

DjangoCon France 2018 Code of Conduct Transparency Report

Joachim Jablon

What is this document and what purpose does it serve ?

DjangoCon France (or DjangoCong, or Rencontres Django) is an annual conference held in France, gathering people from the Django community. It is operating under a [code of conduct](#) (fr). This code of conduct was changed this year, with a lot of inspiration from [the one DjangoCon Europe has](#). One of the goals of the changes was to improve welcomeness, safety, and to give organizers better ways to assess the state of the community (in order to hear, you need to be listening). It has now become a standard practice for events with a good code of conduct to publish a transparency report afterwards, and it is what this document is.

The goals of making these informations public are:

- For people to understand better how codes of conduct are enforced, and to show it goes beyond a few words on the website;
- For event organizers to better understand how to enforce code of conduct at their event, and what to expect in terms of code breach;
- For event attendees to ensure that things they have seen that might be breaking the code of conduct did not go unnoticed (or maybe it did, in which case it's always time to talk to us).

For these reasons, the report is in English even if most of the conference was held in French.

The goal of this document is **not** to point at people, and for this reason, it will stay as anonymous as possible.

How the code of conduct (CoC) was set up and presented

For an event with 70 people + ~15 online, the team behind the CoC was composed of 3 people: mainly 2 people (1 female, 1 male) for all things on site, and one moderator for the open chat on our streaming page. The CoC was posted on the website (with links in the top menu from every page), physically printed and taped twice on the walls of the event main room, and briefly presented along with the team during the opening talk.

The rules we agreed on was that any report to an organizer would be treated by both members of the team (except in case of conflict of interest, in which case the other team member would take the decisions). Decisions would not be publicly debated, and would be announced privately to the person who broke the code, the victim if applicable, and the reporter if applicable. Finally, a Transparency Report would be published afterwards.

The incidents

3 incidents were acted upon:

- An anonymous person joined the streaming page (on twitch) and made inappropriate aggressive sexual comments. They were immediately and permanently banned from the page by our moderator and their messages were deleted. We have no way of knowing who it might be in reality, so our actions are limited.
- Several speakers taking questions from the audience, as well as attendees, reported their discomfort after an attendee asked those speakers aggressive questions. We had a discussion with the attendee and explicit our expectations for questions from the audience. We were satisfied with the level of understanding the attendee expressed during the discussion.
- Regarding one of the talks, we had reports that some of the remarks the speaker made were dismissive of both some technologies and the people who used them. The speaker was aware that they had gone too far on that matter and we discussed the subject. We decided that a strong reminder of the safe culture that we're trying to embrace would be the most efficient way forward.

What we could have done better

- Add a "I read the CoC" checkbox when buying the ticket. we realized that, while prominently displayed on our website, our CoC was not visible in our online ticket booth
- Be explicit on what we expected good questions from the audience to ask speakers to keep in line with the values of our event.
- Be explicit on what we wanted to avoid in the talks, especially in terms of comments regarding other communities, and practices. This could be made clearer in our code of conduct, and a communication could have been made toward the speakers beforehand.
- Use a streaming platform less likely to be "trolled" by an anonymous harasser than Twitch. That being said, the open chat was useful, we'll need to balance things to maximize usefulness and minimize risks.

Side note regarding questions

As a side note, the following are qualities that we understand would define good questions from the audience to a speaker:

- Be genuine questions more than remarks, be asked out of curiosity and give an opportunity to the speaker to give opinions or informations related to the subject they have been studying;
- Be centered around the speaker, more than around the person asking;
- Be interesting for a large part of the audience;
- Be respectful to the speaker:
 - The aim is not to show the person asking knows the subject better than the speaker
 - the aim is not to corner the speaker and have them say "I don't know"
 - the aim is not to prove that the speaker said something wrong.

Keep in mind that many of those points do not fall under the CoC, but lack of respect and making the speaker (or the audience) feel aggressed inherently do.

