

Minutes of the 2025 Annual General Meeting

held at the Moat House Hotel, Acton Trussell, on Saturday 29th November.

Present: Janice Kaufman (Chair); Tim Soutar (Vice Chair); Nicola Thompson (Finance Officer); Marian Williams (Administrator) plus the following members of the management committee, Mick Bond; Stuart Horsewood; Arwel Williams; Nichola Skedgel (EA representative); Glen Reddington (website manager) plus

The following clubs were in attendance:

Midland region (30 teams represented)

Burton; Cannock & Stafford AC; Cheltenham & County Harriers; City of Stoke; East Wales; Gwent Harriers; Halesowen A & CC; Marshall Milton Keynes AC; Northampton AC; Nuneaton Harriers AC; Solihull & Small Heath AC; Swansea Harriers; Swindon Harriers; Tamworth AC; Team Avon; Tipton Harriers; Wolverhampton & Bilston AC; Yate & District AC; plus Annette Brown (Solihull & Small Heath AC); Andy McAfferty (Burton AC)

Northern region (18 teams represented)

Blackburn Harriers; Chesterfield & District AC; City of Sheffield & Dearne AC; East Cheshire & Tameside AC; Gateshead Harriers; Liverpool Harriers; Rotherham Harriers; SY Dons; Team North Cumbria; Trafford AC; Wigan & District Harriers

Southern region (12 teams represented)

Blackheath & Bromley Harriers; Bracknell AC; Brighton & Hove AC; Cambridge Harriers (Kent); Highgate Heathside; Portsmouth/Winchester; Winchester & District AC; Woodford Green with Essex Ladies

Apologies: Grace Hall (President); Leslie Roy (Scottish area co-ordinator); Dean Hardman (EA age group consultant); Altrincham & District AC; Basildon AC; Bexley AC; Bicester AC; Blackpool, Wyre & Fylde AC; Bolton United Harriers & AC; Border Harriers & Seaton AC; Bristol & West/Mendip; Bromsgrove & Redditch AC; Camberley & Woking; City of York AC; Crawley AC; Daventry AAC; Dudley & Stourbridge AC; Falkirk Victoria Harriers; Giffnock North AC; Gloucester AC; Guildford & Godalming AC; Hallamshire Harriers; Hasting AC; Havering AC; Hereford & County AC; Herne Hill Harriers; Hillingdon AC; HY AC; Kingston upon Hull AC; Leeds City AC; Llanelli AC; Macclesfield Harriers; Manchester Harriers; Pitreavie AAC; Rugby & Northampton AC; Rushcliffe AC; S Factor; Salford Metropolitan AC; South Wales; Team East Lothian; Telford AC; Tonbridge AC; West Wales; Wirral AC; Worcester AC.

1. **Janice Kaufman, chair**, welcomed everyone to the AGM, and thanked them for coming.
2. **Minutes of the 2023 AGM**
P1, Item 2 **Crispian Webb (Cheltenham & County Harriers)** pointed out that it had been Jane Woolley and not he who had raised the query.
Acceptance of the updated minutes was proposed by **Crispian Webb (Cheltenham & County Harriers)**
and seconded by **Joyce Tomala (East Wales)**.
The minutes were unanimously approved by the meeting and **signed by the Chair**.
3. **Chair's Report.**

Janice's report had been circulated to clubs and published on the website. She stated that it had seemed to be a very long season culminating in the national finals, she confirmed her thanks to Arwel Williams and his team at Liverpool for their successful hosting of the Finals in September. Despite the poor weather on the Sunday, everything had run smoothly, the final result in the LAG was very competitive, with just 1.5 points between the top 2 clubs.

She also expressed her gratitude to Grace for her work on the registration of all our athletes and also checking and updating all the records achieved this year. She pointed out that YDL is not just a development league but also a talent and performance league in that it attracts some of the top athletes in the country, particularly offering league competition opportunities for U20s that no-one else seems to offer.

She thanked Dexta Thompson for his work on the Social Media applications which is appreciated by the athletes, and to Glen Reddington for his work on updating the website to make it more accessible especially for mobile phones.

The unfortunate glitch in the software a few days before the final round of the UAG fixtures was due to an accidental deleting of the data which involved clubs having to re-enter their athletes and further registration checks having to be made. She stressed that there is no data held on the athletes that would make it a data protection issue. As a result, the data is now being backed up centrally on a more frequent basis, but clubs also need to play their part by keeping their own portals updated, not only adding athletes with the correct details, but also by removing those athletes who are no longer competing for them. Each club has their own unique password which should be restricted to those who need to access the portal; if any club requires a new passcode due to personnel changes this can easily be done on request.

The fixtures for next year are very challenging; there are no dates available in June, and August is very late for leagues catering for age group athletes. At least 2 of the UAG fixtures fall within the qualification period, however for selection purposes the performances must be achieved in a L2 meeting, so hosts will need to apply for a L2 licence if there are any athletes looking for international selection.

It is very important that all clubs provide the officials as set out in our rules, it is patently unfair to expect others to cover gaps. We will be reviewing this carefully in 2026 and if some clubs are falling down on their commitment, we will be looking at different options for them. The important thing is that we must fulfil the licence requirements in order for results to be accepted.

Points for Performance has proved to be a very useful tool for a variety of reasons, not least that it can help to identify the top performances which could be used to possibly reward athletes going forward.

Keith Perry (Halesowen) asked for clarification about qualifying performances, **Janice** assured him that it was just international selections who required a L2 status meeting. **Marian** pointed out that the league applies for all the licences for our fixtures as L1 meetings, if any host clubs feels that they have the requisite number of officials (requirements are available on the UKA website) for a L2 match then they can apply independently for a licence for their match.

4. Administrator's Annual Report

The report had also been circulated as outlined above. **Marian** commented that while every year brings its own trials and tribulations, the changes for 2026 mean that we are going to be facing challenges we've never met before, and they will require a fair bit of work to how we do things. She endorsed what Janice had said about both the fixtures and officials and stated that she thought that 2026 was probably the worst year she had encountered for fixture dates. With regard to officials, she felt that the portal made it much more straightforward for clubs to enter their officials well ahead of the season which in

turn gave us more time to validate them. It also made it easier for clubs to declare them. She reminded everyone that if they are using an official from another club, they must still enter them on their own portal in order to declare them, unlike the athletes, there is no problem with officials being added to the portals of a number of clubs.

We are the biggest league in the country with more athletes and many more clubs competing – almost 250 teams, across one or both age groups. We've had a few dropping out for 2026 due to the lack of numbers likely to be available in the U20 age group and this has also affected the way the structures are being looked at. Our statistics also allow us to assess the take up of individual event groups, and maybe we need to talk to event leads to see how we can improve things for the athletes' benefit. She re-iterated her thanks to clubs for their support of the league during the year and also for their hard work with their athletes, if anyone knows someone who may want to take on some of the vacant roles please do get in touch; she also expressed her thanks to the management committee for their support and hard work.

David McCormack (Bracknell) re-iterated concerns about clubs not bringing officials, he felt it was a problem for double headers especially as they were only expected to provide half a team which left their partner team struggling if they brought no officials at all.

Janice commented on the timetables, whilst the number of athletes will be lower in the UAG so shouldn't present as big a problem, the LAG timetable will be more challenging especially if the length of the competition day is going to be reduced to 6 hours, as she believes that is under discussion at the moment.

5. Financial Report.

5.1 **Nicola Thompson, the finance officer**, presented the accounts as circulated. She commented that whilst we had made a slight profit in 2025, the proposals to be voted on later would result in a loss for 2026 which will be absorbed by the reserves. We had hoped for a 3-year support grant to be awarded to make budgeting easier, but this didn't look likely now.

5.2 She asked if there were any queries about the report which had been circulated.

Arwel Williams (Liverpool Harriers) queried the figures for the national finals as they didn't agree with the totals he had for each separate heading. Nicola commented that her records kept everything in separate headings, but the independent examiner had put everything together without highlighting where the individual amounts had come from. She will provide a breakdown of the Finals' Income and Expenditure and circulate that.

Janice informed the meeting that the league has received grant support of £25 000 pa for the last few years, plus a sum in 2025 for digital enhancement which we had used to make a number of changes and improvements.

She had submitted a significantly more complicated application for £25 000 per year for 3 years which aligned with the Talent funding payments, plus an additional sum to allow for the cost of implementing the changes we will need to make to move to the new age groups which we had been assured would be forthcoming. She had just received a draft figure for the EA grant for £22 500 for one year, 10% down on previous years, more if you considered the sum received for digital enhancement, with no payment awarded for any additional expenses to manage the age group changes, although they had been promised. She expressed her disappointment at this.

The proposals we have on the agenda will be met from our reserves, but with a decreased grant we will be running at a much bigger loss.

Glen Reddington asked what the policy was for the reserve funds, Janice replied that it was intended to ensure that the league could continue in the event of any unforeseen problems. We try to keep one year's operating costs.

Sandra Woodman (Team Avon) asked why the grant was decreasing, given that ESAA are usually awarded £100 000 for their championships, and it is competitions such as YDL who help to develop the athletes for those championships.

Nichola Skedgel informed the meeting that all applications were considered by a new independent funding panel, and that all organisations have had their funding reviewed. There isn't sufficient funding to fulfil all the requests so a % decrease has been applied to all successful applications.

Janice confirmed that once we had the official notification, we would let all clubs know, she hoped that application for years 2 & 3 would be a simpler process. She also commented that competition specifically aimed at the U18 and U20 should be encouraged and supported by the governing bodies.

Mick Bond asked if years 2 & 3 had been considered.

Nichola responded that subsequent years have not been looked at.

Janice felt that the grants should be allocated before budgets have to be set for the following year.

5.3 Adoption of the accounts

- **Mick Bond (Cambridge Harriers)** proposed that the accounts be accepted
- **Sandra Woodman (Team Avon)** seconded the proposal

The meeting voted unanimously in favour of adopting the accounts.

5.4 Subscriptions for 2025/2026

Janice then moved on to the proposal to maintain the team subscriptions at **£135 per match scheduled**, this would go directly to the host club reimbursements.

- **Arwel Williams (Liverpool Harriers)** seconded the management proposal.

The meeting voted overwhelmingly in favour of the proposal

5.5 Re-imbursements to teams

5.5.1 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)"

Mick Bond (Cambridge Harriers) seconded the management proposal.

The meeting voted unanimously in favour of the proposal.

5.5.2 The Management Committee proposes that, for the 2026 season, the host club reimbursement should increase as follows:

A fixed payment of £750, or £1000 for double headers (or divisions of 9 or more), matches consisting of 15 or more teams will be paid an additional £250.

plus **£300 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 available for each fixture

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

The meeting voted unanimously in favour of the proposal.

6. Proposals

6.1 There were no proposals from clubs

6.2 Management Committee proposals for rule changes:

6.2.1 The Management Group propose the following changes to the Rules of competition for 2026:

All references to U17, U15 and U13 to be replaced by U18, U16 and U14 respectively, in accordance with the decision made at the 2024 AGM

RULE 2. RESPONSIBILITIES OF HOST CLUBS

2.7 On the evening of the fixture, the host club shall send the match and all individual results to the League Area Co-ordinator and the League Webmaster by email. Corrected results should be sent to the League Administrator, Power of 10 and Athletics Weekly by 09:00 of the Tuesday following the match by email.

To be amended to:

2.7 On the evening of the fixture, the host club shall also send the match and all individual results to the League Area Co-ordinator and the League Webmaster by email. Corrected results should be sent to the League Administrator and Power of 10 by the Tuesday following the match by email. Changes to names on the team portals may not be accepted after this point.

Janice explained that this proposal is to remove the reference to Athletics Weekly, as they no longer wish to receive any results. Also, to reinforce the responsibility of all clubs in each division to ensure that their athletes' names are corrected on the portal before the host club sends the results to Po10.

Athletes and parents are very keen to have the correct results showing on Po10 and as **Marian** explained once they have been sent to Po10 it can take quite some time to get them checked and amended which can be a problem if athletes need the data for qualification purposes.

Paul Wilson (Chesterfield & District) thought that this didn't allow team managers sufficient time to go through the results and update their portals as their team managers work 12-hour shifts.

Anna Tyler (Burton) also felt that the time was too short for some team managers to check the results and update the portals so would appreciate a little more leeway.

David McCormack (Bracknell AC) pointed out that clubs are often involved in other leagues, and it is often the same people involved so they don't have the time.

Joyce Tomala (East Wales) spoke as one of the scrutineers for some Midlands matches, she pointed out that it's extremely frustrating for them when clubs don't bother replying to requests to check something, it sometimes takes over a week to get a response. Athletes want their results to be correct, but you can't do anything if team managers don't engage with the process.

Janice commented that on a Monday morning there are quite a number of emails to Po10, usually from parents asking why the results haven't been published, and they're not happy to wait.

Karen Higgs-Smith (WGwEL) commented that they always circulate the results to parents as soon as they receive them so that they too can check them for correctness. This takes some of the onus off the team managers to do all the checking themselves.

Paul Wilson (Chesterfield & District) further commented that Roster uses unique numbers for each athlete which would make it easier to check that the athletes have been declared correctly, however **Arwel Williams (Liverpool Harriers)** pointed out that Roster does not work for leagues, and Marian commented that we have approx. 14 000 athletes on the system which would make it extremely difficult to use a system of individual numbers.

Janice stated that our results software can produce the results instantaneously online, we do it at the finals, but it does depend on host clubs having suitable wi-fi at their track and also recorders with the capability of using it.

Richard Pownall (MMK) suggested that sending the results to Po10 could be a guideline rather than a requirement, however **Marian** thought that this could end up delaying the results by several days, it would also mean that results recorders would be expected to keep the results open for longer, and with the tight scheduling of our matches with sometimes consecutive weekends being used for YDL matches, this could make it untenable for all those involved in the checking and amendments of results. She felt that the system works better with a deadline rather than a looser arrangement.

Margaret Grayston (Wigan & Dist Harriers) agreed that there are a number of tracks who don't have adequate wi-fi, or the wi-fi fails during the day

Martin Smith (Swindon Harriers) suggested that if all the results are displayed on a notice board, many errors can be picked up at the match. **Glen Reddington** pointed out that this was what used to happen with the NJAL results, so that changes can be made immediately.

Marian agreed that whilst this was ideal, and certainly used to be the norm, not all results recorders now have a printer to print the results out for this. Just displaying the track slips and field cards wouldn't show any typing errors or athletes competing in the wrong bib number.

Simon Baker (Highgate Heathside) asked about Open Track for results, it's used by NAL and inputs track results direct from Photofinish. He suggested that the timeframe for sending the results to Po10 could be 48 hours, so the deadline for Saturday meetings would be Tuesday and Sunday matches would be Wednesday.

Tim Soutar (Blackheath & Bromley Harriers) commented that league competition is under threat, although maybe UKYDL is in a better position than most other leagues. Open meetings do tend to provide instant results, so any delay in producing our results puts us under further pressure. We need to wake up to this

In terms of producing results online, it is possible, indeed we do this at the Finals, but not all tracks have a good wi-fi signal, and it puts a lot of pressure on Results Recorders who may not have the skill set needed.

Derek Hayton (Nuneaton Harriers) thought that inputting results can be a little complicated, especially if Results Recorders are inexperienced, so many of the problems stem from that rather than incorrect declarations. As a team manager he always makes sure that the portal is correct on the Sunday evening, but not all do that.

Shaun Ainge (Cannock & Stafford AC) put in a counter proposal to amend the deadline day to a 48 hour limit rather than 24 hours which would mean that hosts of Sunday matches had until Wednesday to submit the results to Po10 and give clubs an additional 24 hours to check them and update their portals as necessary.

The amendment was seconded by **Martin Smith (Swindon)**.

Voting on this counter proposal was:

Votes Against: 2; Abstentions: 5; with the remainder voting for the amendment.

This now became the substantive motion and was then voted on with all votes in favour.

Motion carried.

RULE 5: OFFICIALS

5.4.1 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 at Level 1 or above who signs in for the relevant discipline up to a maximum of 56 points.

Unqualified officials who sign in shall be awarded four (4) match points.

A team who provides a full field team, which must include a Level 2+, a level 1+, and 3 additional officials, will be awarded the full forty (40) points. If a team falls short of this, then the usual eight (8) points will be awarded for a qualified official and four (4) points for an unqualified official.

There will 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.

To be amended to:

5.4.1 Points will be awarded for up to 7 officials who sign in as a Track judge, a 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 at Level 1 or above who signs in for the relevant discipline up to a maximum of 56 points.

Unqualified officials who sign in shall be awarded four (4) match points.

A full field team, which comprises of at least one Level 2+ official, a level 1+official, and 3 additional officials or volunteers, will be awarded the full forty (40) points. If a team falls short of this, then the usual eight (8) points will be awarded for a qualified official and four (4) points for an unqualified official.

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

This is a slight change to clarify the definition of a full field team who will score maximum points. The main confusion arises because not all teams recognise that the team of 5 field officials do not all have to be qualified to score full points, so long as there are at least 2 qualified officials with one of them at least level 2, this satisfies the licensing criteria. It was deemed by the clubs who voted for it at the 2022 AGM that it wasn't necessary to be qualified to competently carry out some of the field duties.

Crispian Webb (Cheltenham & County) said that his club was under the impression that all had to be qualified to score full points.

Karen Higgs-Smith (WGwEL) said that they had been to some matches where the host clubs had insisted that a L4 FJ was necessary. She was also aware that some teams had a L2 official declared but they didn't turn up to actually officiate. **Marian** suggested for the first point that teams have a copy of the rules to hand to show what was required, and for point 2, field referees are expected to chase up these officials who don't actually work at the match, she pointed out that this is checked when the matches are scrutinised, and in some cases points have been deducted from teams who didn't comply.

Karen further commented that it can be very difficult providing a full team of officials with so many clashes, she cited the UAG round 3 match scheduled in 2026 to be held on the same weekend as ESAA and NAL which is horrendous.

Christel Shaw (Brighton & Hove) remarked that there are still some clubs turning up with no officials at all, and any penalty is irrelevant as they are generally the clubs not aiming for promotion. This means that other teams are stretched further by having

to cover for shortfalls. **Janice** confirmed that we are going to keep a closer eye on this in 2026 and issue warnings to clubs who are repeat offenders, and try to find a solution, if all else fails it may be necessary to not accept them joining the league the following year. **Marian** thought it may be worth looking at other measures as well.

Andy Godber (Tamworth) suggested that whilst it can be difficult to source field officials, track judges and timekeepers are in even shorter supply, so whilst it's easier to score points for a field team it doesn't help the track officials.

Jemma Porter (Trafford) asked if it was possible to swap officials over during the day because parents are often reluctant to cover a whole day. She was assured that this was possible but did need someone to ensure that the replacements did turn up and also signed in at the match. This could be put into the documentation sent to all clubs.

Keith Perry (Halesowen) commented that it helped a lot if all teams declared their officials 7 days ahead of each match as per our rules, as this gave time for referees to look for alternative arrangements to cover the gaps. **Marian** agreed and felt that teams should be sorting out their officials well ahead of the matches; they can always adjust the declarations if anything crops up in the same way as athletes can be removed or added.

Janice also reminded everyone that officials must print their names on the field cards as proof that they officiated.

Nichola Skedgel reminded everybody that the fixture calendar is very difficult to organise, and people have little appetite to change to make things work better.

The proposal was seconded by **Joyce Tomala (East Wales)**.

Janice asked for a vote on the proposal:

All were in favour.

RULE 8: MEETINGS

8.3 Teams will be expected to host a match when requested (at least once every two seasons unless the Management Committee agrees otherwise).

To be amended to

8.3 Teams will be expected to host a match when requested (at least once every two seasons unless the Management Committee agrees otherwise). **Failure to do this may result in the team being expelled from the league.**

(Clarification – teams do not have to host on their own track if it is unsuitable).

This to reinforce the concept of sharing the responsibility and cost of hosting a match. It is manifestly unfair to expect other clubs to consistently have to cover any shortfall.

Stuart Horsewood (Winchester) asked for confirmation that this refers to both age groups? **Marian** replied that it refers to all teams in one or both age groups; if a club has a team in both, then they should realistically expect to host at least one age group alternatively each year, however if a 6-team division has 4 matches per season, as in LAG in some regions, then teams are likely to be asked to host twice every 3 years.

With no further questions, the proposal was seconded by **Stuart Horsewood (Winchester)**. **The proposal was unanimously approved.**

RULE 11: SCORING

11.1 Upper Age Group: In all field events, 3 competitors per team shall be permitted, all of whom will score. 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).

Lower Age Group field: 2 competitors per event per team permitted.

To be amended to

11.1 Upper Age Group: In all field events, 3 competitors per team shall be permitted, all of whom will score. If there are two U18 competitors, then both shall compete in the U18 age group, if there are three U18 competitors then one shall compete in the U20 age group and two shall compete in the u18 age group.

(For clarification: if there is only one U18 competitor then they must compete in the U18 age group).

Lower Age Group field: 2 competitors per event per team permitted with the exception of the U14 long throws, where only one competitor is permitted.

Mick Bond confirmed that this change to the Lower Age Group field events is to accommodate the Hammer and Discus for U14s whilst accepting that an increase in the number of events will increase the length of the competition day, which is unacceptable.

Margaret Grayson (Wigan & District) asked why Pole Vault wasn't included in the U14 events. Mick affirmed that it should be possible if restricted to one competitor as per the long throws.

Paul Wilson (Chesterfield) indicated that his club would support including PV for U14s as well.

Karen Higgs-Smith (WGwEL) suggested that the only alternative to restricting throws to one scoring competitor would be to alternate them. She also welcomed the inclusion of PV as there aren't many opportunities available at the moment.

Jodie Williamson (City of Stoke) commented that field events, are penalised by leagues when they limit the number of throwers allowed, or as in the UAG where only 3 competitors are allowed in the field events with 4 on track. **Marian** explained that the long throws are the controlling factor for the length of the day, as most venues don't have access to two separate throws areas, so they must run sequentially. The more limitations that are put on the length of the competition day, the more long throws in particular will be under threat.

Bob Willows (Brighton & Hove) reminded everyone that additional athletes can be catered for as non-scorers.

Jemma Porter (Trafford) remarked that they would not want the throws to rotate.

Margaret Grayson (Wigan & District) seconded the proposal with the addition of U14 Pole Vault for one athlete as per the long throws as follows:

Lower Age Group field: 2 competitors per event per team permitted with the exception of the U14 long throws and Pole Vault, where only one competitor is permitted.

The proposal was unanimously approved.

11.4 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.

To be amended to

11.4 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, teams will be deducted a further five points.

Marian explained that this proposal to award a fixed penalty for overuse of an athlete(s) is to prevent the current system of applying an unequal penalty which causes confusion and is time consuming to administer. The league has always felt that overuse of an athlete is to be firmly discouraged.

Margaret Grayston (Wigan & District) asked if the league could circulate a reminder to team managers to make sure their athletes know that they cannot just add themselves to an event. Marian commented that this was down to team managers, it wasn't something we would want to put into the rules

Derek Hateley (Nuneaton) asked for confirmation as to which event would be removed altogether from the results. Marian stated that all events an athlete competes in after they have reached the maximum number have to be removed from the results.

Annette Brown (Solihull & Small Heath) asked who would be expected to remove the offending performance, **Marian** replied that in the majority of cases it would be when the match was scrutinised because not all results recorders are well versed in the rules around this, however if it was spotted at a match then it could be dealt with through the team manager before the results are sent out. **Marian** is hoping that the software will be able to identify a deduction in the scoring system.

Jodie Williamson (City of Stoke) wondered whether more than 5 points should be deducted, but it was agreed that this would be something to look at in future, there are a number of changes happening next year, and in some cases we aren't yet aware what the limitations on events will be.

Glen Reddington asked when UKA are likely to be making a decision on this.

Arwel Williams replied that rules were going to be discussed in December.

The proposal was seconded by **Annette Brown (Solihull & Small Heath)**.

Again, there was unanimous support for this proposal.

RULE 12: NON SCORING EVENTS

12.2 In the Lower Age Group, two U13 and two U15 athletes per sex per team will be allowed in the non-scoring 800m and 75m/100m events ONLY. These athletes shall be declared on the relevant declaration sheet.

To be amended to

12.2 In the Lower Age Group, two U14 and two U16 athletes per sex per team will be allowed to compete as non-scorers. These athletes shall be declared on the relevant declaration sheet.

This change is to make allowance for the 2nd year U16 athletes, who previously would have been allowed to compete as non-scorers in the U17 age group in events other than sprints and 800m.

Mick Bond (Cambridge Harriers) asked for confirmation on the number of non-scorers in the LAG, at the moment each age group is allowed two non-scorers in each of the defined events, which amounts to four non-scorers per age group. Marian confirmed that this was an error on her part when she had typed up the rules.

Keven Tomas (Rotherham Harriers) wanted to confirm that the non-scorers could be entered in any events

Mick Bond submitted a counter proposal to change the number of non-scorers from 2 to 4, such that:

*In the Lower Age Group, **four** U14 and **four** U16 athletes per sex per team will be allowed to compete as non-scorers. These athletes shall be declared on the relevant declaration sheet.*

Shaun Ainge (Cannock and Stafford) seconded this.

All votes were in favour of this.

7. To consider the following amendments to the constitution.:

Item 2: OBJECTS

2.1 To provide inter club competition for Clubs for athletes who are in the under 20, under 17, (herein after referred to as "Upper Age Group") and under 15 and under 13 age groups (hereinafter defined as "Lower Age Group") as defined in the UKA Rules of Competition, with the exception of school teams who cannot be a member.

To be amended to:

2.1 To provide inter club competition for Clubs for athletes who are in the under 20, under 18, (herein after referred to as "Upper Age Group") and under 16 and under 14 age groups (hereinafter defined as "Lower Age Group") as defined in the UKA Rules of Competition, with the exception of school teams who cannot be a member.

Conduct of General Meetings

It is proposed that, with effect from next year's AGM, general meetings should be capable of being held without the need for members to be physically present at the same location and that, subject to approval of this proposal, the Management Committee be authorised to make such changes to the Constitution of the League as are deemed necessary to achieve this result.

Arwel Williams asked what the situation was with Scottish teams, as their age groups would no longer be aligned with the rules of YDL. **Janice** confirmed that all teams competing in the national finals would have to conform to YDL age groups. She pointed out that SA make no contribution towards the league so don't have any influence in our rules.

Margaret Grayston (Wigan & District) advocated that all teams in a league should adhere to their rules, which in YDL's case was those set out by EA and WA. The amendments were seconded by **Margaret Grayston (Wigan & District)**
All votes were in favour of the changes to the constitution

8. Election of management committee vacancies (with Terms of office as shown).

Nominations received for:

Vice Chair: (to 2029) **Tim Soutar** nominated by Blackheath & Bromley Harriers & AC

General Committee:

Leslie Roy (to 2027) serving as Scottish Area Co-ordinator – nominated by Dundee Hawkhill Harriers; Kilbarchan AAC, Clydesdale Harriers, Banchory Stonehaven AC

Arwel Williams (to 2026) serving as Finals' Co-ordinator – nominated by Liverpool Harriers

Karen Higgs-Smith (to 2027) nominated by WGEL

plus

One vacancy to 2026 to serve as Midland Area Co-ordinator

Two further vacancies to 2027 – one to serve as Results Co-ordinator; one to serve as Northern Co-ordinator

The meeting voted unanimously in favour of all the above nominations.

9 **The 2026 Annual General Meeting is scheduled to take place in November (date to be confirmed).**

10 Janice then asked Tim to lead on the paper from the Working Group on composite teams. **Tim** explained that the paperwork gave the details of how and why the working group was set up, and whilst there were some detailed discussions held, there was no consensus as to a working solution.

It was not intended that composite teams would be removed, but an attempt was made to try to define the principles and purpose of composite teams and look at their effectiveness.

The paperwork gave four questions to be put to the AGM.

Whilst there was a consensus in favour of the inclusion of composite teams, and agreement that their function was to provide more athletes with opportunities to compete in a league, with a view to growing the individual clubs so that they may be able to operate as a standalone club, however Tim also pointed out that disbanding a composite team would present some problems which would need to be addressed.

It was accepted that some composite teams may remain in perpetuity depending on their circumstances, but it was also agreed that some composite teams are gaining an advantage over standalone teams and should be looking at working toward becoming standalone teams.

Sandra Woodman (Team Avon) disagreed with the concept of composites having to split into their component parts, she commented that teams in rural areas find it more difficult to source and develop officials, and also asked what the definition of a large composite team, is it based on performance or number of athletes?

Janice suggested that it was a development over time; this is about the principle rather than specific examples. She gave some statistics about our current composites:

- **20% of the teams in the UAG of the league are composite teams**
- **When looking at the teams in the top 20 list, 25% of those are composite teams**
- **However, 50% of the teams in the finals are composites which is disproportionate.**

Stuart Woodman (Yate) asked what the definition of a large composite team was, is it based on performance or number of athletes? A composite team can provide better opportunities for their athletes which will improve their performances.

Tim remarked that no-one fills all the events, even at the national final. He felt that the league is trying to assess if there is a significant problem. Ideally, we would like to get some agreement at the meeting about the first 2 points and then go away to try to work out what can be done about it?

Paul Wilson (Chesterfield) replied that implementing any changes would be the difficult part.

Joyce Tomala (East Wales) suggested that this whole issue is like a sledgehammer to crack a nut, we're already finding that some clubs are dropping out due to lack of numbers, so we don't know what 2026 is going to bring.

Stuart Woodman (Yate) confirmed that none of the individual clubs in the Team Avon composite could form a standalone team capable of competing on their own. **Marian** suggested that this should be what the management team would look at when teams

applied to become a composite. One consideration should be to look at how successful a club is at senior level, as that should be reflected in the number of junior athletes.

Jodie Wilkinson (City of Stoke) asked if it was a knock-on effect of Covid, but was assured that complaints had started well before Covid. She asked if it mattered if a composite team was very successful? **Tim** responded that it mattered to the standalone clubs who were being denied promotion, or a place in the national final because a composite team was dominating their division.

Janice further pointed out that composite teams have a big advantage with the finances, they pay the same amount as a standalone team but can share those costs between all the clubs in their composite, similarly hosting costs and transport costs can be split.

Mick Bond (Cambridge Harriers) thought that the majority of clubs are not affected by this and agreed with Joyce that it was a sledgehammer to crack a nut.

Simon Baker (Highgate Heathside) remarked that we are just looking at a principle, not aiming at any specific teams, he felt that maybe the age group changes may alter the landscape.

Janice pointed out that whilst this may be the case, the finances won't work if there is an increase in the number of composites.

Paul Wilson (Chesterfield) commented that it may be necessary to change the financial model.

Mark Exley (Northampton) reminded everybody that UKYDL was set up as a convenience for funding.

Mick Bond wondered whether the finals could be restricted to standalone teams only, but **Sandra Woodman** asked what the incentive would then be for composite teams.

Dennis Thomas (East Cheshire & Tameside) asked if composite teams can be looked at the end of each season, as a form of health check to see if they still needed to be a composite. **Tim** replied that it would be possible if time allows.

Richard Pownall (Marshall Milton Keynes) felt that composites help small clubs who wouldn't otherwise be able to compete which is a good thing.

Sandra Woodman (Team Avon) suggested that we leave it as it is and assess the situation next year. **Janice** agreed that we do not expect to make any decisions at this meeting, but it will be monitored.

Tim reminded everyone that we need to be careful that we retain the purpose of the league as a club league and not a regional team or similar.

Karen Higgs-Smith (WGwEL) thought that clubs should be encouraged to grow their individual clubs rather than rely on sourcing athletes from other clubs, 2nd claim athletes are a means of building up team numbers.

As time was running short, **Tim** then summed up where we currently appear to be. UKA review the composite applications each year, but the committee really need a steer as to what they should be doing, there are no standards to measure composite teams, but should we take no action until there are expressions of concern from a number of clubs. Whilst we don't want to leave the matter festering, it's far from clear what actual measures can or should be made.

Janice thanked everyone for coming and wished them a safe journey home.

Paul Wilson (Chesterfield) spoke on behalf of his club, and no doubt many others, to thank the committee for all their hard work.

The meeting closed at 14:29

The Chair thanked everyone for their input to the meeting and wished them a safe journey home.

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

DRAFT