



# UK YOUTH DEVELOPMENT LEAGUE

## Minutes of the 2018 Annual General Meeting

held at the Great Barr Hotel, Birmingham, on Saturday 17<sup>th</sup> November

**Present:** Grace Hall (Chairman); Janice Kaufman (Vice Chairman); Karl Ponty (Finance Officer); Marian Williams (Administrator) plus the following members of the management committee: Stuart Hall; Alan Johnson; Leslie Roy; Joyce Tomala; Lorraine Vidler; Donna Fraser (UKA)

The following clubs were in attendance:

Midland region (36 teams represented)

Birchfield Harriers; Bristol & West AC/Mendip; Burton AC; Cannock & Stafford AC; Charnwood AC; Cheltenham & County Harriers; City of Stoke AC; Cwmbran Harriers; Halesowen A & CC; Kidderminster & Stourport AC; Marshall Milton Keynes AC; Notts AC; Royal Sutton Coldfield AC; Rugby & Northampton AC; Solihull & Small Heath AC; South & East Wales; Swansea Harriers; Team Avon; Team DC; Wolverhampton & Bilston AC; Yate & District AC

Northern region (28 teams represented)

City of York AC; Deeside AAC; Doncaster AC; Kingdom Athletic; Leeds City AC; Liverpool Harriers; North Wales; Preston Harriers; Rotherham Harriers; Sale Harriers; Southport Waterloo AC; Spensborough & District AC; Team Edinburgh; Team Glasgow; Trafford AC; Wigan & District Harriers; Wrexham AC

Scottish region (5 teams represented)

Ayr Seaforth; Dundee Hawkhill Harriers; Edinburgh AC; Pitreavie; Victoria Park Glasgow AC

Southern region (9 teams represented)

Blackheath & Bromley Harriers & AC; Brighton & Hove AC; City of Portsmouth AC; Shaftesbury Barnet Harriers; Team Dorset

Apologies: Norma Blaine MBE (President); Malcolm Charlsh (YDL committee); Chris Power (NI area co-ordinator); Nigel Holl (UKA); Altrincham AC; Bracknell AC; City of Sheffield & Dearne AC; Havering AC; Hereford & County AC; Hillingdon AC; Horsham Blue Star Harriers; Leamington C & AC; M60 Nomads; North Somerset AC; Paddock Wood AC; Rhymney Valley AC; Salford Metropolitan AC; Shettleston AC; Swindon Harriers; Thames Valley Harriers; West Cheshire AC; Woodford Green with Essex Ladies; Worcester AC; Wyeshire

1. **Grace Hall, the chairman** extended a warm welcome to everyone in attendance and introduced Donna Fraser who was attending as the new member of the committee representing UKA.
2. **Minutes of the 2017 AGM**  
The minutes were deemed to be an accurate record, and their acceptance was proposed by **Guy Ferguson (Notts AC)** and seconded by **Alan Johnson (Trafford)**.  
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 be taken as read 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.

**Geoff Morphitis (Shaftesbury Barnet Harriers)** asked if any figures were available re the officiating at league fixtures, Marian replied that she did have the full breakdown for all matches and would set up the laptop at lunchtime for anyone who wished to see the spreadsheet.

**Jack Frost (Sale Harriers Manchester)** asked why the decision had been taken to stop publishing the Handbook and Programme as he felt it was a retrograde step. He felt that the decision taken last year to publish both in one document had been a good one, and very popular with both parents and athletes. **Arwel Williams (Liverpool Harriers)** referred to the Northern League whose Handbook has only been available on the website for many years and host clubs just print up the relevant pages for their officials. He felt that the cost saving was justified. Marian replied that the committee decision had been based on the necessity of cutting costs; the document would still be produced and put onto the website for all who needed it to print up as and when required. **David Little (Team Dorset)** asked what the cost would be for a limited print run so that each team could be sent one copy. Marian replied that it was difficult to estimate as the costs for a limited run would be considerably higher per booklet than for a print run of over 4 000. **Leslie Roy (Victoria Park Glasgow)** wondered why people needed a hard copy. Jack pointed out that the website version was in A4 format and not the more useful A5. **Sam Hillier Smith (Yate)** highlighted a number of options available to clubs using different formats to print sections of the Handbook themselves. Whilst there were some who agreed that it was a regrettable decision, there were also a number who felt that they weren't needed as most people had access to technology and could therefore print it up in different formats for the differing requirements of those who needed the information. Grace suggested that any feedback from clubs about this issue would be very helpful.

**Kevin Thomas (Rotherham Harriers)** queried whether results would still be published on Power of 10 if there weren't the requisite number of officials at a match. Marian felt that it was unlikely that Po10 would publish results where the number of officials was too low. Grace Hall pointed out the results will always be on our website and we are aiming to ensure that the final, scrutinised results will replace the initial results sent by host clubs on the day of the match.

**David Little** asked for further clarification on throwing cages, and asked whether UKA would be sending out further information as to which tracks were affected. **Tim Soutar (Blackheath & Bromley)** pointed out that UKA had already sent out the document but clubs would need to have their cages assessed as to how they could upgrade or adjust them to the required IAAF standard, he felt that timetable changes wouldn't be sufficient for some tracks, he reminded the meeting that Michael Hunt is the point of contact.

**Arwel Williams** gave an example of the differing costs quoted to his clubs when they had looked at how best to upgrade their cage, he also informed the meeting that every track would need to be compliant by 2020.

**Donna Fraser** confirmed that this was a Health & Safety issue, there is a cost involved but it is something we have to do. She reaffirmed that clubs will need to contact Michael Hunt if they have any queries.

**Graham Felton (Royal Sutton Coldfield)** reported that he made enquiries from cage suppliers about upgrading their cage, but prices had gone up by 15 – 20% since this information had been circulated. Could UKA bring some pressure to bear on suppliers.

**Paul Baxter (City of York AC)** asked if it could be fed back to UKA that the dissemination of information on Trackmark was very poor. **Kevin Thomas** further commented that the process is expensive and questioned why it was deemed to be essential. Previously tracks had been inspected on a regular basis by UKA appointed inspectors and this had worked well. Donna agreed to take this back from the meeting.

**David Little** asked what the rationale was behind joint fixtures as in his opinion it would lengthen meetings in some divisions. Grace replied that attendance was very variable at some matches and so it was being trialled in the Midlands and North initially and would be assessed. It was never the intention that it would be used for all matches and certainly not when it could lengthen the day to an unacceptable level. One additional benefit would be the easing of the officials' situation especially for some smaller clubs.

## 5. Financial Report.

5.1 **Karl Ponty, the finance officer** had produced a very detailed report which had been circulated to all clubs, and he explained the rationale behind the financial documents also circulated. For 2018 he had used the same headings as in previous years, but alongside this he had also shown the accounts in more detail in order to give a clearer picture as to how the income and expenditure was allocated using the different headings.

### 5.2 Adoption of the Accounts

- **Geoff Morphitis (Shaftesbury Barnet Harriers)** proposed that the 2018 accounts be adopted
- **Arwel Williams (Liverpool Harriers)** seconded the motion.

Votes Against: 0

Abstentions: 0

The meeting voted in favour of adopting the accounts

In 2019 the accounts will be produced using the new format.

On the income side, the regional finals had been removed from the overall total to differentiate them from the regular income from teams. Donations were from individual members of the committee who wished to donate some of their fees back to the league.

He explained that under the new format he had broken the expenditure down to central costs, league costs and other special costs; the administration fees had been apportioned in accordance with the work that each post holder carried out. Hosting support and travel support had been separated, the majority of travel claims for the 2018 season had been received by the 30 September deadline, although if there were any clubs who hadn't submitted their claim they would need to contact Karl as the forms are no longer on the website. In the interests of budget forecasting it was important that we are aware of how much the league costs.

In light of the reducing funding from UKA, Karl suggested that it was wise to retain a sizeable amount in our reserves to cover the expenses of the league going forward. As the UKA money is essentially to support Talent Development and Performance, the committee had agreed to allocate the UKA money into three distinct areas in line with UKA objectives:

- Precision Measurement for Talent
- Developing Talent from across the UK
- Rewarding team performance

**Geoff Morphitis** commented that the overall standard of accounting disclosure in the accounts is over and above that which was expected and wished to compliment Karl on that, he commented that responses to queries had been very timely; he thought that the format is excellent for both information and transparency, however he wondered if UKA appoint anyone to oversee the accounts? Lorraine confirmed that UKA had audited the accounts in 2016 at the end of the first round of funding.

Geoff then noted that the figure to cover Hardship seemed high. Karl explained that the figures hadn't changed from 2017 only that it was more visible now. Payments in 2018 had been made along the same lines as in previous years but from 2019 onwards travel costs were going to be taken out of the Hardship payment and considered along with travel for all other clubs; travel

over sea and accommodation would remain within the Hardship budget. With regard to accommodation it had been discussed and subsequently agreed that teams travelling over three hours in each direction would be eligible to apply for overnight accommodation. Once the league structures have been confirmed, any club who feels that they fall into the category they should apply for Hardship and all claims would then be considered by the management committee in January. The committee would agree a set figure per head for all competing athletes and up to 9 accompanying adults (officials and team managers).

**Arwel Williams (Liverpool Harriers)** asked for confirmation about accommodation costs, and Karl confirmed that for 2018 he had made the payments in the same way as in previous years. Going forward, the committee would be applying the three-hour travel limit to accommodation.

**David Little (Team Dorset)** commented that having regionalised divisions had cut down on the travel for many teams, it had reduced costs and also made the overall day shorter.

Karl reiterated that any teams who wished to be considered for Hardship in 2019, will need to download the claim form from the website and submit it for consideration by the management committee at their January meeting.

### 5.3 Subscriptions for 2018/2019.

***“The Management Committee propose that subscriptions remain 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.”***

**Geoff Morphitis** suggested that £90 per match was lower than other leagues and disciplines and wondered if a gradual increase would be sensible in the light of the diminishing funding support from UKA. He suggested an increase of £10 per match wouldn't be too excessive for clubs to pay in 2019 and would be preferable to a larger increase which may be necessary in future years. **David Little** commented that it may be a struggle for the smaller clubs to pay the potential extra £40 per team.

**Grace Hall** asked if Geoff wished to submit a counter proposal to increase the fees:

- **Geoff Morphitis** proposed that the fees be increased by £10 to £100 per match,
- **Paul Allen (Kingdom Athletic)** seconded the proposal

**Stuart Hall** pointed out that charging too much may well result in some clubs dropping out which would be counter-productive.

**Karl Ponty** explained that as the league had made a significant profit in 2018, it was decided not to ask for an increase especially as they had increased quite substantially the previous year.

**John Melville (Team Glasgow)** suggested that the fee could be proportional according to team sizes as shown on the portal, however Karl pointed out that this would be difficult to administer and would make budgeting very difficult as we would have no idea what our income was likely to be. He felt that further research would have to be done on this. **Guy Ferguson (Notts)** thought that there may a strong case for Payment to Compete to be made in future years; he suggested that clubs in Premier divisions are usually bigger and so can absorb cost increases more easily, but the smaller clubs are more vulnerable to large increases in fees. The bottom line is that the league must be financially viable, and that we must have a mechanism in place to support the league going forward.

**Kevin Thomas** also felt that until we know what the financial impact Trackmark will be, we shouldn't overburden clubs at this time.

**Grace then called for a vote on the amendment**

Votes For: 16

Votes against: 53

The amendment was rejected

- **David Little (Team Dorset)** proposed to accept the original management proposal
- **Dave Edwards (Wrexham)** seconded the proposal

The meeting voted unanimously in favour.

Karl pointed out that if any club wished to pay more as a donation they would be more than welcome.

#### 5.4 Travel.

*"The Management Committee propose to reimburse travel expenses for the 2018 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"*

- **Hilary Nash (Team Avon)** proposed that the meeting accept the above proposal
- **David Little** seconded the proposal

The meeting voted unanimously in favour.

##### 5.4.2 Track Hire.

*"The Management Committee propose that, for the 2018 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 2018 season."*

There was some confusion over the wording and it was thus agreed to amend the wording as follows:

*Up to £500 - 50% of costs;*

*Above £500 - 60% of excess costs;*

*Plus £100 for the use of Photo Finish and £50 for the use of EDM in the 2018 season.*

- **Lee Coupland (Southport Waterloo)** proposed that the meeting accept the proposal
- **Keith Perry (Halesowen)** seconded the proposal

The meeting voted unanimously in favour of this reworded proposal.

5.5 Karl explained that the management committee wished to change the method of payment back to teams such that claims could be submitted and paid during the course of the season rather than retrospectively after the AGM.

##### 5.5.1 To approve the Management Committee's proposal to reimburse travel expenses for the 2019 season:

**Less than 400 miles – no payment**

**400 miles or more – 50p/mile**

**Hilary Nash** suggested that the payment for composite teams should be aggregated rather than payment based on the closest track to the venue. Karl responded that this was the default position

for all teams, but that composite teams would be treated a little differently and they are encouraged to forward comments on their own circumstances to the management committee for consideration. **Grace** pointed out that the Financial report did give details as to how the differentials would be dealt with.

**Paul Farres (City of Portsmouth)** asked whether the 400 miles was per match or for all matches together. He was assured that this was the total number of miles across the season.

**Steve Endacott (Team DC)** felt that this proposal would penalise his team if it was successful. Karl assured him that that was not the intention and that all composite team claims would be looked at in further detail to allow for the differences.

**Geoff Morphitis** asked whether there was a minimum amount payable for claims? Karl replied that at the moment there wasn't, indeed he had received a claim for 50p this year.

**Janice** thought it would be better to consider this for next year, but Grace felt that it wasn't unreasonable in the light of some of the claims made this year to put in a minimum payment

- **Geoff Morphitis** proposed that in addition to the original proposal, claims below £25 will not be considered
- **Tim Soutar** seconded the proposal

The meeting voted unanimously in favour.

5.5.2 ***The Management Committee proposes that, for the 2019 season, the host club reimbursement should be paid as follows:***

***A fixed amount of £200, and a variable amount of £30 for each team timetabled to compete at the match***

***plus £100 for the use of Photo Finish, £50 for the use of EDM and £25 each for the use of track and/or field wind gauges in the 2019 season.***

Karl Ponty informed the meeting that in 2018 the Mean payment to clubs was £270, and the Median payment £260. Under this proposal most teams will receive an increased payment for hosting, and they would be better position to budget their costs and potentially also be better equipped to negotiate with track providers.

**Judy Kelsall (Burton AC)** asked whether teams hosting double headers would receive the additional payments for the teams in both divisions, this was affirmed.

**Keith Parry** asked if it would be acceptable if teams who were co-hosting could come to their own arrangements as to who would claim. Joyce Tomala asked that all teams should contact the area co-ordinator in regard to this.

**Hilary Nash** asked if there was any allowance for the different age groups needing longer track time, and thus increased costs. Karl replied that this was certainly something the committee could consider for future years.

**Steve Endacott** enquired what the fixed cost had been previously, but it was pointed out that this was a new concept for 2019.

**Stuart Hall** reminded the meeting that in 2019, wind gauges are also to be included in claims. Karl endorsed this and informed clubs that claims will only be paid after confirmation from the Administrator that the equipment has been used, and this will be checked under the scrutinisation process.

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

- **Judy Kelsall (Burton)** proposed that the motion be approved by the meeting
- **Paul Baxter (City of York)** seconded the proposal

Votes against: 2

Abstentions: 0

The meeting voted overwhelmingly in favour.

Karl informed the meeting that the forecast budget was based on the 2018 figures: ie 25% of matches used Photofinish, 30% of matches used EDM.

Hardship has been split into the component parts, and the cost of all finals have been shown as a separate entity.

## 6. Resolutions.

### 6.1 Proposals from clubs:

#### Carried over from the 2017 AGM:

6.1.1 **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.”***

**We would even support regional finals which would be at a lower cost. At least then more clubs would benefit**

**The net costs for the last 3 years are as follows:**

**2014      Birmingham - £30 207**

**2015      Birmingham - £26 721**

**2016      Bedford - £25 709**

**2017      Birmingham - £tbc, but will be similar to previous years.**

At this point Grace suggested that she was aware of some disquiet amongst some of the membership and asked if anyone had anything to bring up prior to opening the discussion.

**Geoff Morphitis** stated that having looked at the constitution into the principle of carrying motions over from a previous meeting and there doesn't seem to be anything. He had asked Grace whether this motion had been proposed formerly this year by Liverpool and the supporting clubs, because the figures contained it are the same as last year's proposal. Is there a new proposal for this year or is it just last year's proposal?

**Grace** confirmed that he had asked the question of her and she had responded that it had been left on the table as the legal advice she had received at the time was that this was an appropriate way to deal with it. She had presumed that as it was left on the table, and based on the minutes that had been circulated in December, which had subsequently been approved, she felt that there wasn't a need for the clubs to re-submit it. Whilst there was nothing in the constitution about this, conversely there was nothing in the constitution that didn't allow for this action and it's all down to legal interpretation. She hadn't approached our previous legal advisor about it but had taken general advice and the consensus was that the interpretation could vary from one person to another. She felt that this proposal tabled was just to come back and finish what was started last year. Since then we had received the cost of last year's finals and this year we have the itemised cost of the 2018 final and that gave members everything they need to have a vote on this. If Geoff wished to raise a Point of Order that the proposal wasn't submitted in the correct manner, then the meeting could decide whether or not to proceed with this proposal. Geoff responded that he would like the proposal to be discussed so that everyone could air their views

which would allow the meeting to ascertain what the issues were, but as to the submission itself there may be some further challenge.

**Tim Soutar** also confirmed that he felt the matter should be discussed; he had not seen the legal advice which the Chairman has received but felt that the meeting should understand - and he asked that this be minuted, that there was a question over whether the appropriate formalities leading to a vote, and thus the decision, had been taken. That may or may not be relevant subsequently, but if the discussion were to proceed, and he felt that it should, it had to be on the understanding that there is a question mark over whether it would be a legitimate resolution if passed.

**The Chairman** then referred back to her original statement that the members present must be the ones who decide whether it would be worthwhile going ahead with the discussion.

**Tim Souter** re-affirmed that he felt it would be worth discussing, but if the chairman was suggesting that it is up to the meeting to decide if it is legitimate or not, he pointed out that it was a matter of constitutional law and he didn't feel that the meeting was in a position to do that because all the members hadn't been notified about its legitimacy. He further suggested that it may well be that it was acceptable; he didn't feel that we would ever wish to go to a Court of Appeal because no-one would benefit from that.

Grace suggested that this would only be relevant if the proposal were successful, however Tim stressed that the issue is, whatever the outcome of the vote, that those who are not happy with that result should not be deemed to have acquiesced, so people should not be estopped from challenging on the basis that they were at the meeting, and therefore compliant, everyone should be able to reserve that right. Grace felt that we shouldn't waste people's time; if the meeting discussed the proposal there should be a valid outcome.

Tim pointed out that unfortunately the proposal had not gone through the formalities that every other resolution had gone through so there was a question mark over it which could not be decided at the meeting.

Grace stated that if a decision was reached, no-one should be able to go back and state that it wasn't constitutional. The members attending would make the final decision as to whether the discussion and vote could take place and that the outcome would be binding. If Tim wasn't willing to put a Point of Order to the meeting to this effect then she, as Chairman, would do it. Tim reiterated again that the Point of Order would be that in proceeding with the issue no-one should be in a position subsequently to state that it cannot be challenged on the grounds that they were here and had participated; the basic problem being that the membership is more than the people in the room. Grace asked why this proposal was different to all the other proposals; Tim replied that it was because all the others had followed the correct procedure, and people had been informed on that basis.

**David Little** asked whether one of the clubs who originally proposed the motion could justify why they wished the proposal should go ahead, as it had been based on old figures which have now been updated.

**Arwel Williams** responded on behalf of the club who originally submitted this motion in 2017. He had been willing to defer the motion the previous year to see whether the costs could be reduced. Everyone accepted that the proposal had been deferred, and the minutes of the 2017 AGM stated this, furthermore he felt that Tim using the threat of a Court of Appeal was disgraceful.

**Bryan Forsbrook (Cheltenham & County)** asked if any of the eight clubs had made any comment. Grace responded that there had been an assumption that the proposal would automatically be on the table and only when the possibility of a Point of Order had been raised then the clubs involved had either informed herself or the proposer that they wished the matter to be discussed and voted on.

She then suggested that the meeting could decide to carry on and accept that whatever happened at the meeting would be binding, or she could put it to the vote that the item is on the

agenda illegally. She then posed the question to all the members present – *“Is this item on the agenda correctly? And if so, can we discuss it and vote on it without anything on the result being questioned afterwards?”* and asked for a show of hands.

**Tim Soutar** pointed out that at this juncture there had to be a Point of Order that a vote on that question would be ineffective. Everyone in the room was likely to be thinking that if they raised their hands they would be legitimising the process. He apologised if his words had been deemed to be threatening, but he was actually trying to avoid a situation where, after the event, it ended up in some kind of awful dispute. He wished to make it clear that there was a problem that could not be resolved that day. He expressed a preference to go ahead with the discussion, but that it should be understood that any decision on this issue would not be free from potential challenge from whomever wished to make such a challenge, and nothing done in the room could fix that. Grace pointed out that the Management Committee have the right to do whatever they feel the majority of members would prefer, and they are happy to take that on board. She then invited the proposer of the original motion to make a brief statement in support of the motion, and would then open the floor for further questions.

**Arwel Williams** spoke briefly to the motion:

Whilst he didn't wish to repeat the bulk of what he had said the previous year, he acknowledged that the league had managed to reduce the figures for 2018 quite significantly, which was very commendable; a large chunk of the savings were made on officials the cost of which had been halved, additionally the cost of the stadium at Bedford was significantly cheaper than the quotes received from other stadia, consequently he felt that the figures weren't sustainable in the long term and the figures in the budget for the finals wouldn't cover the amount needed.

Whilst he understood that the athletes who go to the finals enjoy their experience, he felt that we need to cut our cloth according to our reducing income. 13 teams had attended the finals which meant that almost 300 hadn't gone. He could understand the concerns from Shaftesbury and Blackheath because the finals produce the team that goes to Europe but he felt that there are other ways to determine that.

He reiterated that UKA didn't have a sponsor, so the league cannot afford the finals. If UKA wanted us to hold finals, they should put up the money for it.

**Mark Exley (Marshall Milton Keynes)** pointed out that UKA are sponsored by Mueller, and supported by UK Sport).

**Hilary Nash** stated that the finals are an inspirational event for the athletes; those who attended who are inspired to continue training and try to qualify next year, and for the others who didn't make it but are aiming to get there next time. It is a unique occasion where athletes compete together as a team, unlike national championships where they compete as individuals; in addition, he pointed out that the budget already included an allowance for finals in 2019. He therefore felt it was something we should strive to retain.

**Katherine Rankin (Preston Harriers)** wished to second everything Hilary had said, as their club also viewed the finals as inspirational for all the athletes, for the younger age groups it is their only chance to compete in a national event unless they are one of the few who qualify to compete in the national finals. She pointed out that some of the high schools recognise the achievement of the athletes who compete at a national level and to take that away would be regrettable; if that opportunity was taken away the league just becomes a regional competition.

**Peter Hancock (Preston Harriers)** informed the meeting that it had taken their club ten years to work their way through the divisions to get to the Premier division then a further ten years until they qualified for the finals, although they had been soundly defeated that time. He felt that it was something they and their athletes aspired to, and that all clubs can set their stall out to achieve the honour of reaching the finals. He pointed out that the YDL is a national league, if you remove the finals then it becomes just a group of regional leagues, no longer national. Last year

the club had been concerned that the cost was too high but now it was much closer to being what it should be.

**Paul Farrer** pointed out that it's not just aspirational for clubs in the Premier divisions, but it's also something that teams in lower divisions can aspire to. His own club Portsmouth are not in a Premier division, nevertheless it gave them something to aspire to and is an end goal, which is important for athletes to have.

**Guy Ferguson** also wished to back up what had already been said, he pointed out that it wasn't just the 13 clubs who had qualified for the finals, but an aspiration for all the clubs in the Premier divisions, and an end goal for all clubs who are developing as it gives them something to aim for. Athletics is a sport driven by achievement, and whilst it's great to be big in the region, it's even better to achieve at a national level and that's what drives his athletes.

**Keith Perry** pointed out that even small clubs have aspirations to achieve the goal of qualifying for the finals, and it's what makes us a national league.

**Donna Fraser, UKA representative** informed the meeting that she and Nigel are now working alongside one another for the YDL and they had been very impressed with the accounts and wished to congratulate Karl on the detail given; UKA recognise that their financial contribution to YDL is diminishing, but they are fully supportive of the finals, moving forward.

**Geoff Morphitis** congratulated Joyce and her team for the tremendous job in reducing the costs for the finals significantly, he then went on to Arwel's point about the cost of officials and agreed that he too found it quite high and felt that further savings could be made. He alluded to Arwel's comment that stadium costs would rise, but suggested that if the finals were to be held in the Allianz stadium, as an example, the costs would be lower, there is a compensatory cost between stadium hire and officials' costs and catering.

He expressed his thanks to Donna for confirming what Nigel Holl had previously said to him, that UKA support is there in the capacity of a sponsor of this league from its outset. He reiterated that UKA does have sponsors with Mueller and the new deal with Nike as well as funding from the governing body, so he felt that it was unfair to spread the fear that they didn't have the money. He suggested that UKA view YDL as important in their development role and that they see the final as an important use of their money. Geoff finished by pointing out that for a lot of athletes the finals are the pinnacle of their athletics careers at that point

**Grace Hall** pointed out to the meeting that the money received from UKA has never been sponsorship but was actually a grant. Initially the funding came from a consortium which comprised UKA and England Athletics who approached Sport England and got the grant specifically for YDL. In the last tranche YDL was not even considered as it was deemed that the league should be self-sufficient. We were nowhere near that point, and so the money from UKA has been grant funded from their talent programme supplemented with a figure which is from UKA specifically. The money will continue to go down for the next two years and then it will cease, the league are only guaranteed £20 000 from 2020. The money is paid as a grant and not sponsorship. When asked about the league finding a sponsor Nigel had pointed out that sponsors want something back for their money which is not likely in our type of sport, and this was why we've never been successful at finding a sponsor for the league, despite assistance from UKA in trying to do so. When the league were in receipt of £120 000 the finals were a viable financial outlay, but not so now.

She further went on to state that when we come to a vote on this hypothetically if next week, next month, or next year, someone comes along and offers to sponsor YDL, but only if there are finals, or a sponsor who wanted to support the finals alone, the management have the right to re-instate the finals based on that offer. This proposal only takes away the finals until such time as a sponsor is found, only doing this because we have no sponsor at this time.

She pointed out that the management can add the name of a sponsor under the constitution, item 1.1, plus also:

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.

Therefore, if a sponsor should materialise, and it is a fit with the league, and complies with the governing body rules, the finals would be re-instated.

She wished to make it clear what people would be voting for.

**Arwel Williams** stated that there was no reference to the YDL finals on their website, he reiterated that if UKA wanted the YDL finals to take place then they needed to put up the funding.

**Paul Baxter** reminded the group of the meeting that had taken place in Sports City in March 2017 where Nigel Holl had stated that the league must ultimately be self-funding. He agreed with Arwel that UKA should put up the money for the finals if they wanted them.

**Arwel Williams** then suggested that if clubs wanted to compete in a final then they should be asked to pay for it to the tune of approx. £1 000 per club. However, **Guy Ferguson** pointed out that that would definitely preclude smaller clubs from ever being able to compete in it; it would become a commercial decision which we should avoid, to try to keep the access open to all. **Tim Soutar** agreed that we shouldn't be putting a price on it and it shouldn't become a competition which was only available to those who could buy their way into the national finals. He also suggested that if this motion was passed then maybe the word 'development' should be removed from the title, he asked what the development was if we removed the top tier of the league away. He wholeheartedly supported the other comments with regard to the league becoming just a series of regional competitions.

**Grace Hall** commented that maybe the word should be 'realistic' and that we should become the 'realistic league'. She then reminded everyone that winning the UAG finals did not automatically give them the right to attend the European Junior club championships, we just nominate the teams to UKA and it is up to them whether or not they accept the nomination but there are other ways to nominate the teams. **Geoff Morphitis** suggested that the debate was about retaining the national final as pinnacle for a year's inter-club athletics, the nomination to the Euros was only a by-product of the finals and not the main purpose of them. He stated that what Grace had quoted was in direct contradiction to what Nigel had said to him. He was however curious to know if Arwel was saying that as the funds for the finals are already in the budget, was this proposal to be put in abeyance in 2019? Arwel responded that they would have to be abandoned at some point, as the league must balance its books.

**Paul Baxter** reminded everyone that the league does have £60 000 coming in from UKA, but there is still a deficit forecast for next year.

**Paul Allen** suggested that it should be reviewed annually as the financial situation changes. It is more than viable in 2019, and the Management committee should bring it back every year when the budgets have been set.

**Peter Hancock** suggested that the management committee should review it and bring it back to the table when they feel it is necessary.

**Grace Hall** then called for a vote on the proposal.

There was a substantial majority against the proposal

#### The motion was defeated

**Joyce Tomala** then informed the meeting that she does not wish to be involved in the organisation of the finals any more, neither does the officials secretary or the competition director.

**Mark Exley** asked if there was any reason behind that decision, and Joyce responded that it was a lot of work and that the responses from some clubs has been diabolical. **Stuart Hall** further stated that those involved felt that they had done it for long enough.

**Grace Hall** informed the meeting that the management committee have it in hand. Further information should be available in the new year. She then thanked Arwel for bringing this proposal forward.

## 6.2 Management Committee proposals for rule changes:

### 6.2.1 RULE 2: RESPONSIBILITIES OF HOST CLUBS

#### Rule 2.6 –

Wherever possible, results should be circulated to all competing clubs on the evening of the fixture. Any corrections or amendments should then be returned to the host clubs within 24 hours.

#### To be replaced with:

***“Results should be circulated to all competing clubs on the evening of the fixture. Any corrections or amendments should then be returned to the host clubs within 24 hours”***

Marian explained that the current rules only stipulated that host clubs send results through to the web manager and area co-ordinators on the evening of the fixture, but the committee felt that it was equally important for all competing teams to receive a copy of the results as soon as possible. Many matches now use a wifi link or mobile hotspot to produce the results which means that they can be emailed immediately on completion of the match, if not, a paper copy of the results could be given to all clubs at the match followed up with an emailed copy later that evening. This allowed teams time to check through and send any corrections back within the 24 hours so that a corrected version would be sent to Power of 10, AW and the Administrator on the following Tuesday.

**David Little** suggested that there was a weakness in the rule by using the word “should” instead of “must”.

**Kevin Thomas** asked why the results went to area co-ordinators and the website immediately. Marian explained that this gave athletes, parents and coaches the opportunity to see the initial results and may themselves notice errors. She explained that the intention for 2019 was to update the website with the scrutinised results. **Joyce Tomala** added that area co-ordinators can also help with queries as they too have a copy of the results.

- **Kevin Thomas** proposed that the motion be accepted
- **Alan Johnson** seconded

The meeting voted unanimously in favour.

### RULE 5: OFFICIALS

#### Rule 5.4.3 –

Five (5) match points will be credited for each official provided up to a maximum of 35 points, subject to satisfying the criteria above. In addition, any club providing the requisite number of officials, will receive a 20-points bonus taking the total to 55 points. There will however be a deduction of 5 points if a club does not provide the Level 2 field official, reducing the points to 30 maximum.

#### To be replaced with:

***“Points will be awarded for up to 7 officials who sign in as a Track judge, Timekeeper or Field judge on the league H & S signing in sheets, subject to satisfying the criteria above.***

***Six (6) match points will be credited for each qualified official who signs in for the relevant discipline up to a maximum of 42 points. Unqualified volunteers who sign in for any of the above duties shall be awarded three (3) match points.***

***There will however be a deduction of 5 points if a club does not provide a Level 2 field official, reducing the points to 37 maximum if all officials are qualified in their relevant discipline.”***

Marian referred to previous comments about the shortages of officials, as it had an issue which formed the majority of complaints this year. It is apparent from the number of emails received that there seem to be less officials willing and able to work at matches, and the information the league has collated would seem to support that perception in a number of divisions, but in addition to this, a large number of comments received had referred to the problems where a team could earn as many points for fielding unqualified volunteers as for qualified and experienced officials. The management committee felt that whilst it was important to reward the efforts of volunteer helpers as they are the ones where future officials are likely to be recruited from, it was important to reward the efforts of those who had gone on to become qualified, who in many matches were having to work a lot harder to cover the gaps, hence the proposal to award more points to qualified officials than to unqualified volunteers. So this proposal was tabled to try to encourage clubs to actively recruit and retain officials, without awarding a disproportionate amount of points for officials.

She reminded the meeting that there must be two qualified officials on all field events, and on long throws and pole vault one must be a level 2 field judge.

**David Little** felt that the rule didn't specify which officials' teams need to provide and they could turn up with 7 field officials, however Grace Hall pointed out that it was set out in rule 5.4.1.

**Denise Harris (Deeside)** suggested that the rule should be reworded such that the requirement was for '*at least a level 2 or above field official*' rather than just a '*level 2 field official*'. Everyone concurred.

It was pointed out that Trainees are not qualified until they have been signed off.

**Lyn Orbell (Birchfield)** noted that there is no mention of any specific qualifications for timekeepers and track judges which means that clubs aren't penalised if they don't provide either of these in the same way as they are for field judges. Marian commented that there was nothing in our rules about this at present, and UKA rules specify only that there must be four track judges and timekeepers (three for tracks with less than 6 lanes).

**Guy Ferguson** had reservations about this proposal as there was nothing to incentivise team managers to use the trainees to officiate instead of those already qualified, which could mean that they take longer to become qualified. It was pointed out that there was no reason that clubs couldn't use trainees alongside qualified officials, but Guy remarked that with a limited amount of personnel available it was unlikely that clubs would have that many volunteers to do that.

**Leslie Roy** referred back to Lyn Orbell's point and pointed out that specifying levels for field judges was for Health and Safety purposes.

**Hilary Nash** welcomed the potential change but felt that this proposal still didn't reward qualified officials sufficiently and pointed out that there are some clubs who regularly turn up without a level 2 field judge which puts the field referee under enormous pressure on the day, and the deduction of 5 points was a very small penalty, he suggested that the points should be 8 & 4 instead of 6 & 3 with a deduction of 10 points for not providing a level 2 field judge as this is a Health & Safety issue. Grace commented that there had been quite a long discussion at the management committee and it was felt that the proposal was intended as an interim measure which would be assessed as to whether further tweaking was needed and that further changes would be looked at for subsequent years, she felt that it would be wise to see how these changes proposed worked in 2019 before making additional changes. A number of delegates suggested that having a level 2 (or above) field judge on long throws and pole vault was a health and safety issue and so it was suggested that the deduction should be greater than 10 points, in consequence:

- **Hilary Nash (Team Avon)** proposed the following amendment to the proposal:

***“Points will be awarded for up to 7 officials who sign in as a Track judge, Timekeeper or Field judge on the league H & S signing in sheets, subject to satisfying the criteria above.***

***Eight (8) match points will be credited for each qualified official who signs in for the relevant discipline up to a maximum of 56 points. Unqualified volunteers who sign in for any of the above duties shall be awarded four (4) match points.***

***There will however be a deduction of 20 points if a club does not provide at least a Level 2 or above field official, reducing the points to 36 maximum if all officials are qualified in their relevant discipline.”***

- **Graham Felton** seconded the amendment

Voting for the amendment was as follows:

Votes For: 34

Votes against: 31

**David Little** commented that in many cases host clubs were themselves unable to provide enough officials and chiefs to run a match.

The amendment now became the substantive motion:

Votes For: 37

Votes against: 36

The amendment was approved

**Leslie Roy** commented that the current process of recruiting and training officials was not conducive to getting new people involved and there is too much red tape which needs to be addressed or clubs will continue to struggle, **Donna Fraser** informed the meeting that it is already under discussion, she has noted the comments made and will pass on the concerns highlighted.

## **RULE 6: NUMBERS**

### **Rule 6.2 –**

Numbers for non-scoring athletes are to be provided by the Host Club. They must be worn, front and back.

### **To be replaced with:**

***“Numbers for non-scoring athletes, where needed, are to be provided by the Host Club. They must be worn, front and back.”***

Marian explained the rationale behind this proposal. In the LAG, many non-scoring events are run as separate races and therefore athletes are able to wear their club bib numbers, consequently there is no need for them to be issued with separate numbers. The results software is only able to accept club numbers so it makes sense to use these wherever possible to avoid difficulties entering results into the software. The UAG records their results differently so different numbers are required, hence the inclusion of the wording – where needed.

**Geoff Morphitis** queried whether all non-scoring athletes in field events need to wear the number front and back, it was agreed that this wasn't necessary.

After some discussion it was decided to withdraw the proposal and add a clarification onto the rule instead.

## **RULE 11: SCORING**

### **Rule 11.4 –**

Should any athlete exceed their event restrictions as laid out in Appendix 1, the points gained will be deducted. In addition, the points scored by the athlete in their highest scoring event will also be deducted.

**To be replaced with:**

***“Should any athlete exceed their event restrictions as laid out in Appendix 1, the performances from any subsequent event(s) will be removed from the results. In addition, the points scored by the athlete in their highest scoring event will be deducted.***

Marian referred to the current UKA rulebook regarding the maximum number of events for age group athletes. This proposal was to clarify the procedure that would be followed in the event that this rule was broken.

There were a few requests for confirmation of which events would be removed and Marian confirmed that the first event which contravened the rule would be removed from the results.

**Grace Hall** also confirmed that Power of 10 contact us when they have picked up rule contraventions such as this. She also referred to disqualifications made when athletes aren't registered to compete.

- **Alan Johnson** seconded the proposal

The meeting voted unanimously in favour of the proposal.

7 There were no constitutional amendments tabled.

8 **Election of management committee members for 2018/2020. Nominations received for: -**

General Committee **Stuart Hall**  
(4 positions) **Alan Johnson**

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

**Election of General Committee member (to 2019).** (Casual Vacancy currently filled by Lorraine Vidler).

Nominations received for **Lorraine Vidler**

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

Grace reminded the meeting that there are still vacancies for up to two further members of the management group, she asked if anyone was interested in serving on the committee to please contact her to discuss it.

9. **The 2019 Annual General Meeting will take place on Saturday 16<sup>th</sup> November 2019.**

The Chairman thanked everyone for their input to the meeting and wished them a safe journey home. The meeting closed at 15:24.