

UK YOUTH DEVELOPMENT LEAGUE

Minutes of the 2017 Annual General Meeting

held at the Great Barr Hotel, Birmingham, on Saturday 18th November

Present: Grace Hall (Chairman); Margaret Grayston (Vice Chairman); Marian Williams (Administrator); plus the following members of the management committee: Stuart Hall; Alan Johnson; Karl Ponty; Leslie Roy; Joyce Tomala; Nigel Holl (UKA)
Plus: David Jeacock in attendance to advise on constitutional matters.

The following clubs were in attendance:

Northern region (27 teams represented)

City of Sheffield & Dearne AC; Deeside AAC; Gateshead Harriers; Kingdom Athletic; Leeds City AC; Leigh Harriers; Liverpool Harriers; North Wales; Preston Harriers; Sale Harriers; Southport Waterloo AC; Spennorth & District AC; Team Edinburgh; Team Glasgow; Wrexham AC

Midland region (34 teams represented)

Amber Valley & Erewash AC; Birchfield Harriers; Bristol & West AC/Mendip; Burton AC; Cheltenham & County Harriers; City of Stoke AC; Coventry Godiva Harriers; Cwmbran Harriers; Derby AC; Halesowen A & CC; Kidderminster & Stourport AC; Newport Harriers; Notts AC; Royal Sutton Coldfield AC; Rugby & Northampton AC; Solihull & Small Heath AC; South & East Wales; Team Avon; Team DC; Team Gwent; Wolverhampton & Bilston AC

Scottish region (6 teams represented)

Dundee Hawkhill Harriers; Edinburgh AC; Pitreavie; Shettleston Harriers; South Lanarkshire; Victoria Park Glasgow AC

Southern region (13 teams represented)

Blackheath & Bromley Harriers & AC; Brighton & Hove AC; City of Portsmouth AC; Horsham Blue Star Harriers; Reading AC; Shaftesbury Barnet Harriers; Team Dorset

Apologies: Norma Blaine MBE (President); Lorraine Vidler (Finance Officer); Malcolm Charlish (YDL committee); Chris Power (NI area co-ordinator); Altrincham AC; Bicester AC; Border Harriers; Cannock & Stafford AC; Charnwood AC; Crawley AC; Daventry AC; East Cheshire Harriers & Tameside AC; Hallamshire Harriers; Hereford & County AC; M60 Nomads; Marshall Milton Keynes AC; Salford Metropolitan AC; Southampton AC; Swansea Harriers; Swindon Harriers; Tamworth AC; Windsor, Slough, Eton & Hounslow AC; Yate & District AC

1. **Grace Hall, the chairman** welcomed everyone to the 4th AGM of the UKYDL and thanked them for attending.
2. **Minutes of the 2016 AGM**
The minutes were deemed to be an accurate record, and their acceptance was proposed by **Guy Ferguson (Notts AC)** and seconded by **Joyce Tomala (Cwmbran)**.
The minutes were approved by the meeting and signed by the Chairman.
3. **Chairman's Report.**
As the report had been distributed prior to the meeting, Grace suggested that it wasn't necessary to go through the report in detail and opened it to the floor for questions, there were none.

4. Administrator's Annual Report

Marian Williams, the administrator, also suggested that as this report had also been sent out in advance, she too would just take questions, again there were none.

5. Financial Report.

5.1 **Lorraine Vidler, the finance officer** was unable to attend the meeting due to illness, and in her absence, the Chairman explained that there was a typing error in the Income and Expenditure figures, such that the figure for Track Hire and Mileage should read £48 448 and NOT £45 448, the total should therefore be £156 322 and not £153 322, this makes the surplus of £785 correct which is the figure showing on the Balance Sheet. She stated that the correct documents would be posted on the league's website; if any clubs require a copy then they would need to contact the Administrator. In the absence of the Finance Officer, the chairman asked if there were any questions from the floor.

Bob Welfare (Preston) queried what the Admin costs covered, as they appeared to be exactly the same as in the previous year. Grace Hall explained that these are the per annum payments made to various members of the management group for admin work, as follows:

- Administrator - £12 600 pa on a self-employed basis
- Area Co-ordinators - £500 per age group
- Webmaster - £2 000
- Finance Officer - £3 000
- Chairman - £2 000, however she only takes 50% of the entitlement
- Results Co-ordinator - £2 000

This amounts to £24 600 paid in total.

Other than the Administrator, all other post holders' payments would be reduced by 25% in the forthcoming year which amounted to a total of £21 600 for 2017/2018.

Geoff Morphitis (Shaftesbury Barnet Harriers) pointed out that the prediction made at last year's AGM regarding the decrease in grant funding had proved to be correct and despite a drop of over 30% in grant funding, with a rise in club affiliation fees of 21%, the actual drop in income was only 12%, for which he commended the management committee's efforts to turnaround a large loss into a small profit.

However, he had three main areas of question:

Firstly, a rhetorical question as to how the turnaround had been achieved, as it was evident that the increase in the clubs' fees coupled with the reduction in payments back by way of track hire and mileage payments had brought this about. He therefore suggested that the league was being funded in essence by the clubs.

Secondly, 'What further could have been done in the following areas?':

- Why had the cost of League/Area/Promotion & Relegation matches gone up by £10k?

Grace Hall explained that Scotland and Northern Ireland had always held area finals but that those figures were not now included in the overall Track Hire and Mileage figures. Furthermore, due to the structural change in the Midlands, there was now an Area final and 2 promotion matches in lieu of the 4th round of matches, added to this, following consultation meetings in the Northern region, it was necessary to hold a final and relegation match to move forward. **Joyce Tomala (Midland Area Co-ordinator)** gave a brief statement regarding the Midlands. The arrangement agreed at last year's AGM had resulted in an overall reduction from 15 matches down to 6, so whilst it had been agreed that the league would meet the costs of those 6 fixtures, the overall costs would be down

due to the net loss of 9 matches, and the potential decreases in mileages for the large number of clubs who only had three fixtures. **Geoff Morphitis** then asked why the host clubs hadn't been asked to bear the costs as they would have done in a 'normal' 4th round fixture, as host clubs only receive a small payment from the league for hosting their matches. It was pointed out that the venues had to be sourced before the identity of the clubs attending those finals/promotion matches was known, and clubs had been reluctant to commit to funding a fixture that they may not have been competing in. It was also pointed out that the clubs who attended those area finals and promotion matches paid for the fourth match.

In addition to the Midlands matches, for 2018 only the structure in the Northern region had also resulted in an area final and promotion match. **Alan Johnson (Northern area co-ordinator)** explained that he had taken the responsibility for hosting the area final in Sheffield as the home club were competing in Middlesbrough, and it would have been unreasonable for him to have had to pay the costs.

– Why did the management committee decide to move the final from Bedford to Birmingham at an increased cost?

Joyce Tomala (Finals Co-ordinator) pointed out that he was using the 2016 costs at Bedford as a comparison, and that the quote for 2017 from Bedford was almost £9 000. In addition, there were problems with accommodation, and travel costs to clubs was greater in Bedford than Birmingham. The Chairman then referred Geoff to the figures in the accounts which show a reduction in the costs of the 2017 final over the 2016 final.

– There was a question over the number of officials who had been accommodated over the weekend

Joyce Tomala explained that only chief officials who had to attend the technical meeting, and those officials who had to travel in excess of 150 miles had been offered accommodation, others had stayed, but had paid for their own accommodation. The league had also introduced a single room supplement to cut down on costs, which officials had chosen to pay for.

Grace Hall explained that when the league was set up, the Finals were intended to offer a specific level of competition for both athletes and officials, and this meant that the costs were going to be high to cater for the governing body's expectations at that time. She suggested however that as there was an agenda item coming up about this matter it would be a better and more productive use of time to defer some of the comments until that point.

There were a number of points raised about the provision of officials, namely:

- Why was it necessary to use a call room, with the additional officials' requirement, when clubs involved hadn't wanted one? Grace referred Geoff to her original statement about the level of the meeting, but did concede that maybe it was less necessary in the Lower age group.
- Why clubs hadn't been asked to bring their own officials as they would for a normal league fixture? The clubs who attend the finals would then bear the cost of those officials, which would save around £8 000 if the figures are correct. Joyce then pointed out that there are some clubs who struggle to find sufficient officials of the required standard to attend.

Mark Exley (Rugby & Northants) made a general point about the attitude of some of those officials selected by the league towards those who came with their clubs, and felt that they were looked upon as somehow inferior to those selected by the league, and he suggested that it may explain why clubs found it difficult to persuade officials to work at the finals, there were some agreement from the room with this comment. It

was also pointed out that there was a discrepancy between appointed officials who had travel costs and car parking taken care of, but club officials weren't even allocated parking spaces.

Moira Maguire (Team Edinburgh) said that whilst they had been asked if they could bring additional officials it was difficult when a number of them had already been selected by the league.

Jack Frost (Sale Harriers) stated that the club was disappointed not to have been able to bring their own officials who had supported them throughout the season.

Guy Ferguson (Notts AC) suggested that there was a cause for concern at the quality of information that has been presented in the accounts. There is a question about the accuracy of information and a lack of detail in the notes, which would quite likely have answered a number of questions that had been raised. He asked that the committee take away as an action point, that we need an improved set of accounts.

Geoff Morphitis then asked if there is a budget for the season? Finally he asked for an explanation as to why the decision was made to stop awarding medals to the UAG winners?

Grace Hall replied that the finals sub-committee was responsible for making recommendations to the management group based on the necessity of reducing costs. One of those recommendations was concerning medals. Joyce had contacted all clubs likely to be affected and asked for feedback concerning the option of not awarding medals to the older athletes. Only two clubs had replied and neither had objected strongly, other than to suggest that if more money became available that they be re-instated. The remainder of the clubs hadn't bothered to reply.

In the event, the 8 clubs involved had sorted out their own medals and shared the costs between them.

Grace Hall had observed the medal presentations in 2017 and it appeared that a number of athletes didn't bother to collect their medals; **Tim Soutar (Blackheath & Bromley)** then pointed out that officials had been instructed not to accompany the athletes to the podium as was the practice in the LAG, **Mark Exley & Arwel Williams** concurred with this. **Ken Goodger (Newport Harriers)** questioned why medals should be presented at all, as this is a team competition and not a national championship.

Geoff Morphitis felt that the accounts should contain a provision for the amount to be paid subject to approval at the AGM. **Nigel Holl** pointed out that this figure was actually showing in the accounts this year.

It was agreed that in future there must be a more informative breakdown of the figures presented to the AGM.

5.2 **Hilary Nash (Bristol & West AC)** felt that whilst the notes needed to be more informative that did not mean that the accounts were incorrect, he therefore proposed that the accounts were adopted by the meeting

Bob Willows (Brighton & Hove AC) seconded the motion.

Votes Against: 0

Abstentions: 4

The meeting voted in favour of adopting the accounts

5.3 Subscriptions.

“The Management Committee propose that subscriptions for 2017/2018 be set at £90 per match per team, plus such sum as the Management Committee may fix to attend any subsequent matches to include regional finals or promotion matches.”

There were a number of comments raised about this proposal:

Ken Goodger (Newport Harriers) pointed out that the proposal was too open ended and could effectively allow the management group to charge significantly more for any finals or promotion matches, the example quoted being £1 000. He suggested that there should be a maximum amount specified. **David Jeacock** wished to remind the meeting that the wording was actually the same as in the previous year and this had not presented any problem. **Arwel Williams (Liverpool Harriers)** then suggested that it should remain as £90 per match for all matches, but **Geoff Morphitis** felt that this meant that clubs in his region would be subsidising the Midland area finals and promotion matches, he felt that the host club should bear the costs in the same way as they would for a normal league fixture, it was then pointed out that the vast majority of clubs were subsidising the national finals to a far greater degree.

Guy Ferguson (Notts AC) also explained the difficulty finding host clubs for area matches when there was no guarantee that they would be there, as they would not only be supporting them financially but would also be expected to find chief officials and volunteers to organise those matches.

Judy Kelsall (Burton AC) asked for confirmation that the subscriptions for her club would rise from £400 to £540 for both teams. This was confirmed.

Arwel Williams (Liverpool Harriers) proposed that the proposal be amended to:

“Subscriptions for 2017/2018 be set at £90 per match per team.”

Alan Johnson (Trafford AC) seconded this.

Votes Against: 4

Abstentions: 3

With a large majority voting in favour, this amendment was approved.

5.4 Mileage.

“The Management Committee propose to reimburse travel expenses for the 2017 season retrospectively as follows:

5.4.1 ***Less than 500 miles – no payment;***

Greater than or equal to 500 miles and less than 750 miles @ 50p per mile

Greater than or equal to 750 miles and less than 1000 miles @ 60p per mile

Greater than or equal to 1000 miles @ 70p per mile”

Leslie Roy (Victoria Park Glasgow) asked those totals were per match or across the season. It was confirmed that the total referred to the accumulated mileage across all divisional fixtures.

Guy Ferguson asked what the likely total was going to be, as without it, it wouldn't be possible to budget accurately. **Grace Hall** reminded him that the projected figure for refunds of Track Hire and Mileages were on the balance sheet as £54 500 in total, she estimated that the mileages amounted to approx. £10 000. **Geoff Morphitis** further suggested that in the Notes to the accounts, it should show the split between mileage and Track Hire.

Nick Corry (Blackheath & Bromley) asked if the payments were staged, such that payments would only be paid for the excess mileages over the initial 500 miles as this wasn't clearly stated in the wording. **Marian Williams** confirmed that this was correct, the first 500 miles were deducted from the overall total before payments were calculated. She agreed that it wasn't clear stated, and the management committee would take this on board for future meetings.

David Little (Team Dorset) asked why we were proposing to pay a higher rate for those who travel further, he suggested that there should only be more than one payment level regardless of distance travelled. **Janice Kaufman (Gateshead Harriers)** disagreed and stated that clubs travelling longer distance often had to incur greater costs such as a second driver, so clubs should receive more. Leslie Roy asked for confirmation that clubs in receipt of Hardship wouldn't also be eligible to claim mileages. This was confirmed.

Stuart Hall (Spenborough) seconded the proposal.

The meeting voted unanimously in favour of this proposal.

5.4.2 Track Hire.

***"The Management Committee propose that, for the 2017 season, the host club reimbursement for track hire, to include First Aid costs, should be paid as follows:
Less than £500 - 50% of costs;
£500 or more - 60% of costs;
Plus £100 for the use of Photo Finish and £50 for the use of EDM in the 2017 season."***

Joyce Tomala seconded the proposal.

The meeting voted unanimously in favour of this proposal.

A copy of the form will go onto the website with all necessary information about payment of registration fees which are due by the end of January.

6. Resolutions.

6.1 Proposals from clubs:

6.1.1 **Proposed by Liverpool Harriers** and supported by Doncaster AC; Gateshead Harriers; Rotherham Harriers; Trafford AC; Wigan & District Harriers; Wirral AC:

"We propose that the number of 2nd claim athletes is increased to 5 (five) males and likewise 5 females, on the proviso that those 5 male and female 2nd claim athletes cannot cover more than 50% of the total events at any meeting"

Arwel Williams spoke to this proposal; he pointed out that the league currently allows four 2nd claim athletes per gender which is a remnant of the old NJAL and had not been revisited since the league's inception, despite the addition of the U17 age group to the original U20s. This gave the composite teams a big advantage in terms of the number of athletes they had at their disposal to fill their teams. His club felt that by increasing this to 5 athletes it did go some way towards redressing the balance without unduly affecting the make-up of the team, and also stressed that both genders together should not be able to compete in more than 50% of the events.

He referred to the situation with his own county – there are currently three other teams in their locality who cannot themselves field a team in the league but an increase to the

number of 2nd claim athletes would help to make it a possibility for their athletes to participate.

Tom Soutar (Blackheath & Bromley Harriers) asked for confirmation as to what the 50% amounted to? He felt that it would be easier if it were a specified number of events. **Lyn Orbell (Birchfield Harriers)** commented that this was what happened in the UKWAL where foreign athletes or HCAs could only compete in a maximum of 12 events in total. **Nick Corry** pointed out that this would add to the administrative burden, and also could cause conflict between team managers. He was concerned that bringing in 2nd claim athletes could be damaging to the morale of a club's existing athletes, bearing in mind that we are a development league, so clubs should be concentrating on developing their own athletes rather than recruiting better performing athletes in other clubs as second claim.

Paul Farres (City of Portsmouth AC) commented that 2nd claim athletes shouldn't be used in such a way as to deprive the club's own athletes from competition. A number of people agreed that they were used to supplement the shortfalls a team may have in specific event areas rather than use it to just bring in athletes with superior performances.

Mark Exley (Rugby & Northampton AC) stated that the 'second claim' rule benefitted those athletes whose clubs don't compete in the league, and could help to raise the standard of the competition by introducing some very good athletes who wouldn't otherwise have the opportunity. **Janice Kaufman** also pointed out that whilst this offered an increased opportunity to recruit 2nd claim athletes, team managers didn't have to use them if in doing so it would be detrimental to their own athletes; it also helped those clubs to retain their members as athletes didn't have to transfer to another club to compete in the league.

Keith Perry (Halesowen AC) asked about the likelihood of reaching the 50% with 2nd claim athletes? He suggested that if that were the case, then those clubs should be in the league in their own right. **Marian Williams** reminded everyone that the 2nd claim athletes are unlikely to be from one club, but could be from several different smaller clubs.

Phil Howe (West Cheshire AC) felt that this was an excellent proposal as it was an incremental change on what we've already had. Some of the points being made were about the principal of second claim in general but this isn't what it's about. If the 50% were changed to 38 events that may make it simpler, and allows the flexibility between U17 and U20.

Tim Soutar proposed that an amendment to the rule should state that, in the interests of equality, 2nd claim athletes should compete in no more than 19 events per gender. **Janice Kaufman** seconded this.

Hilary Nash suggested that the increase of just two athletes in total was unlikely to make a substantial difference, so it wasn't necessary to specify a limit; he put a counter amendment forward proposing that the reference to 50% should be deleted, this was seconded by **Keith Perry**.

For the avoidance of doubt, **David Jeacock** then summed up the three **choices available to the meeting**:

- The original motion proposed by Liverpool Harriers
- The amendment from **Tim Soutar** replacing the 50% with 19 events per gender
- The 2nd amendment from **Hilary Nash** removing the restriction altogether.

Tim Soutar indicated that if the 2nd amendment were to be successful, he would withdraw his proposed amendment.

The meeting then voted on the following amendment:

“We propose that the number of 2nd claim athletes is increased to 5 (five) males and likewise 5 females”

Votes against – 5

Abstentions – 3

With a large majority voting in favour, this amendment was approved and became the substantive motion

The meeting then voted on the substantive motion:

Votes against – 7

Abstentions – 4

With a large majority voting in favour, this motion was approved

6.1.2 **Proposed by Liverpool Harriers** and supported by Blackburn Harriers & AC; Doncaster AC; Gateshead Harriers; Leigh Harriers & AC; Trafford AC; Wigan & District Harriers; Wirral AC:

“We propose that the National UKYDL Finals are cancelled until further notice and the reason being that due to the fact that UKA and the league have no sponsor it is felt that the monies spent would be better utilised in the regions or to make the league work better.”

Arwel Williams spoke briefly to this motion - having been a team manager for over 25 years he was not against the finals per se, but felt that the over-riding need was to manage the books, and over the four years of the league’s existence, the cost of the finals had been substantial. Bearing in mind that after 2018, there was no guarantee of financial support from UKA, the finals are one area where significant cutbacks can be made.

Grace Hall informed the meeting that, alongside this motion, the finals sub-committee, on behalf of the management group, had simultaneously been looking at ways of cutting down the cost of finals, and she asked **Joyce Tomala** to speak at this point as to what they were looking at from 2018 onwards.

Joyce outlined the 5 options we are faced with:

- Retain the Status Quo – this is not a sustainable option given the inevitable increase in stadium costs and security at the majority of facilities as it seems that we are bound by the Purple Book, which is the guide to Health and Safety of Stadiums.
- Reduce the number of competing teams from 8 to 6 which would allow greater flexibility in selecting tracks, although this may not necessarily cost less.
- Paring back the finals to a considerable extent by cutting back on peripheries such as call room, programmes, medals, trophies and travelling expenses for teams, as well as cutting down the number of teams and utilising cheaper tracks, and providing only chief officials with clubs providing the remainder of officials needed. This should reduce the costs by approx. 50%.
- No national finals at all
- Using separate weekends for each age group – this would cut down accommodation and tracks could be selected according to need.

This is a work in progress and all scenarios are being investigated to find the best way to proceed.

Bearing these points in mind, **Grace Hall** opened the meeting to the floor.

Moira Maguire felt that it was a good idea to cut the costs down substantially as in the third option, but thought that the clubs involved would probably be happy to share the costs of the medals as they had this year if necessary.

Geoff Morphitis asked for a breakdown of costs for option 3, but Joyce re-iterated that the work was on-going and nothing was set in stone.

Nick Corry suggested that it was good that efforts were being focussed on cutting costs, but felt that the flip side of removing the finals altogether would make it even harder to attract a sponsor; he wondered whether YDL would actively seek a sponsor for the finals, and referred to the English Schools' championships as an example. **Nigel Holl** responded that the relationship between English Schools' and England Athletics made it easier for them to find a suitable sponsor, whereas it would be much more difficult to find one for a standalone event, he assured everyone that work is continuing, but in a wider context. He felt that the finals could be an attractive option, but would depend on the sponsor's requirements.

Jack Frost (Sale Harriers Manchester) thought that we should concentrate on the 2 main areas of expense – track hire and officials. He felt that there were much cheaper tracks than Birmingham or Bedford available and suggested that the Sports City track would be a cheaper alternative. **Joyce** replied that she is constantly talking to tracks with a view to finding a cheaper option; there is a lot of background work going on and she is working incredibly hard to bring down costs, indeed she has a meeting with a stadium manager scheduled for Tuesday, however we have to bear in mind that local authorities are likely to be increasing costs by at least 5%; she also referred to a meeting she and Stuart Hall had attended with Manchester and their quote, after discounts, was in excess of £9 000. **Keith May (Horsham Blue Star)** reminded everyone that the lack of sponsorship was a long-standing issue and although he had brought this up at last year's AGM nothing had changed. He felt that the smaller clubs were supporting the bigger clubs who attended the final, and suggested that if those clubs wanted a national final then they should be paying for it.

In response to a question from the floor about the numbers who attended, Joyce replied that the bulk of the spectators attended the Lower age group final on the Saturday.

Arwel Williams was fully supportive of clubs bringing their own officials but stressed that, in addition to the chief officials, it would still be necessary to provide a central core of higher level officials to ensure the smooth running of the meeting. It was also important to stress that officials provided by the clubs had to be of an appropriate level. **Mark Exley** felt that we should look at a combination of the options, he also commented that the level of an official didn't necessarily make them superior to some lower level officials. A number of delegates concurred with this. **Jack Frost** also re-iterated that only allowing clubs to bring one field judge with them meant that others who had worked all season with the team in league fixtures, weren't then invited to go to the final with the team.

Guy Ferguson felt that it was important to retain the finals, and thought that the third option outlined by Joyce may provide a way ahead. There needs to be a goal for teams to aspire to, and it would be a mistake to abandon the finals altogether.

Pat Childs (Leeds City AAC) asked why we need finals when neither NYAL or NJAL had them, however several people pointed out that she was incorrect as both predecessor league had run finals and promotion matches.

Geoff Morphitis queried the necessity of employing stewards, and suggested that the gate receipts should provide empirical evidence of the number of spectators to show that numbers aren't high enough to justify paying security personnel, to which **Nigel Holl (UKA)** replied that although we may be able to provide a good guesstimate on numbers, nevertheless stewards are needed for evacuation purposes amongst other statutory duties. **Jeff Walsh (Team DC)** reminded everyone that we need to be mindful of the aspirations of athletes and should not abandon the finals if possible.

In summing up **Arwel Williams** said that he was happy to defer a vote on this proposal until the 2018 AGM whilst alternatives are being investigated. He suggested that the management group should look at ways to reduce the costs for the 2018 finals, with further feedback being brought to the AGM next year for the clubs to consider for subsequent years. **Stuart Hall** pointed out that it is up to the management committee how they ran the finals as it is not a constitutional issue.

The chairman informed the meeting that she was aware that some delegates had to leave early either for travel reasons or due to club, and other, commitments that evening, and so she asked if everyone would be agreeable to bringing Item 8 forward on the agenda as it dealt with the election of officers. The meeting agreed.

8 Election of officers for 2017/2021. Nominations received for: -

Vice Chairman **Margaret Grayston**
 Janice Kaufman

Finance Officer **Lorraine Vidler**
 Karl Ponty

The Chairman informed the committee that Lorraine Vidler has since withdrawn her nomination for the role of Finance Officer, which left just the Vice Chairman's post with two candidates.

Grace Hall invited both those candidates to address the meeting to enhance the brief statements that had been circulated to clubs with the AGM papers.

Margaret Grayston declined the offer, as she felt she had given a comprehensive statement.

Janice Kaufman gave a brief supporting statement outlining the current Roles and Responsibilities of the Vice Chairman, with some observations she had made during the course of the AGM as to how the role of Vice Chairman could be enhanced to better support the work done by the chairman and committee, she outlined some of her thoughts:

Looking at sponsorships and partnerships with UKA and possibly EA

Looking at what clubs pay into the league, and what they get out of it; she felt there could be scope to increase what was coming into the league finances and enhancing what smaller clubs get out of it.

Looking at possible options with the School Games

Looking at whether a three-year deal with stadiums could be of benefit in cutting costs

She had worked with the management committee previously as part of the working party and understood that it wasn't an easy job with so many clubs with diverse needs, but reminded everyone that we need to keep looking at what best serves the athletes in all our deliberations, as she pointed out that the U20s aren't well served by the league's structure at the moment, with potentially an 8-week season for the majority.

Both candidates then left the room while the vote was taken.

Janice Kaufman was duly elected. The candidates then returned to the room and the chairman congratulated Janice, and thanked Margaret for all the work she had put into the league since its inception.

The chairman then asked the meeting to vote on whether they wished to elect **Karl Ponty** as Finance Officer

Voting was unanimously in favour

The chairman then expressed her thanks to Lorraine for the excellent work she had done over the last 5 years as well as during the previous 18 months when the league was being set up. She asked the meeting to express their appreciation with **a round of applause**.

Karl informed the meeting that Lorraine would be continuing in post during the handover period until 31st December, with Karl taking over on 1st January 2018.

Election of management committee members for 2017/2019. Nominations received for: -

General Committee **Chris Power**
(4 positions) **Leslie Roy**
 Joyce Tomala

Voting was unanimously in favour of the above being duly elected onto the committee.

Grace informed that meeting that as Karl Ponty had been elected as Finance Officer and Bob Harvey had stood down from the committee there are now 2 vacancies on the management group, she asked if anyone was interested in serving on the committee to please contact her to discuss it. Lorraine Vidler had indicated that she would be interested in continuing as the role of Southern Area Co-ordinator, and the management committee had discussed and agreed that they would be happy to appoint Lorraine as a casual vacancy to enable her to do this. Grace, on behalf of the management group, proposed a vote of thanks to all retiring members who were standing down from the committee for their hard work over the last 5 years.

The meeting then reverted back to the original agenda:

6.2 Management Committee proposals for rule changes:

6.2.1 RULE 7: DECLARATIONS

Marian Williams explained that the changes to Rules 7 were proposed, to bring them into line with the new results software. Team managers had fully embraced the introduction of the portal and we now needed to adjust the rules accordingly.

Rule 7.1

Declaration sheets are obtainable on the website and should be sent, by email, to the host club at least 24 hours before the start of the meeting.

Be replaced with:

“Declarations must be made on the Team Managers’ portal, and must be made at least 24 hours before the start of the meeting”

Paul Allen (Kingdom Athletic) seconded the proposal.

Geoff Morphitis asked how many people failed to comply with the 24-hour rule? Marian replied that she doesn't have any empirical evidence about numbers but there were some habitual 'offenders' although not very many, but they did make it difficult for the host club by not declaring in advance. Geoff then asked why it was necessary to declare the teams 24 hours ahead of the meeting if the portal can be updated during the course of the match. **Arwel Williams** explained start lists have to be produced, and leaving it to the morning of the match wasn't really an option. **Alan Johnson further** pointed out that not all tracks will have a wi-fi link so some matches will still be using the paper change slips.

The meeting voted unanimously in favour of the proposal.

Rule 7.2

Team declarations must be made on the official sheets provided by the League. Please note, second-claim declaration sheets (applicable only to upper age group athletes – subject to a maximum of 4 male and 4 female per club) must be completed for each athlete at each fixture.

Be replaced with:

“Second-claim athletes (applicable only to upper age group athletes – subject to a maximum of 4 male and 4 female per club per match) must be clearly identified on the portal.”

It was pointed out that the number of second claim athletes would be increased to five in accordance with the vote taken earlier in the meeting. The important thing was that they must be declared and identified correctly on the portal.

Arwel Williams seconded the proposal.

The meeting voted unanimously in favour of the proposal.

Rule 7.3

The declarations should be fully completed giving full name, age group and first- or second-claim competitor, or non-scoring athlete.

(For clarification: It will be necessary to provide the URN for each competing athlete on the declaration form)

Be replaced with:

“All athletes' details must be fully completed on the portal showing the correct URN and accurate date of birth”

Marian explained that when the portal is completed correctly it is far easier to check registration; adherence to this rule will cut down on the excessive amount of work that Grace has had to do this year, to comply with the UKA rules of competition.

The bulk of the teams are on the portal now, so for most, it should just be a matter of adding new athletes which is not too onerous a task.

Lyn Orbell pointed out that team managers should also be ensuring that the athletes' correct names are on the portal. It was agreed that this was the ideal but provided the URN and DoB are correct it was possible to identify the correct athlete and amend the portal accordingly.

There was a query raised about new members, when they may not have received their URN. **Grace Hall** then explained that team managers should provide as much correct information as possible on the portal; whilst the athletes(s) would show on the results as

unregistered, the club has a further 7 days to register any such athlete(s) with their governing body. She is aware that this can be a lengthy process so uses some discretion, however clubs should try to expedite the process as quickly as possible to avoid losing points.

David Little thought that the proposal should also include the statement that names should be declared correctly.

David Jeacock suggested that this could be done by combining the two statements as follows:

“The declarations should be fully completed giving full name, age group and first- or second-claim competitor, or non-scoring athlete. All athletes’ details must be fully completed on the portal showing the correct URN and accurate date of birth”

David Little seconded the proposal.

The meeting voted unanimously in favour of the proposal.

Rule 7.4

Changes on the day should be submitted 10 minutes before the scheduled event time on an “athlete change slip”

Be replaced with:

“Changes on the day should be submitted 10 minutes before the scheduled event time, either on the portal, or using the bespoke league change slips, whichever is appropriate”

This change was to allow for fixtures using a wi-fi link which enabled team managers to update using the portal instead of paper changes.

Stuart Hall seconded the proposal.

The meeting voted unanimously in favour of the proposal.

Rule 7.5

In the event of an athlete competing without having been declared on the official sheet, all points gained will be deducted.

Be replaced with:

“In the event of an athlete competing without having been declared in the correct manner, all points gained will be deducted.”

Stuart Hall seconded the proposal.

The meeting voted unanimously in favour of the proposal.

6.2.2 RULE 10: CANCELLATION OF MEETINGS/EVENTS

Marian Williams explained that the rationale behind this change was to differentiate between individual events cancelled during the course of a match, and the situation where the whole fixture is abandoned. The current rule 10 deals with both scenarios within one rule 10.3, and this proposed change sought to clarify the difference. Rule 10.3.3 and 10.3.4 are better sited under rule 10.2 which refers to individual events cancelled prior to the day of the fixture, and this would simply extend that:

Move, and re-number, existing rule 10.3.3 and 10.3.4 to become

10.2.1 ***“If an event is cancelled during the course of a match by either the Track or Field Referee, on safety grounds, the decision must be communicated to a meeting of Team Managers. If conditions change during the meeting, that event will remain cancelled.
(The referee must make the decision which is final)”***

10.2.2 ***“Points for any events cancelled on the day of the meeting will be awarded according to the declarations at the start of the meeting. Athletes scoring points will be deemed to have competed and the event will count as part of their maximum number of events”.***

(Rules 10.3.1 and 10.3.2 remain as they are currently).

There was some discussion as to whether the wording is clear enough, however it was pointed out that this is not a re-wording of the rules, but a relocation of two parts of the existing rule. It was reiterated that there must always be consultation with team managers when either individual events are cancelled, or a match is abandoned, and they will agree the allocation of points, where necessary.

A number of points were raised about the timing of the cancellation and whether some team managers may try to manipulate the team to gain points.

David Jeacock suggested that the scoring of cancelled events is a complex issue, and the management committee may be wise to re-visit the wording and look at the implications of the allocation of points for future discussion.

Marian agreed to add a clarification to differentiate between cancelled event(s) and an abandoned match.

Joyce Tomala seconded the proposal.

The meeting voted unanimously in favour of the proposal.

6.2.3 **RULE 11. SCORING**

It is preferred that the official league results software is used

Be replaced with:

“The official league results software must be used to record the results”

Alan Johnson seconded the proposal.

The meeting voted unanimously in favour of the proposal.

7. To consider the following amendments to the constitution.

Objects of the league

Add 2.4 to the objects of the league:

2.4 “To do all things that are incidental or conducive to the attainment of the objects of the League or any one of them.”

Grace Hall explained that when the Working Party had proposed the changes to the Objects of the league last year in the constitution, the statement outlined above had been

left out. The management committee have asked for it to be re-instated as it covered the league for a number of eventualities, she cited an example where the management committee may wish to organise a raffle to generate income. The statement above would cover them for that.

Joyce Tomala seconded the proposal.

The meeting then voted on the proposal

Voting was unanimously in favour of this constitutional change.

9. The 2018 Annual General Meeting will take place on Saturday 17th November 2018.

In response to a query from Geoff Morphitis about the date of the 2018 final, Nigel informed him that the calendar has yet to be finalised but should be published before 7th December.

The Chairman thanked everyone for their input to the meeting and wished them a safe journey home. The meeting closed at 15:39.

DRAFT