



UK YOUTH DEVELOPMENT LEAGUE

Minutes of the 2023 Annual General Meeting

held at the Holiday Inn M6 J7 Hotel, Birmingham, on Saturday 25th November.

Present: Grace Hall (Chair); Janice Kaufman (Vice Chair); Karl Ponty (Finance Officer); Marian Williams (Administrator) plus the following members of the management committee, Stuart Horsewood; Tim Soutar plus:

The following clubs were in attendance:

Midland region (30 teams represented)

Birchfield Harriers; Cannock & Stafford AC; Cheltenham & County Harriers; City of Stoke AC; Coventry Godiva Harriers; Derby AC; Dudley & Stourbridge Harriers; East Wales; Gwent Harriers; Kidderminster & Stourport AC; Marshall Milton Keynes AC; Northampton AC; Rugby & Northampton AC; Saffron AC; Solihull & Small Heath AC; Swindon Harriers; Team Avon; Yate & District AC

Northern region (12 teams represented)

Blackburn Harriers; City of York AC; Gateshead Harriers; Kingdom Athletic; Liverpool Harriers; Rotherham Harriers; Wigan & District Harriers

Southern region (9 teams represented)

Blackheath & Bromley Harriers; Brighton & Hove AC; City of Portsmouth AC; Highgate Heathside; Portsmouth/Winchester; Shaftesbury Barnet Harriers; Winchester & District AC

Scottish region (2 teams represented)

Dundee Hawkhill Harriers; Pitreavie AAC

Apologies: Alan Johnson (Northern area co-ordinator); Leslie Roy (Scottish area co-ordinator); Arwel Williams (Liverpool Harriers); Lynne Moody (Solihull & Small Heath AC); Basildon; Bicester AC; Border Harriers; Bournemouth, New Forest Juniors & Salisbury; Bristol & West AC/Mendip; Bromsgrove & Redditch AC; Daventry AAC; East Cheshire Harriers; & Tameside AC; Halesowen A & CC; Harrow & Dacorum; Havering AC; Medway & Maidstone AC; Southampton; Swansea Harriers; Tamworth AC; Team Bedfordshire; West Cheshire AC; Wirral AC; Windsor, Slough, Eton & Hounslow.

- 1. Grace Hall, chair,** welcomed everyone and thanked them for coming to the AGM. She introduced members of the committee seated around the room and gave a brief update with regards to Alan Johnson who was in hospital on a ventilator at that time.
- 2. Minutes of the 2022 AGM**
The minutes were deemed to be an accurate record, and their acceptance was proposed by **Joyce Tomala (East Wales)** and seconded by **Annette Brown (Solihull & Small Heath AC)**.
With just one abstention, the minutes were approved by the meeting and signed by the Chair.
- 3. Chair's Report.**
Grace's report had been circulated to clubs and published on the website.
There were no supplementary questions.
- 4. Administrator's Annual Report**
The report had also been circulated as outlined above, there were no supplementary questions.

5. Financial Report.

5.1 **Karl Ponty, the finance officer**, commented that there was nothing unusual to report; the figures are quite healthy with reserve funds to allow the league to continue if we are unsuccessful in our bid for grant money from EA. The league had run at a loss of £17,750 which was somewhat hidden by the late receipt of a grant from EA which had been received after the accounts for 2022 had closed so was showing in the 2023 accounts instead. The league is currently in negotiation with EA about a delayed grant for 2023 which will help to offset the cost of supporting host clubs' expenses for precision measurement. Grace and Tim will be attending a meeting on Monday with EA and it's hopeful that we'll be awarded £25,000. Karl explained that this would mainly support the use of technology, it is unlikely that we will receive anything from either WA or SA.

Lesley Nunn (Team Avon) asked for further explanation about the administrative fees; Karl explained that these used to be referred to as Honorarium payments; they were paid in varying amounts to committee members with the largest portion being paid to the Administrator as that is a full-time role, the charges are allocated to different cost centres according to the workload. Grace further clarified that some members opted not to take the money, and she donated some of her allowance back to the league which is showing in the accounts. There were no further questions on the accounts.

5.2 Adoption of the Accounts

- **Doug Gunstone (Dundee Hawkhill Harriers)** proposed that the 2023 accounts be adopted.
- **Martin Smith (Swindon Harriers)** seconded the motion.

Votes Against: 0

Abstentions: 0

The meeting voted unanimously in favour of adopting the 2023 accounts.

5.3 Subscriptions for 2023/2024

Karl then moved on to the proposal to increase the team subscriptions by 8% to **£135 per match scheduled**, this would go directly to the host club reimbursements.

He commented that whilst he had intended pursuing his suggestion from last year's meeting that individual clubs should become members of the league to cover administration costs with an additional (lower) match fee, he felt that this would not be prudent now as he was resigning, and it wouldn't be fair to leave it for his successor to have to sort out.

- **Shaun Ainge (Cannock & Stafford)** seconded the management proposal.

Votes Against: 2

Abstentions: 0

The meeting voted overwhelmingly in favour

5.4 Re-imburements to teams

5.4.1 The management proposal for payments to reimburse travel payments was to remain at the same level as in the current year:

Less than 400 miles – no payment

400 miles or more - 50p per mile

The maximum support due to any team, attending a single away match, to a maximum of £500 per match in total (towards transport and accommodation).

(NB Claims amounting to less than £25 will not be reimbursed)''

Paul Allen (Kingdom Athletic) seconded the management proposal.

Votes Against: 0

Abstentions: 0

The meeting voted unanimously in favour of the above motion.

- 5.4.2 The Management Committee proposes that, for the 2024 season, the host club reimbursement should be paid as follows:

A fixed amount of £375, and a variable amount of £40 for each team timetabled to compete at the match, plus £200 for the use of Photo Finish, £80 for the use of EDM and £40 each for the use of track and/or field wind gauges.

Craig Scott (Swindon Harriers) seconded the management proposal.

Votes Against: 0

Abstentions: 0

The meeting voted unanimously in favour of the above motion.

6. Resolutions.

6.1 Resolutions from Clubs –

- 6.1.1 **Proposed by East Wales**, supported by Cardiff AAC; Charnwood AC; Cheltenham & County Harriers; South Wales; Swansea Harriers; West Wales.

We propose that Rule 11.2 be amended such that there is no absolute requirement to field at least one U20 athlete in all individual U20 track events.

The rule as it stands states:

- 11.2** In all **individual** track events, 2 competitors per team shall be permitted. In the U20 competition, if 2 athletes are entered, then at least one of them must be in the U20 age group.

(For clarification: relays are not subject to this rule)

This would be amended to:

- 11.2** In all **individual** track events, 2 competitors per team shall be permitted.

Joyce Tomala (East Wales) spoke to the motion; she stated that this suggestion had come from the coaches and athletes in her team. The clubs putting this forward felt that it could result in fuller fields which would be beneficial to athletes, and also help to create parity with field events which had no such restriction. Having volunteered to help with the scrutinising, she is aware that some clubs have entered two U17s in U20 track events, the B athlete had subsequently had to be removed from the results. Not all could be accommodated as non-scoring athletes.

Stuart Hall (Liverpool) said that Liverpool Harriers were against the motion as they felt that it was contrary to development for U20 athletes, he also pointed out that field events only have 3 competitors across both age groups.

Paul Allan (Kingdom Athletic) wondered whether it may contribute to U20 athletes dropping out if they weren't guaranteed a place in the team.

Grace pointed out that there is a clarification in the field events such that if there are only 2 U17s, they must compete in their own age group, so it's only where there are 3 U17s being used that they can compete as an U20. This proposal doesn't have such a clarification.

Mary Baker (Saffron) asked what this proposal actually meant as she was unclear as to what would change.

Joyce confirmed that it would enable teams to use two U17 in an U20 track event if they don't have an U20 able to compete. It wouldn't prevent teams using U20s.

Paul Farres (City of Portsmouth) asked if an U17 who competed in the U20 age group in one event would be prevented from competing in their own age group in other events. He was assured that the ruling only prevents an U17 competing in both age groups in the same event, but they can compete in both age groups in different events.

Janice Kaufman (Gateshead) suggested that clubs would use U20s if they have them, as they are likely to be better than U17s, this could benefit U17s who could potentially get better competition.

Karl Ponty (Derby) suggested that if clubs wished to, they could apply their own selection criteria to prevent U17s competing in U20 events if they wished to do so.

Grace thought that some unscrupulous team managers could abuse this proposal, but Marian felt that whilst this may have been the case previously, the incidences of this type of abuse were less frequent now.

Tim Soutar (Blackheath & Bromley) proposed an amendment to bring the selection criteria in line with that in field events:

11.2 In **all individual** track events, 2 competitors per team **per age group** shall be permitted. If there are two U17 competitors, then both shall compete in the U17 age group, if there are three U17 competitors then one shall compete in the U20 age group and two shall compete in the u17 age group.

(For clarification: if there is only one U17 competitor then they must compete in the U17 age group).

This amendment was seconded by **Annette Brown (Solihull & Small Heath)**.

Votes Against: 2

Abstentions: 4

The meeting voted overwhelmingly in favour of adopting the amendment to stand as the substantive motion.

The meeting then moved to vote on the amended proposal.

Votes Against: 2

Abstentions: 4

The meeting voted overwhelmingly in favour of this amendment.

6.1.2 Proposed by East Wales, supported by Cardiff AAC; Charnwood AC; Cheltenham & County Harriers; South Wales; Swansea Harriers; West Wales:

We propose that the league introduces an U20 4 x 400m Mixed relay to replace both the U20M and U20W's 4 x 400m relays.

Joyce Tomala (East Wales) spoke to the motion; mixed relays seem to be being brought into many major competitions, and the athletes in their teams are keen to see it brought in to YDL. The number of U20 athletes in many clubs is still low after Covid, so it would seem to be a good time to look at alternative events which may inject more interest and enthusiasm at the end of a meeting.

Paul Farres (City of Portsmouth) asked if this would mean allowing two mixed teams to replace the two single sex races?

Paul Allan (Kingdom Athletic) thought it could become a highlight at the end of the match. He wondered if guest teams would be an option.

Lesley Nunn (Team Avon) thought it should be trialled for one year and then assessed to see if it had been successful.

Mary Baker (Saffron) thought that this would penalise teams who had 4 U17 Men who wouldn't get to run a relay. She was assured that this proposal wouldn't affect the U17 relays. **Simon Baker (Highgate Heathside)** suggested that it may be worth rotating so that 2 matches had single sex relays with 2 matches holding mixed relays.

Tim Soutar (Blackheath & Bromley) fully supported the trialling of mixed relays, but thought it was strange that we would be reducing opportunities when we're trying to increase participation, he suggested that non scoring races wouldn't be a suitable option, but if we look at an A and B option, it could work, if athletes buy into it then we would be increasing opportunities. He therefore put forward an amendment to the proposal that:

We introduce A and B string U20 4 x 400m Mixed relays to replace both the U20M and U20W's 4 x 400m relays.

Janice Kaufman (Gateshead) supported the amendment, as there wouldn't be an increase in the number of events.

Lynn Orbel (Birchfield) supports Joyce's proposal as they too felt that it would increase the enthusiasm from athletes. It was certainly well met by their athletes when they competed in a mixed relay at the Welsh international.

Karl Ponty (Derby) thought it would be a problem, if a club had 4 U17M and only 1 female athlete, no-one would get a race.

Tim Soutar suggested that you could allow ad hoc non scoring relays possibly involving athletes from different clubs, especially if there were free lanes, this would improve the competition and increase participation.

This amendment was seconded by **Paul Allan (Kingdom Athletic)**.

Votes Against: 1

Abstentions: 4

The meeting voted overwhelmingly in favour of adopting the amendment to stand as the substantive proposal.

The meeting then moved to vote on the amended proposal.

Votes Against: 2

Abstentions: 0

The meeting voted overwhelmingly in favour of the amended proposal.

6.2 Management Committee proposals for rule changes:

3. ELIGIBILITY OF ATHLETES

3.1.1. Competitors can be either first claim members of their club or second claim (2nd claim) members whose first claim club is not a member of the League. Clubs are limited to 5 male and 5 female second-claim athletes per match.

(For Clarification: Composite teams are not permitted to use second claim members – see Appendix 1)

To be amended to:

3.1.1. Competitors can be either first claim members of their club or second claim (2nd claim) members whose first claim club is not a member of the League. Clubs are limited to **6 (six) male** and **6 (six) female** second-claim athletes per match.

(For Clarification: Composite teams are not permitted to use second claim members – see Appendix 1).

Grace explained that this had been suggested by a number of teams in order to help smaller teams to increase the number of athletes available to them; it also offers an opportunity to athletes whose teams weren't members of YDL.

Richard Pownall (Milton Keynes) asked for clarification that this rule is only specific to the UAG. It doesn't prevent athletes from a club who compete in the LAG but not in the UAG, from joining another club as a second claim member. It was agreed to add a clarification about this.

The management proposal was seconded by **Dave Paver (City of York AC)**

Votes Against: 0

Abstentions: 0

The meeting voted unanimously in favour of the proposal.

11. SCORING

The initial statement to be amended to:

Matches will be scored as shown in the Appendix 1 based on 'A' and 'B' strings which follow the number of teams in the division to which teams have been allocated, **subject to an athlete having achieved the minimum standard to score (Appendix 3) in the UAG.**

Janice explained that this proposal had been discussed at previous AGMs, but not been successful. There have always had minimum standards set for Vertical jumps, so this was merely levelling up all events. It was still an issue much debated partly to try to prevent 'hopeful' team managers entering reluctant, and sometimes unskilled, athletes to score points, but also to try to encourage clubs to identify events where they had shortfalls and try to promote those events and develop the athletes to compete in them.

Paul Farres (City of Portsmouth) pointed out that NAL are bringing in the same principle for their matches.

Nicola Thompson (Blackburn) commented that the minimum standards in the throws are too high, and even athletes who have trained in these events may not achieve them. She thought that it penalised multi eventers who although they train for an event may not be specialist enough to achieve the high standards.

Crispian Webb (Cheltenham & County) felt that the standards were inconsistent across events, and also serves as a disincentive for an athlete who wants to compete for a number of reasons. He also suggested that Welfare was down to team managers and coaches.

Shaun Ainge (Cannock & Stafford) felt that the standards in PV hadn't been adjusted from the 2023 standards and that they are too high. Marian responded that the PV had been the subject of discussion last year when coaches had been widely consulted, this is a H&S issue.

Sandra Woodman (Team Avon) commented that weather conditions can affect performance which could result in competent athletes failing to score. She also felt that they were not inclusive and took no account of para-athletes.

Mark Exley (Northampton) endorsed the principle of achieving a standard in order to score points as it would help to prevent the athletes who make very little effort but felt that the long throws were extremely high and wondered whether they should be equated to the PB awards scheme.

Daniel Parton-Rychlewski (Birchfield) felt that the concept is good, but the actual standards needed looking at further, and maybe should be correlated with NAL, he

suggested that the meeting should adopt these standards but review them over the course of 2024.

Grace commented that it was impossible to please everyone. The concept may be great, but finding the right balance with the standards is very difficult.

Doug Gunstone (Dundee Hawkill) suggested that the meeting should adopt these standards but review them over the course of 2024.

Paul Allan (Kingdom Athletic) suggested using the figures for analysis and bring it back to next year's AGM for approval. He felt it was important to have standards that are not too difficult to achieve, but would cut out the 'silliness'.

Joyce Tomala (East Wales) said that the coaches in the clubs in her team were against these standards as they are too stringent but suggested that the PB awards standards may be used as a basis. She suggested that this proposal was not accepted this year, but 2024 results compared to the PB awards over the year and then revised accordingly for next year's AGM.

Mary Baker (Saffron) felt that the health and safety issue was the responsibility of the officials and not down to the league, other leagues adopted that stance.

Kevin Thomas (Rotherham) said that, as an official, he wouldn't be happy with that responsibility, as it would vary from match to match, and official to official. He suggested using the standards in a version of adapted software to evaluate them.

Grace commented that we don't have the volunteers to run a separate set of results for comparison.

Annette Brown (Solihull & Small Heath) thought that as a field official it was part of her responsibility to check competency.

Richard Pownall (Milton Keynes) thought that Health & Safety is always a consideration but did not necessarily rest with the league. He wondered whether the meeting should vote on this, but with the premise that the standards would be looked at further.

Janice clarified that the standards were based on the minimum standard for Po10 and then adjusted downwards by 10% for track and 15% for field events. She had done some analysis in 2019, and found one Hammer throw to be 1.48 metre, and for JT was 2.79m and LJ was 1.88m which are not valid attempts. She further felt that this sort of performance was disrespectful to other athletes. In the MD events there were only a handful of performances that didn't reach the standards.

Mark Exley (Northampton) thought that this could cause conflict for athletes and parents.

Paul Farres suggested that it was clear from the discussion that whilst people were not against the principle but wondered whether the league need to take it back to put in more justifiable performance standards.

Martin Smith (Swindon) thought that it should be parked for a year and then brought back with adjusted standards in place. He wondered if it could be outsourced for analysis.

Grace asked if anyone was prepared to second the proposal, otherwise the management group would look at revising the standards to bring them back next year.

No-one seconded the proposal as it stood. Consequently the proposal failed.

12. NON-SCORING EVENTS

- 12.1** In the Upper Age Group each team is allowed to enter a non-scoring athlete in up to six events (of either age group) per gender per meeting No more than three of these events, per gender, may be field events. If more than one such athlete is entered in an event, for the purposes of this rule, each athlete shall be deemed to

be entered in a separate event. These athletes shall be included on the declaration sheet 1.

(For clarification – each team will be allowed up to 6 non-scoring performances per gender in each fixture. NB non-scoring teams in Relay races comprise of 4 of the non-scoring places).

To be amended to

12.1 In the Upper Age Group each team is allowed to enter a non-scoring athlete in up to **8 (eight) events per sex per meeting** No more than 3 (three) of these events, **per sex**, may be field events. If more than one such athlete is entered in an event, for the purposes of this rule, each athlete shall be deemed to be entered in a separate event. These athletes ***must be declared on the portal prior to competing.***

This is a rule which clubs have suggested needs to be amended to allow more athletes the opportunity to compete. In reality, for the majority of teams, it is in the sprint events where more non scoring places are requested, but the rule doesn't make any specifications about which events can accommodate non-scorers, other than to retain the existing number of places in field events. It was clarified that these refer to the maximum number of non-scoring performances, not athletes.

Paul Allan (Kingdom Athletic) asked whether this still included the relays. **Marian** suggested that this was an area to look again at.

Simon Baker (Highgate Heathside) asked for confirmation that this referred to 8 performances, not 8 athletes, he wondered if could be relaxed further to allow athletes to fill empty lanes, but **Grace** suggested that we must be careful that the league doesn't become an Open meeting. She commented that a lot of clubs put non scoring athletes in events without declaring them, when they are reminded to add them onto the portal to get them into the results, they have to decide as to which athletes to include.

Marian concurred with this; she pointed out to a practice in the Midlands where host clubs apply for a separate licence to run additional events tagged onto the day.

The management proposal was seconded by **Crispian Webb (Cheltenham & County)**

Votes Against: 0

Abstentions: 0

The meeting voted unanimously in favour of the proposal.

6.3 Additional changes to the timetable

6.3.1 The management team propose to rotate 1500m, 3000m and Steeplechase/800m in the Upper Age Group timetables for 3 rounds of fixtures. Fourth and subsequent rounds will be held using the full timetable of events.

Marian stated that it was with a lot of reservations that this proposal had been brought to the agenda. It's clear from feedback from many clubs and individuals that the UAG in general is an area of concern and once issue is that of the low numbers in Middle distance events. She had drawn together the raw data from this year's matches and it had been clear that not one team had managed to field a full team in the four MD events. The 800m is the best supported, but some athletes compete in 200, 400 and 800 rather than 800 and 1500, the longer the race, the lower the number of competitors. On the other hand, there are more opportunities for athletes to compete in the shorter races, ie

800m and 1500m, whilst Steeplechase is much less well catered for in event specific and open meetings.

It has always been the intention of the league that every event should be catered for at every match, indeed how can an event be developed if the opportunities to compete in that event are reduced? However, on the other hand, Marian questioned how a field of just one or two athletes competing in a steeplechase race can be considered good for development, and the numbers are there for all to see.

She felt strongly that this is something that needs to be addressed by event leads as there is a clear shortage of steeplechasers across the ages, and it's not just a YDL issue.

The length of the competition day isn't in itself a factor in this proposal, it is just a by-product of it.

Crispian Webb (Cheltenham & County) questioned whether hurdles races were also an area of concern since numbers are generally low in those, and they take an inordinate amount of time to set up. He also felt that the length of the competition day was less important than the length of journeys having to be undertaken, he cited having to travel up to 2 hours for one fixture in the previous season.

Mark Exley (Northampton) felt that this was an issue which impacted the sport as a whole rather than individual clubs; he felt that if the league were to rotate the longer flat events, then that would potentially improve the numbers competing, but felt that steeplechase is an outlier event.

Lesley Nunn (Team Avon) wondered whether it would be worth just having one to score in the MD events rather than rotate the events and use the non-scoring facility for other athletes. This would mean that athletes have the opportunity to achieve qualifying times for ESAA champs.

Doug Gunstone (Dundee Hawkhill) objected to the principle of rotating the events, he felt that Middle distance runners are not getting a fair crack of the whip.

Paul Farres (Portsmouth and Winchester) commented that YDL is not unique in having these issues, as the results at County Championships show.

Jackie Agyepong (Shaftesbury Barnet) stated that her clubs felt that Steeplechase needs to be kept in the timetable at all fixtures to promote the development.

Paul Allan (Kingdom Athletic) suggested that host clubs could look at the numbers declared in advance and then decide as to whether or not the event(s) would go ahead. This would prevent team managers using the events just to gain points.

Janice Kaufman (Gateshead) said that her club were happy about the rotation of 1500m and 3000m, with 800m in every match, Steeplechase should be in the programme for at least 2 of the 3 matches. **She proposed that the 800m remains in all fixtures, the 1500m and 3000m rotate and that Steeplechase is in at least 2 of the 3 matches.**

Margaret Grayston (Wigan & District) agreed that the rotation of 1500m and 3000m would help the numbers but thought that 800m and Steeplechase should be in every match. If we reduce S/Chase from the timetable, then athletes will go to BMC where they have pacemakers. Lynn Orbell commented that BMCs shouldn't be using pacemakers as it is contrary to the rules.

Kevin Thomas (Rotherham) agreed that a rotation of 1500m and 3000m would be helpful, athletes prefer to compete in a BMC race rather than a league race with few athletes. He felt that the 800m should remain in all fixtures, as a lot of 800m runners double up in the 4 x 400m.

Karl Ponty (Derby) commented that the length of the timetable is down to the long throws rather than track event, but he was assured that this has been looked at with a view to shortening the field programme.

Tim Soutar (Blackheath & Bromley) acknowledged the situation as being very difficult and was reluctant to identify any events as 2nd class events by reducing the opportunities for athletes to compete in them.

Grace summed up the comments from delegates, she suggested that the amendment to the original proposal should now read:

That the 1500m and 3000m be rotated across the divisional matches in the season, with the 800m and Steeplechase to be included in all fixtures.

This amendment was seconded by **Margaret Grayston (Wigan & District)**

Votes Against: 7

Abstentions: 4

The meeting voted in favour of adopting the amendment to stand as the substantive motion.

Lesley Nunn (Team Avon) asked if Men could run as Non-scorers in the Women's races, and vice versa. After some discussion it was agreed that this wouldn't be a problem as the results of non-scoring races appear separately.

Annette Brown (Solihull & Small Heath) suggested that the timetable could further be amended so that the longer races run before the lunch break. This may be a problem adjusting the hurdles, as the longer distance events allow time to adjust them.

The meeting then moved to vote on the amended proposal.

This was seconded by **John Gercs (Rugby & Northants)**

Votes Against: 11

Abstentions: 6

Votes For: 27

The meeting voted in favour of the amended proposal.

7 Constitutional amendments: there were no constitutional changes proposed.

8 Election of management committee members. Nominations received for: -

Finance Officer: Nicola Thompson (to 2027) – nominated by Blackburn Harriers & AC; Liverpool Harriers & AC; Trafford AC

General Committee:

Leslie Roy (to 2025) serving as Scotland Area Co-ordinator – nominated by Team North Lanarkshire; Inverness Harriers.

Tim Soutar (to 2024) – nominated by Blackheath & Bromley Harriers & AC; Trafford AC.

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

PLUS

Three further general committee vacancies and a Midland Area Co-ordinator

No nominations had been received for the above vacancies; however, 2 people had expressed an interest after the deadline for nominations, Dave Paver, City of York and Mick Bond, Cambridge Harriers (Kent); following discussion with the management committee, they would be asked to serve as casual vacancies in the first instance with the possibility of seeking nomination at the next AGM.

If anyone else is interested in taking a role on the committee, they are advised to contact Grace Hall, Chair of UK YDL for further information. The UK YDL website contains information about the Roles and Responsibilities of all committee posts.

Janice suggested that anyone with marketing expertise would also be most welcome.

- 9 **The 2024 Annual General Meeting is scheduled to take place in November 2024 (date to be confirmed).**

The AGM closed at 14:00

The Chair thanked everyone for their input to the meeting and invited them to remain behind for an opportunity to take part in a discussion on the future of the league.

Signed:	Date:
---------	-------

DRAFT

UK Youth Development League AGM 2023.

Chair's Report.

In what is the eleventh year of the UK YDL competition, we did manage to get through the 2023 track season, albeit with less volunteers doing more work, and with our member clubs managing to put a little more than basic teams out than they did in 2022. It has also become apparent that it is not only clubs trying to build up athlete numbers following the turbulent few years we have experienced, but the lack of officials is also now becoming even more of a problem. Not all officials resumed normal service, and many are now not renewing their officiating licenses, leading of course to major problems, not only for YDL, but other competition providers.

The other problem we have encountered is the fixture planning, with YDL working with other league competition providers to find solutions to an ever-increasing competition calendar. 2024 is looking to be the most problematic year ever with the process now being overseen by the Home Country Federations, and no longer UKA, who at least tried to use a priority system in previous years. We will carry on talking to the competition working group, but I do not anticipate much change to the dates we are now being given for next season.

The National Finals weekend, once more in Manchester, was a success and we would like to express our thanks to all the officials, volunteers and Manchester Regional Arena for their support.

The outright winners in both the Upper Age Group and the Lower Age Group competitions, were Blackheath & Bromley Harriers & AC. Congratulations, not only to Blackheath & Bromley Harriers & AC, but to all UK YDL teams for their successes this year, both at the finals and in the normal fixtures they competed in.

It is also good to see that the athletes themselves are finally benefitting from a full return to training, and an increase in numbers for some clubs. At least I have seen an increase in additions to squads on the team manager portals, but not all member clubs yet. Yes, I am the one who deals with the eligibility of athletes, and thousands have been checked this year. The downside to that has been the increase in athletes on club squads who following the update to EA membership in July, are no longer members of EA, or they look to be unregistered. Perhaps clubs could do a spot of housekeeping on their portals during the off season, deleting athletes no longer competing and sending those who you know have paid their HCAF membership fee, to check.

This season also saw an increase in league records, 11 new individual records and a number of relay records, but for all the athletes who took part, a new PB or two is what we hope you have achieved. Our main objective however is that the athletes enjoyed the season and being part of a team who competes in the YDL and enjoyed the experience. League records are on the YDL web site.

Finally, none of this would happen without the clubs, their officials, and volunteers, who have made it possible for our matches to take place. Plus, to the management committee members who have worked so hard, not just during the season, but all year round, thank you. I look forward to seeing you all again in 2024.

Grace Hall.

Chair.

29.10.23



Administrator's Annual Report to the AGM November 2023

Once again, we have come to the end of what proved to be a challenging year for the league, with the weather playing a large part in some of the frustrations felt by both ourselves and our member clubs. I don't recall so many matches having to be cut short, or so many events having to be cancelled due to local circumstances during any of the previous seasons.

We still have problems sorting out our fixture dates, it's impossible to organise fixtures that don't impinge on school holidays. The UAG matches are timed to avoid a direct clash with external exams for the vast majority, but this does mean that we have to utilise the bank holiday weekend and the start of the summer holidays. It doesn't sit right to finish our season in June for most teams but that may be our only option. The Midlands is currently the only region to offer regional finals and promotion matches, but even those met with some issues where teams decided not to bother competing even though they had qualified. Maybe that now needs to change, and we revert back to a straight 4 matches for all, certainly promotion matches are a massive headache to organise, and unless we find a volunteer to fill the role of Area Co-ordinator, we may not be able to hold these in 2024.

As ever, we've had to deal with complaints about a variety of things – dates of fixtures are a perennial problem, although to a large extent the decision as to the actual dates we are given is out of our hands; there are also complaints about the length of the competition day, and the distance travelled, mostly in the Southern region which has a large geographical spread and the small matter of London and the M25 to navigate. As I said in my report of last year, maybe we should be looking at moving away from a linear structure, especially in the LAG, and making the divisions more geographically based where possible.

We are looking at measures to reduce the length of the competition day in the UAG, but it's always a balance to make sure we're not compromising on competition opportunities for all athletes. It's clear from our results that some of the technical events in particular are still struggling to get back to pre-pandemic levels, so this year we have put forward some proposals for the UAG to help alleviate this and make the experience more enjoyable for the athletes.

We are fortunate that we have some clubs who will always step up and host matches, but equally we have a few who try to avoid this at all costs. Every team in the league should be prepared to host, or co-host if needed, at least once every two years; with the cost of stadium hire increasing, it's only fair and proper that everyone takes their share of shouldering the responsibility.

Looking at the scheduling of fixtures for next year and anticipating that a number of clashes are likely to occur it's more important than ever that anyone hosting a match sorts out their chief officials and other necessary posts as soon as possible, it was somewhat alarming this year to find quite a number of hosts had waited until the very last minute to sort out their chiefs and then struggled to find volunteers. We're very aware that officials are not a plentiful resource, but I believe it has been alleviated somewhat this season by the changes brought in at last year's AGM, however it remains a priority that all clubs need to make every effort to provide a full team of officials for every match, otherwise it's putting the onus onto other clubs to bail them out, which is patently unfair. We've been



scottishathletics





working with EA to look at how to support clubs who are struggling, as providing officials is part of a team's commitment to the league as well as a way for them to score points and support their athletes' efforts. Equally it's imperative that everyone is familiar with the league rules to avoid some disappointment when athletes' performances have to be removed for breaking those rules.

We are by some margin the biggest league in the country with 139 clubs competing in the UAG, and 189 in the LAG; in all there were 120 regional fixtures, 47 in the UAG and 73 in the LAG, of which 25 were double header matches, plus the 2 National finals. This all takes place due to the commitment and hard work done by an ever-diminishing band of volunteers. On a personal level, I'm very grateful to our management committee for their support and assistance during the year, especially as too we are short of numbers. In particular, I must thank Grace and Janice for their hard work scrutinising and chasing anomalies for all the Northern region's results, and to Joyce Tomala who has helped with some of the Midlands' results. They've made a massive difference to my workload.

Last and by no means least, I would like to express thanks to all the volunteers in our clubs who continue to work hard supporting their athletes; without your enthusiasm and commitment there would be no matches, so, thank you all.

Marian Williams
UK YDL Administrator

Breakdown of divisions, teams, and clubs by region:

UAG

	Divisions	fixtures	teams	clubs
Midlands	6 divisions	12 divisional* + 3 finals	33 teams inc. 6 composites	50 clubs
Northern	4 divisions	12 divisional	29 teams inc. 4 composites	42 clubs
Southern	5 divisions	20 divisional	33 teams inc. 10 composites	47 clubs

LAG

	Divisions	fixtures	teams	clubs
Midlands	9 divisions	18 divisional* + 3 finals	50 teams inc. 5 composites	60 clubs
Northern	7 divisions	25 divisional*	41 teams inc. 2 composites	46 clubs
Southern	6 divisions	20 divisional*	37 teams inc. 4 composites	45 clubs
Scotland	3 divisions	6 fixtures* + 1 final	23 teams inc. 7 composites	38 clubs

* indicates where double header matches were used

31 Oct 2023



scottishathletics



YDL Finance Officer Report to AGM 2023

The league is in a sound financial position on 1st October 2023 with healthy reserves and cashflow.

The final examined accounts for the AGM 2023 are included with this report.

The League has not received any grants during this financial year, but a retrospect England Athletics grant of £50,000 for 2022 has been added to the accumulated fund.

This year the League had deficit of £17,750 which will be met from reserves.

Club Membership with Team match Fees

It was suggested last year (2022) that we might change the way we manage affiliation fees into a membership payment and a match fee. Initially this would involve additional financial administration in implementing the change and supporting members.

In the current circumstances with a change in Financial Officer, with the agreement of the committee, anything non-urgent and likely to complicate the role in the short term for a new officer has not been proposed this year.

Helping the Hosts !

In 2022 members decided to spread the financial costs of hosting by collecting more in affiliation fees provide more financial support to those that do host. In 2023 inflation has significantly increased the costs likely to be faced by hosts next year.

There is a need to consider the wider financial situations at this time and pressures on members. A mixture of small rises in fees and a limited use of reserves may be the best approach.

To keep pace with inflationary costs it is suggested that we increased the affiliation fees by 8% (effective £10 per match, calculated as £135 per match) and for this to be distributed directly to the hosts with the fixed rate becoming £375 per match and £40 per team (previously £350 fixed and £35 per team respectively). Hosts may only apply for the £40 per team if officials are provided with an adequate lunch and refreshments.

There are no changes in the support for precision measurement (Photofinish, EDM and wind gauges). The support for Precision Measurement Costs would be met by reserves and/or grants received.

For Example, a host of a 6-team match could claim:

£375 (Fixed)

£240 (Variable – supporting officials, £40 per team)

£360 (maximum claim for Precision Measurement)

£975 Total Claim Possible

In summary the finance proposal is:

- Affiliations fees increase by approximately 8% (Teams affiliation fees calculated as an £135 per planned match for the season).
- To help fund rising hosting costs, the fixed rate is increased to £375 per match and to further aid the catering for volunteers at the match, the variable amount is increased to £40 per team.
- No further changes to support offered but other existing support will be continued.

Karl Ponty

YDL Finance Officer

31st October 2023

YOUTH DEVELOPMENT LEAGUE
ACCOUNTS FOR THE YEAR ENDED 30 SEPTEMBER 2023
BALANCE SHEET AS AT 30 SEPTEMBER 2023

		2023		2022
		£	£	£
ASSETS				
Current Assets				
Cash at Bank	- Current Account	12,157		19,213
	- Deposit Account	<u>220,000</u>		<u>180,747</u>
		232,157		199,960
Debtors		0		270
Less Current Liabilities				
Amounts Due Within One Year:				
Creditors	Note 1	<u>830</u>		<u>1153</u>
Net Current Assets		<u>231,327</u>		<u>199,077</u>
CAPITAL ACCOUNT AND RESERVES				
Accumulated Funds				
England Athletics - Grant (retrospective)		50,000		
Balance as at 1 October 2022		<u>199,077</u>		<u>207,431</u>
Adjustments				2520
Surplus/(Deficit) for Year		<u>-17,750</u>		<u>-10,874</u>
		<u>231,327</u>		<u>199,077</u>

K Ponty
 YDL Finance Officer

1st October 2023

Independent Examiner's Report

I have examined the books and records of the Youth Development League for the year ended 30th September 2023, and from these and explanations given to me I have prepared the Statement of Account set out on Pages 1 to 3 and can confirm they are in accordance therewith.



Helen L Ashley
 ACMA

30th October 2023

**YOUTH DEVELOPMENT LEAGUE
INCOME AND EXPENDITURE ACCOUNT**

FOR THE YEAR ENDED 30 SEPTEMBER 2023

	2023		2022
INCOME	£	£	£
Affiliation Fees	106,200		81,320
Affiliations deferred	0		13,500
Grants	0		0
Donations	765		764
Interest Received	<u>1,448</u>		<u>8</u>
Other		108,413	95,592
EXPENDITURE			
Administration Costs			
Committee Meetings	144		144
Competition Development	232		0
Website and Support	1500		2,050
Officer Expenses	130		577
AGM	1467		1,101
Professional Fees	484		374
Results Software Development	1700		750
Administration Fees	<u>7000</u>		<u>7,000</u>
		12,656	11,996
League Match Costs			
Hosting Support	62,160		46,735
Competitor Numbers	4,790		4,347
Results Match Support	750		2,000
Administration Fees	8,000		8,000
Area Administration Fees	<u>1,875</u>		<u>1,875</u>
		77,575	62,957
Precision Measurement for Talent			
Photofinish Support	10,450		8,850
Track Wind Gauge	2,920		2,100
EDM Support	7,080		4,100
Field Wind Gauge	<u>1,120</u>		<u>925</u>
		21,570	15,975
Developing Talent from Across the UK			
Travel Support	1,781		2,033
Administration Fees	<u>500</u>		<u>500</u>
		2,281	2,533
Rewarding Team Performance			
Cost of Staging National Finals	Note 2 8,775		7,290
Cost of Staging Area Finals	719		2,803
Competitor Numbers	350		500
Results Software Developer Support	250		250
Administration Fees	<u>850</u>		<u>850</u>
		10,944	11,693
Miscellaneous Sundries		99	200
Prior Year adjustment	Note 3	1,039	<u>1,112</u>
		<u>126,163</u>	<u>106,466</u>
Surplus/(Deficit) to Accumulated Funds		<u>-17,750</u>	<u>-10,874</u>

**YOUTH DEVELOPMENT LEAGUE
ACCOUNTS FOR THE YEAR ENDED 30 SEPTEMBER 2023
NOTES TO THE ACCOUNTS**

	2023	
	£	£
1 Creditors		
(Unexplained Bank Refund - Repayment Likely)		830
		830
		830
2 Cost of National Finals		
Income		
<i>Gate Receipts</i>	3620	
<i>Franchises</i>	500	
<i>National finals team receipts</i>	1625	
	5745	
Expenditure		
<i>Track Hire and Staffing Costs</i>	6958	
<i>First Aid</i>	1400	
<i>Medals and Trophies</i>	1179	
<i>Officials' Expenses and Catering</i>	4983	
	14520	
		8,775
3 Prior Year adjustment		
<i>Bank Charges from 2022</i>	44	
<i>Late Hosting Claims 2022</i>	2,148	
	2,192	
<i>Less Creditors accounted for in 2022</i>	1,153	
		1,039