



UK YOUTH DEVELOPMENT LEAGUE

Minutes of the 2018 Annual General Meeting

held at the Great Barr Hotel, Birmingham, on Saturday 17th 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; Spenborough & 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; Wyshire

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 Morphet** 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 Morphis 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 16th 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.



Youth Development League AGM 2018.

Chairman's Report.

I will start by congratulating the winners from this year's National Finals weekend, which saw Reading AC crowned lower age group champions, and Blackheath & Bromley Harriers & AC upper age group champions.

The upper age group match also saw Blackheath and Bromley Harriers and AC taking both gender split titles, just as they had done in 2017, and they have now been nominated to UKA as the 2019 representatives for the European Champions Club Cup for juniors. The 2018 European competition took place in Castellon, Spain, on the 15th September and the club secured 4th place in both competitions.

Congratulations to all the teams for their successes this year in YDL.

Congratulations must also be given to all the YDL member club athletes who were selected for international competition in 2018. Watching the action from the Gold Coast in April I was once more pleasantly surprised to see athletes who I remembered from YDL, competing for their home countries, five of whom still hold YDL league records. Later in the season I also managed to check out the athletes who were selected for two of the major Junior internationals in 2018, the European U18 Championships, and the IAAF Junior Championships. Once more nearly 80% of those selected had utilised YDL in their quest for experience leading up to selection. One other interesting fact I picked up when compiling my lists of selections, was that of a Bedford & County athlete, who has competed in YDL, but competes for the Netherlands, he won the European U18 100m title.

Registration checking, one of my responsibilities, no one else really wants to do it, has been a little easier this year after the rule change in 2017 effectively passing the buck to competition providers. Our software is invaluable in enabling it to be dealt with, but I still spent a considerable amount of time informing teams of a problem with their athletes on the clubs' team manager portal. If any of you looked at the league tables throughout the season, you will see that even with ample warning, there were some clubs who still didn't register their athletes with the relevant home country within the much extended timescale I used, more than the governing body rules allows, and suffered disqualifications. I was also pleased to see my expectations of take up with the leagues Team Manager portal software, did reach the 100% I mentioned last year, what did we ever do without it?

Congratulations to all clubs who were divisional winners, or who gained promotion and commiserations to the clubs who have been relegated; plus, to all the athletes who took part, we hope you enjoyed the experience.

Finally, none of this would happen without the officials, volunteers and our funding partner UKA, who have made it possible for our matches to take place. Plus, to the management committee members who have worked so hard to pull it all together, especially those new members, who may now be regretting the whole process, thank you.

Grace Hall.

Chairman.

31.10.18



Administrator's Annual Report to the AGM November 2018

2018, like all years before, proved to have its fair share of challenges; whilst for the most part we were blessed with wonderful sunny days for the majority of fixtures, we did have one match cancelled due to inclement weather, and a couple of others who were a close-run thing. We held a total of 173 league fixtures, including all finals and promotion matches, involving 311 teams across both age groups, and, given that we have well over 20 000 athletes registered on our portal, it's clear that we, as a league, offer competition opportunities for a significant number of young athletes.

One area that has produced a significant number of complaints and comments is that of officiating in league fixtures. It seems that a number of clubs are consistently failing to provide their full quota of officials, and many of those who do sign in are unqualified volunteers. Whilst it's encouraging on the one hand to have people willing to step up and help out, unless we can persuade many of these volunteers to attend the courses to qualify as officials, then we are putting those qualified officials who do turn up under huge pressure to plug the gaps; moreover, we are in danger of doing a lot of athletes a huge disservice. I think it's safe to say that we are going to come under more intense scrutiny and it's highly likely that results from some matches will not be eligible for Po10 rankings if the situation continues to decline. Whilst our rules state that at least one of the field judges signing in must be a level 2 field judge, the current requirements for a level 1 licence (the majority of our fixtures are at level 1), is a minimum of two qualified field judges on each field event with a level 2 on all long throws and pole vault, and unless we meet these criteria at our matches then the results will not be compliant with our licence and will not therefore be eligible for Po10 rankings. It is a similar situation for track judges and timekeepers where at least four qualified officials should be in attendance.

We have continued to look at finances this year, and our new Finance Officer has been hard at work acquainting himself with the idiosyncrasies of the YDL accounts as well as trying to deal with a decreasing budget. He has done an excellent job in his first year and for that we are all most grateful. As a committee we are looking at cuts we're able to make without adversely affecting the league and its athletes, and to this end one of the changes we have decided to implement is that in 2019 we will no longer be issuing printed Handbooks, it will be published on our website as usual for clubs to access, and if necessary print up relevant pages for distribution to officials and athletes.

One of the challenges issued from the last AGM was to reduce the costs of the National Finals, and Joyce, ably assisted by the finals sub group, has done a sterling job reducing the net costs to marginally over £10 000 which is well over a 55% reduction. A fantastic achievement in these difficult times and again very deserving of our thanks. It's no easy task organising any event such as this, but they pulled it off with aplomb and I feel sure that all those involved were immensely grateful to have the opportunity to compete at a national event as a team. It was a fitting way to finish off the season and our congratulations must go to Reading AC, league champions in the lower age group, and Blackheath & Bromley Harriers, their counterparts in the upper age group, and it the latter who now go on to represent GB in the European Champions Club cup, as a result of their win. I'm sure we all wish them good luck.



Area co-ordinators have been busy sorting out the divisional structures for next year, a pretty thankless task at times, and I am most grateful to them for taking a lot of pressure from me as it is they who generally deal with first line enquiries from clubs and take a lot of the flak when things don't meet with everyone's favour. I referred earlier to the number of teams participating in the league in 2018; for 2019 we have lost some teams and gained others, but overall the number of participating clubs remains consistent.

The results software is proving to be popular with all but a small minority; the team managers' portal is working well and cuts down on a lot of work for everyone involved in the results process. Where host clubs have been able to go 'paperless' the final results have been more accurate as team managers have been able to take more responsibility for making sure the declarations are correct. Even for tracks without wi-fi, a mobile phone link makes it possible to run a match without the use of the tedious paper changes and inevitable errors involved in transferring data.

The software offers us an even greater opportunity to look at areas of concern, and I have been going through the competitor numbers in each of the events, so that we can begin to look at how we can improve the competition experience for our athletes. It's not uniform across the divisions and in general the participation levels in Premier divisions is good, but there are some areas where we would like to focus our attention and try to come up with some strategies. The Midlands region is again at the forefront of some of these changes, and Joyce is looking at holding joint fixtures for some divisions, not only will there be more competitors in events, but it should also increase the number of qualified officials available; she is also looking to organise an event specific throws competition for one of the areas, which will shorten the competition day, and help to alleviate any H & S problems around the throwing cages.

You will all by now be aware of the new directives around throwing cages which may have a negative impact on the long throws in competitions. We will be taking a very careful look at the timetables in both age groups, but it is difficult when we don't have a clear idea of exactly what is available, stadium-wise, out there.

Finally, on behalf of our committee, I would like to extend our thanks to all those people in clubs across the country who continue to work hard week in, week out supporting their athletes and making things work. There's a small army of team managers, officials and volunteers out there and without their enthusiasm and commitment there would be no matches; so, thank you one and all. I would also like to express my personal thanks to my fellow members of the management committee, who are also volunteers with many other varied commitments. I look forward to another year where we continue working together to ensure the future success of our sport.

Marian Williams
YDL Administrator

YDL Finance Officers Report to AGM 2018

With a change in Finance Officer this year, the clerking role has been divided between myself and Lorraine Vidler (the outgoing Finance Officer). The official date for change over was the 1st January 2018. I would like to thank Lorraine for making the transition as seamless as possible.

In the year just ended (2017-18) the league made a £48,791 surplus due to increases in affiliation fees and cost savings. In 2019 the UKA grant decreases to £60,000 (from £80,000). We propose that we reverse some of the previous cuts to hosting support and travel claims, and continue to promote talent and performance development using remaining grant funds and run a small deficit budget for 2018-19.

This year, following request in previous AGMs (and from individual member representatives) for greater transparency of costs (and division of account into categories to enable more informed decision making), we have proposed a new format for reporting the league's accounts.

To enable accounting consistency in the Income and Expenditure Account we have reported it in previous years' format and provided new version explaining where the larger sums of money are now being appropriated.

A forecast budget (using the new format) is also provided. The forecast includes proposed changes to hosting, travel and the reorganisation of hardship claims.

Income and Expenditure Account Explanations

This year we have chosen to show the "Contribution to clubs for Track Hire and Mileage" as this year's proposed figure (and not the actual figure paid this year for last year's costs - as in previous years). This enables us to see the true incomes and expenditures for the league year and true deficit/surplus relating to actual incomes and expenditure this league year.

While examining the accounts we found a slight error (£89) in the bank balance reported last year on the Balance Sheet this has been corrected in this year's Income and Expenditure.

We also found that the creditors from last year were higher than shown in last year's Balance Sheet. This is the "Prior Year Adjustment" shown on both this year's Balance sheet and the Income and Expenditure Account. This figure is actually accounted for, in the main, by the credits agreed for Midland teams when they had already joined the league with set Affiliation Fees agreed before the decision taken to reduce their number of division matches to three from four. The cost of the "Three Match Credits" was £2700 but was not shown as a creditor last year's balance sheet but was definitely a cost to the 2016-17 accounts year.

We have included some contingency in the Contribution to Clubs for Track Hire and Mileage this year as we have been receiving late claims. This is partially due to our error in not including a deadline date on the claim forms. It is also important to us to pay all teams what they are due both, for fairness, and to ensure accurate forecasting/comparisons for future decision making. This will mean we should expect a small (positive) "Prior Year Adjustment" next year.

New Format for Reporting Income and Expenditure

We have attempted to show income and expenditure under distinct headings which show the operation, development and support mechanisms of the league. Under those headings we have used sub headings to provide a greater description of costs within that heading. In an attempt to show the true costs of each distinct area, administration fees and other expenses have been apportioned across the new headings.

We are fortunate that UKA does not overly prescribe where the grant given to the League is spent (£60,000 for 2018-19). This allows us room to use the grant to help develop athletics through the league in the best ways we see fit. However we felt we did need to give some thought to the areas that we see the grant supplementing. To this end we created budget headings in expenditure that meet existing strategy aims of UKA (broadly interpreted as developing “Talent” and “Performance” “Across the UK”). We hope that these headings (and the subheadings within them) are reasonably self explanatory.

Hosting Support

In 2017-18 there were 163 divisional matches, 8 Area Finals (3 UAG, 5 LAG) and 2 National Finals (1 UAG, 1 LAG).

Area Finals

The Area Finals are hosted by teams/clubs/organisations local to those Areas and are administered by their Area Coordinators. Teams and clubs offering to host the finals have no guarantee that their team or athletes will be competing in them. All reasonable costs of the Area Finals are met by the League.

The costs of Area Finals are paid as soon as reasonably possible after they are incurred.

National Finals

By their nature there is no local scenario for the National Finals. A team of core officials (chiefs and a contingency of experienced officials) and experienced administrators is put together and managed by the League. In previous years, the league had recruited all officials but - as in other matches - the teams this year, were asked to supply their own officials as part of the cost savings requested. The National Finals necessitate a larger stadium (the cost of this is significantly offset by the gate receipts more easily collected at larger venues).

Due to complexities and workload involved in staging and running the National Finals, a Finals Coordinator is appointed and planning meetings are supported.

Accommodation for teams is not supported at the National Finals, though travel is considered as part of a cumulative match travel claim for the season.

The costs of National Finals are paid as soon as reasonably possible after they are incurred.

Divisional Matches

Of the 163 divisional matches nearly all clubs have claimed support. Insisting on evidence of facility and first aid costs has been time consuming for both the teams and the league. However going through the process this year has exposed differences in first aid and facility costs. How facility fees and first aid are negotiated is very much a localized issue. Indeed how the facility cost is derived and described on invoices from hosts is very diverse. Obtaining invoices from suppliers in sufficient time for processing has also proved difficult in many cases.

To this end we propose that for divisional hosting support next year we will use a formula to pay hosting support that only requires minimal evidence.

We propose that for the year 2018-19, divisional matches will be supported with the following hosting support formula:

A fixed support of £200

Plus an additional £30 for every team timetabled to compete at the match.

Eg For hosting a six team match
Support = £200 + 6 (£30) = £380

Additional support will be added for hosts using Photofinish, EDM and/or Wind Gauge measurements (Precision Measurements) –

Photofinish £100
Track Wind Gauge £25
EDM £50
Field Wind Gauge £25

Eg A host supplying all the precision measurement equipment for a six team match would receive £380 + (£125 + £50 + £25) = £580 in total support.

The support will be paid to the host on the proviso that the league administrator is satisfied with the post match documents.

As the calculation for hosting support will be agreed at the AGM each year this will enable payments to be made as reasonably as possible after they are incurred.

We believe this is fairer for all hosts; significantly reduces administration for teams and league volunteers; supports better financial planning for hosts and cash flow management for the both the hosts and the league.

Travel Support

We propose that travel support will be based upon the cumulative mileage that a team travels from (and returning to) their main track and field training facility and the match venues throughout the YDL competitive season. Upper and Lower age group teams are considered separately.

In the case of composite teams, the travel mileage shall be calculated from the main track and field training facility of the closest member club to the match venue. Composite teams may request special consideration for the support of travel for the proportion of athletes in their team from their other member clubs that travel further from their training base to each match venue. Enquiries for additional support of this kind should be made to Area Coordinators and any agreements for further travel support will be subject to committee approval.

We propose that travel support will be paid at 50p per mile on every mile over the first 400 miles of cumulative travel.

This is a reduced threshold for the start of support (from 500 miles to 400 miles) and it is hoped to increase the spread of support to more teams traveling significant distances. This threshold reduction change will more than compensate teams that previously claimed some higher rates at higher threshold levels.

As the calculation for Travel Support will be approved at the AGM each year, support will be paid as soon as reasonably possible after each team has completed its last YDL match of the season and submitted their claim which will be scrutinized by the league.

Reorganisation of Hardship Claims

As claim amounts have changed to meet reducing income through grants the disparity between those claiming Hardship Support and Travel Claims has increased significantly. The league proposes to address

this by dividing the Hardship Fund into constituent parts and thereby making the process more accessible and visible to all league teams.

Travel Support

All Travel (with the exception of “Travel Over Sea” – which applies to only two teams at present, Team IOM and Island Select) will now be calculated using the travel support calculation. Enquiries for additional support of any kind should be made to Area coordinators and any agreements for further travel support will be subject to committee approval.

Accommodation Support

Accommodation Support may be available for teams travelling over 3 hours to a match. This time does not include travel or multiple pickups.

For composite teams, whole team accommodation support would only be applicable if the nearest member club’s main track and field training facility is more than three hours travelling time from the match venue. Partial team accommodation for those athletes based at composite member clubs can be considered. For a full team requiring accommodation, support for up to nine additional adults will be considered (based on seven officials and up to two team managers). For partial teams individual cases can be considered.

Specified proof of financial expenditure for the number of overnight stays will be required and the numbers of athletes actually competing will need to be supplied before any accommodation support payments can be made.

Accommodation Support will be at the fixed rate per person per match staying overnight.

All accommodation support should be agreed by the committee prior to the deadline for the payment of team fees. Requests for accommodation support should be made through Area Coordinators soon after the timetabling of league matches are known.

Accommodation support is not available for the National Finals.

Travel over Sea

It is proposed that the league will continue to support teams requiring travel over sea. This was formerly supported through the Hardship Fund.

The league will consider covering a percentage of the costs of competing athletes and up to nine adults traveling from the island of their team training base to the UK mainland. “Travel Over Sea” support should be agreed by the committee prior to the deadline for the payment of team fees.

Proof of financial expenditure on travel over sea will be required and the numbers of athletes actually competing will need to be supplied before any “Travel over Sea” support can be paid.

Karl Ponty
YDL Finance Officer

YOUTH DEVELOPMENT LEAGUE

ACCOUNTS FOR THE YEAR ENDED 30 SEPTEMBER 2018

BALANCE SHEET AS AT 30 SEPTEMBER 2018

		2018	2017
		£	£
ASSETS			
Fixed Assets			
Computer Equipment	- Net Book Value	Note 2	0
			128
Current Assets			
Cash at Bank	- Current Account	123,622	64,980
	- Deposit Account	60,458	60,343
		184,080	125,323
Debtors		Note 3	1,204
			-
Current Liabilities			
Amounts Due Within One Year:			
Creditors		Note 4	20,309
Proposed Distribution to Areas and Clubs		55,224	10,080
		75,533	54,500
			64,580
Net Current Assets		109,751	60,743
		£109,751	£60,871
CAPITAL ACCOUNT AND RESERVES			
Accumulated Funds			
Balance as at 1 October 2017		63,594	60,086
Prior Year adjustment		-2,634	
Surplus/(Deficit) for Year		48,791	785
		£109,751	£60,871

.....
K Ponty 24 October 2018
Treasurer

Independent Examiner's Report

I have examined the books and records of the Youth Development League for the year ended 30 September 2018, 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.

.....
L J Lancaster 21 October 2018

YOUTH DEVELOPMENT LEAGUE
INCOME AND EXPENDITURE ACCOUNT
FOR THE YEAR ENDED 30 SEPTEMBER 2018

	2018	2017
	£	£
INCOME		
Affiliation Fees	100,770	76,800
Grants from UKA	80,000	80,000
Donations	1,000	
Interest Received	115	307
	<hr/>	<hr/>
	181,885	157,107
	<hr/>	<hr/>
EXPENDITURE		
Administration Costs		
Committee Expenses	5,639	4,851
Postage and Phone	177	204
Stationery	237	237
Working Party	0	268
Administration Fees	<hr/> 22,350	<hr/> 24,600
	28,403	30,160
Contribution to Clubs for Track Hire and Milea	55,224	48,448
League Match Costs	16,826	29,242
Cost of Staging Finals	10,613	24,112
Hardship Payments	16,000	15,136
Area Promotion/Relegation Matches	8,190	8,612
3 Match Credits	50	
Miscellaneous Expenditure		
Website and Software	150	
Accounts Fee	325	450
Depreciation	0	152
Sundries	36	10
Adjustment to Bank Balance 2017	-89	
Prior Year adjustment	<hr/> -2,634	<hr/>
	-2,212	612
	<hr/>	<hr/>
	133,094	156,322
	<hr/>	<hr/>
Surplus/(Deficit) to Accumulated Funds	<u><u>£48,791</u></u>	<u><u>£785</u></u>

YOUTH DEVELOPMENT LEAGUE
ACCOUNTS FOR THE YEAR ENDED 30 SEPTEMBER 2018
NOTES TO THE ACCOUNTS

1 Accounting Policies

Basis of Preparation of Accounts

The accounts have been prepared under the historical cost convention.

Fixed Assets Depreciation Policy

Depreciation is provided, on a straight line basis, at the following annual rates in order to write off each asset over its expected useful life:

Computer and PA Equipment 33%

	2018	2017
	£	£
2 Fixed Assets - Computer Equipment		
Cost		
Brought Forward	1374	1374
Additions		-
Carried Forward	<u>1374</u>	<u>1374</u>
Accumulated Depreciation		
Brought Forward	1246	1094
Charge for the Year	<u>128</u>	<u>152</u>
Carried Forward	<u>1374</u>	<u>1246</u>
Net Book Value	<u>£0</u>	<u>£128</u>
3 Debtors		
Prepayment for website hosting	324	
NIR Team fees underpaid from 2017	880	
	<u>£1,204</u>	<u>£ -</u>
4 Creditors		
Finals	-	7,478
Committee Expenses	380	307
League Costs	3,401	45
Administration Fees	-	1,050
Independent Examiner's Fee	325	450
Hardship Payments	16,000	-
Area promotion/Relegation matches	153	-
3 Match Credits	50	-
Next year's Subscriptions Received in Advance	-	750
	<u>£20,309</u>	<u>£10,080</u>
5 Cost of Staging Finals		
Income		
Gate Receipts and Sale of Programmes	2198	1,873
Franchises	350	350
National finals team receipts	<u>1170</u>	
	3,718	2,223
Expenditure		
Track Hire and Staffing Costs	3,490	7,478
Medals and Trophies	798	1,634
Programmes	449	623
Competitors' Numbers etc.	-	-
Officials' Expenses and Catering	7,924	13,140
Administration	500	500
Team Expenses	-	1,567
Birchfield Harriers	-	203
First Aid	990	990
PA Hire	-	-
EDM Hire	<u>180</u>	<u>200</u>
	14,331	26,335
Net Cost	<u>£10,613</u>	<u>£24,112</u>

**YOUTH DEVELOPMENT LEAGUE
INCOME AND EXPENDITURE ACCOUNT (New Report Format)
YEAR ENDED 30th September 2018**

	2018			2018	
	£	£		£	£
INCOME			INCOME (Proposed New Reporting Format)		
Affiliation Fees		100,770	UAG Division Affiliation Fees		
			Midlands	11,610	
			Northern	10,800	
			Southern	<u>14,130</u>	
					36,540
			LAG Division Affiliation Fees		
			Midlands	14,310	
			Northern	18,000	
			Northern Ireland*	1,280	
			Scotland	6,210	
			Southern	<u>19,570</u>	
			*(under payment £880)		59,370
Grants from UKA		80,000	Grants from UKA		80,000
Donations		1,000	Donations		1,000
Interest Received		115	Interest Received		115
		<u> </u>			<u> </u>
		181,885			
		<u>181,885</u>			
			Note A		<u>177,025</u>

Note A	£4860 (Team Fees for Area Finals) now combined with Area Promo/Rel Matches into Cost of Staging Area Finals
---------------	---

YOUTH DEVELOPMENT LEAGUE
INCOME AND EXPENDITURE ACCOUNT (New Report Format)
YEAR ENDED 30th September 2018

EXPENDITURE		EXPENDITURE (Proposed New Reporting Format)	
Administration Costs		Administration Costs	
Committee Expenses	5,639	Committee Meetings (Oct, Jan, April, May)	1,937
Postage and Phone	177	Sub Group Meetings (Finance, Finals)	1,057
		Website and Support	Note B 1,650
Stationery	237	Officer Expenses	476
		AGM	2,411
		Professional Fees	325
		Results Software Development	Note D,G 6,524
Administration Fees	<u>22,350</u>	Administration Fees	Note B,C,D,E <u>7,500</u>
	28,403		21,880
		League Match Costs	
Contribution to Clubs for Track		Hosting Support	45,044
Hire and Mileage	55,224	Competitor Numbers	5,298
		League Programmes/Handbooks	3,008
League Match Costs	16,826	Results Match Support	Note D 750
		Administration Fees	Note C 7,500
3 Match Credits	50	Area Administration Fees	Note E 3,000
		Area Administration Expenses	Note F 895
		Area Trophies	<u>489</u>
			65,984
		Precision Measurement for Talent	
		Photofinish Support	3,600
		Track Wind Gauge	
		EDM Support	2,400
		Field Wind Gauge	<u></u>
			6,000
		Developing Talent from Across the UK	
Hardship Payments	16,000	Hardship Payments	16,000
		Travel Support	4,792
		Team Accommodation	
		Travel Over Sea	
		Area Consideration	
		Administration Fees	Note C <u>500</u>
			21,292
		Rewarding Team Performance	
Cost of Staging Finals	10,613	Cost of Staging National Finals	10,613
Area Promotion/Relegation Matches	8,190	Cost of Staging Area Finals	Note A 3,330
		Competitor Numbers	422
Miscellaneous		Results Software Developer Support	Note G 500
Website and Software	150	Administration Fees	Note C <u>850</u>
Accounts Fee	325		15,715
Depreciation	0		
Sundries	36	Miscellaneous Sundries	86
Adjustment to Bank Balance 2017	-89	Adjustment to Bank Balance 2017	-89
Prior Year adjustment	<u>-2,634</u>	Prior Year adjustment	<u>-2,634</u>
	-2,212		
	<u>133,094</u>		<u>128,234</u>
Surplus/(Deficit) to Accumulated Funds	<u><u>48,791</u></u>	Surplus/(Deficit) to Accumulated Funds	<u><u>48,791</u></u>

Notes explaining major changes in reporting for the proposed new format

Note A	£4860 (Team fees for Areas finals) now combined with Area Promo/Rel Matches into Cost of Staging Area Finals
Note B	Website Officer Fee now shown as part of the Website and support cost - formerly shown as part of the Administration Fees
Note C	League Administrator and Finance Officer Fees partially redistributed from Administration Fees to relevant budget headings
Note D	Results Officer Fee now shown as part of the Results Software Development and Match Support cost - formerly shown as part of the Administration Fees
Note E	8 x Area Coordinator Fees now shown as League Match Cost
Note F	Expenses of Area Coordinators relating directly to supporting Areas (Area Meetings etc)
Note G	Software Development costs now shown in relevant budget headings - formerly in League Match Costs