolize all ethical discussions (now or in the future) but rather just to provide a special forum for ombudsmen (and some former ombudsmen and ombudsman-like officials, etc.).

Letter from John Leeder (Some Comments on THE DIPLOMACY CHRONICLE 1):

"First off, some people don't like 'debating societies', or tend to discount them. I like them. The term 'debating society' often carries the implication 'all talk and no action'. But a discussion group composed of people who have power (and, let's face it, Ombudsmen do wield power in the hobby - let's hope, responsibly and for good purposes) discussing the philosophies of their functions has the potential to do a lot of good. So I endorse the concept of a NACC. On to its goals.

"(1) Jurisdictions: In theory, any Ombudsman should be prepared to provide his services to any member of the organization he represents. However, with the proliferation of organizations, a person may belong to more than one organization and thus may have a choice of two or more ombudsmen to approach. This has potential for abuse. A person may go 'forum shopping', i.e., approach the ombudsman he feels will give him the best break. This is discouraged in courts of law, but I don't see how we can prevent it in the hobby, and feel that its potential for abuse will rarely be realized. It might lead to a particular ombudsman becoming overloaded with work if he gets a reputation for being effective (or 'soft on players, or GMs, or whatever'); but if ombudsmen are in communication they will be able to transfer cases they can't handle to other ombudsmen potentially capable of handling the matter. This would be analogous to an ombudsman transferring a case in which he is personally involved (Traditionally, when this has happened the consent of all parties has been sought; however, if the complainant were a member of the transferee's organization, i.e., if the transferee had jurisdiction to handle the case, this might not be necessary.).

"Another abuse would be multiple proceedings, i.e., where a complainant approaches more than one ombudsman. This could be forestalled by communication. The NACC could keep ombudsmen informed of what proceedings each ombudsman had under way. No need to be specific on issues; names of parties, relevant game, etc., would be sufficient. It might be specified that when a complainant institutes multiple proceedings and this becomes known all proceedings will be dropped. As many hearings are in camera, this could be circulated for the eyes of fellow ombudsmen only, i.e., separate from the discussions.

"(2) Although player complaints against GMs are numerically the most abundant ombudsmen's concern, theoretically GM complaints against players are equally of concern, as might be publishers vs. guest GMs, etc. I mention this because ombudsmen should not be identified solely with players and players' problems. This would distort the image of ombudsmen.

"(3) Perhaps the DIPLOMACY WORLD publisher should have permission to reprint anything he considers appropriate from DIPLOMACY CHRONICLE or whatever house organ the NAOC publishes. This goes for (ii) as well.

"I agree that NAOC shouldn't become an appeal body from ombudsmen's decisions. For one thing, it would be usurping the function of GDO's OAC. In future, it might evolve into such a role, but I think that the hobby can't afford having layers of judicial bodies with all the delay that that involves. In principle, the local ombudsman's judgment should stand. The appeal body is available when the ombudsman has grave doubts himself or is himself involved (but the latter situation can be handled by transferring to another ombudsman - see (1) above). The IDA JudCom was also used when there was a penalty to be imposed. I don't ever recall either the JudCom or the OAC overturning an ombudsman decision.

"Issues: (1) I obviously agree to former ombudsmen participating (otherwise I wouldn't be writing this!). I have no complaints about bona fide representatives of a players' organization (if such an organization becomes a reality) taking part (interesting to note that one of the "chief advisors" is also a top-rated GM).

"If NAOC is to be a debating society, then obviously all members should be able to discuss. There might be some qualification as to voting members if such things as formal votes become necessary.

"(2) I've touched on this under 'Jurisdiction' above.

"(3) I'd prefer not to see a constitution. Basic guidelines might be: anything anyone writes gets printed. But this can be a pain for the publisher. He might retain the right to edit, paraphrase, etc., unless the member types his comments on a spirit master or provides a number of photocopies sufficient for all members and a few extras for newcomers. (I hope you're enjoying retyping this long-winded stuff...)

"Lastly, I agree that the NAOC would be a good forum to discuss matters of hobby ethics, etc., ombudsmen and like-minded individuals being (presumably) less likely to get side-tracked in personalities and trivialities."

((I don't have too much to add here, for the good reason that I agree with your comments insofar as they apply to the NAOC...))

((As of now, I have everyone's feelings on NAOC and The Diplomacy Chronicle. Therefore, to hasten "things" a bit, I would like to propose the following "constitution" for the NAOC. Note that the word "constitution" is probably misused here, as all it actually is is a set of descriptive guidelines.

((I would appreciate everyone's, i.e., Mark's, Randolph's, John's and Rod's, comments on this proposed set of guidelines. To make things easier a bit, please vote "no", "yes", or "debate" for every clause. Your ballots should be in by January 1, 1980, please.

((Abstentions will be counted as a "yes". "Debate" means that you wish the clause to be altered or at least discussed. Please include your argument with a "debate" vote.

((Why am I making this look so formal? I think the guidelines are actually quite acceptable to everyone, and should therefore meet with everyone's approval... but then, you never know.))

Guidelines for the NAOC:

1. The NAOC is the North American Ombudsman's Committee, a body intending to foster and multiply contacts among North American Diplomacy ombudsmen and to carry their deliberations on ombudsmen and ethics-related issues. Its house organ is The Diplomacy Chronicle. Association with the NAOC is purely voluntary.

2. The NAOC exists for the purpose of discussing (and solving, by mutual agreement of all parties involved) jurisdictional problems, coordinating ambassadors with the DPA and the GM wing of the NADF on ethics-related issues, printing and discussing past, present, and future ambassadors' arbitrations, and, discussing pancontinental ethical problems and issues (especially as they relate to ambassadors and their philosophies on the job).
3. Membership to the NAOC is defined as all current regular Diplomacy ambassadors (in North America) plus anyone they want on. No one may ever lose the status conferred by membership once attained.
4. Matters will rarely - if ever - come to a vote. Nevertheless, when they do (e.g., votes on acceptable candidates for membership, votes on the structure of the NAOC) they will be resolved by majority vote, all abstentions being counted as a 'yes'. Members may also opt to vote "debate", which will have the effect of deferring a decision and allowing for further debate.
5. Members are expected to contribute directly to the NAOC discussions, and are entitled get their relevant arguments printed in The Diplomacy Chronicle. Non-members may also participate, though their arguments may not be printed herein depending on space limitations.
6. The publisher of Diplomacy World has permission to reprint anything he may deem worthwhile (which appears in these pages) in his 'zine.

That's it. Your comments are invited, be they about the English, the principle of having such guidelines, or whatever; hopefully this entire matter will be resolved by Christmas.

François.

The first part of the document discusses the importance of maintaining accurate records of all transactions. It emphasizes that every entry should be supported by a valid receipt or invoice. This ensures transparency and allows for easy verification of the data.

In the second section, the author outlines the various methods used to collect and analyze the data. This includes both manual and automated processes. The goal is to ensure that the data is as accurate and comprehensive as possible.

The third part of the document provides a detailed breakdown of the results. It shows that there has been a significant increase in sales over the period covered. This is attributed to several factors, including improved marketing strategies and better customer service.

Finally, the document concludes with a series of recommendations for future actions. These include continuing to invest in marketing, improving operational efficiency, and maintaining a strong focus on customer satisfaction.

Appendix