



UK YOUTH DEVELOPMENT LEAGUE

Minutes of the 2019 Annual General Meeting

held at the Holiday Inn M6 J7 Hotel, Birmingham, on Saturday 16th 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; Julian Starkey; Joyce Tomala; Lorraine Vidler; Rob Logan (UKA) plus:

The following clubs were in attendance:

Midland region (22 teams represented)

Birchfield Harriers; Cannock & Stafford AC; Cwmbran Harriers; Derby AC; East Wales; Halesowen A & CC; Kidderminster & Stourport AC; Northampton AC; Solihull & Small Heath AC; Swansea Harriers; Team Avon; Wolverhampton & Bilston AC; Yate & District AC

Northern region (17 teams represented)

City of York AC; Kingdom Athletic; Leeds City AC; Middlesbrough AC (Mandale); North Wales; Rotherham Harriers; Spensborough & District AC; Trafford AC; Wigan & District Harriers; Wrexham AC

Scottish region (3 teams represented)

Dundee Hawkhill Harriers; Pitreavie; Victoria Park Glasgow AC

Southern region (13 teams represented)

Basildon AC; Basildon Beagles; Blackheath & Bromley Harriers & AC; Bracknell AC; Brighton & Hove AC; City of Portsmouth AC; Portsmouth/Winchester; Shaftesbury Barnet Harriers; Stevenage & North Herts AC; Team Dorset

Apologies: Donna Fraser (UKA); Chris Power (NI area co-ordinator); Altrincham AC; Amber Valley & Erewash AC; Bedford & County AC; Bicester AC; Bristol & West AC/Mendip; Burton AC; Charnwood AC; Cheltenham & County Harriers; Deeside AAC; Gateshead Harriers; Havering AC; Horsham Blue Star Harriers; Leamington C & AC; Liverpool Harriers; Marshall Milton Keynes AC; M60 Nomads; North Somerset AC; Reading AC; Rugby & Northampton AC; Sale Harriers; Salford Metropolitan AC; Thames Valley Harriers; West Cheshire AC; Woodford Green with Essex Ladies; and the following individuals: Bob Frost (Wrexham AC); Geoff Morphitis (Shaftesbury Barnet Harriers); Sam Hillier-Smith (Yate & District AC); Keith Perry (Halesowen A & CC);

1. **Grace Hall, the chairman** extended a very warm welcome to everyone in attendance and introduced Rob Logan who was attending the meeting as the representative of UKA.

2. Minutes of the 2018 AGM

The minutes were deemed to be an accurate record, and their acceptance was proposed by **Alan Johnson (Trafford)** and seconded by **Jo Davis (Swansea)**.

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; she asked the representatives from Blackheath & Bromley for an update on the European Junior Clubs Cup in 2020, and it was confirmed that the future of the competition was

uncertain; at the moment there is no competition in 2020 and although it was still scheduled for 2021, if it does take place, it was possibly going to be in a different format. She then 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. **Lesley Nunn (Yate & District)** stated that she would like to bring up some issues but as they were also on the agenda under rules changes, it was agreed that she would bring them up at those points.

David Little (Team Dorset) asked what were the implications of double headed matches and if there were any plans to introduce any into the South? Lorraine Vidler replied that clubs in the UAG had been consulted and she had only received three responses who had all been in favour, the reasoning behind the query was the lack of officials in the South willing to work at league matches; at the moment, there were no double headers taking place in the South. Marian pointed out that another major benefit was the reduction in the number of venues needed. David commented that the double headers would effectively double the length of the timetables, but Marian refuted that and referred to those who had experienced double headers in 2019.

Mark Exley (Northampton) commented that they had worked well in the Midlands division he had attended; some of the teams in the divisions were quite small, so it allowed for doubling up in most events, he felt that it would depend on how strong the teams involved were.

Karl Ponty confirmed that the length of the meeting was slightly longer as the Premier timetable had been used, but they had provided a better competition for athletes and created a better buzz around the matches, there were also both financial benefits and for officials' numbers.

Alan Johnson reported that there had been 1 set of double headed matches in the North due to small divisions; there could be a disadvantage for clubs who may have to travel further.

Lesley Nunn (Yate & District) suggested that there may be difficulties in 2020 as one of the double headers involved a Premier division who generally had a full quota of long throwers and would have to embrace another 4 clubs' athletes as well. She thought it would inevitably lead to a lengthening of the day. She felt it had been presented as a fait accompli to the Midlands Area meeting and not enough consideration had been given to those who had expressed concerns.

Grace Hall assured her that the decision hadn't been made until after the area meetings had taken place, and further commented that the Midlands was the region where communications between clubs and league was better than the others.

Joyce Tomala also commented that this only came about due to the geography of the region and a reduction in the number of teams in that area, it is intended only as a trial for 2020, if it didn't work then we will look at it again.

Lyn Orbell (Birchfield) asked for confirmation about applying for permits as the Midland Counties had informed clubs that they will have to apply for licences individually rather than competition providers applying en bloc. She was assured that in 2020 the league will be applying for Level 1 licences for all fixtures, if hosts wished to apply for a level 2 licence, they would have to apply themselves. In 2021, when Trackmark is fully operational then host clubs will have to apply themselves. Alan Johnson confirmed that this was the case.

5. Financial Report.

5.1 **Karl Ponty, the finance officer** had produced a very detailed report which had been circulated, and he explained the rationale behind the accompanying financial documents.

He pointed out the increase in the use of technical equipment, which was a positive move, probably brought about by the league specifically setting funds aside to encourage the use of Photofinish, EDM and wind gauges. He hoped that by increasing the budget it would encourage more clubs to use them at matches.

He pointed out that the Hardship fund had been replaced by two new categories – Accommodation Support and Travel Overseas. The net result was a reduction in costs.

Another category introduced into the budget was Rewarding Team Performances and he was happy to report that the cost of the national finals had been reduced significantly from the previous year.

He reported that the league maintains sufficient funds in their accounts to allow it to continue to function in the unlikely event of there being no external funding, although he did feel that we must continue to stress our strong case for financial support to continue with the work of developing athletes.

Stuart Nunn (Team Avon) stated that whilst they had felt it to be a privilege to compete at the national finals, it was nevertheless a financial burden on their team, he asked if it were possible to include an amount to go towards supporting teams who qualify. Karl responded that this would have to be balanced against all the teams who cannot qualify for the finals but do make a contribution towards their costs through their registration fees. If we were to receive more funding from UKA then this could allow for the league to allocate a greater level of support for those teams who qualify.

Tim Soutar (Blackheath & Bromley) asked if it were possible to survey the clubs who attended the finals to get an overall picture of their costs, he indicated that it had cost them in the region of £20 000 to attend the finals in both age groups. Karl agreed that it would be worth knowing, he also felt that UKA could prioritise the finals and offer support for this.

Paul Blakey (Derby) – reported that as a host club this season they had received a lot more enquiries as to whether Photofinish and wind gauges were going to be used at the fixture; although there is a cost involved, it is what athletes are increasingly expecting at matches. Karl agreed that general feedback supported this, and this was one of the reasons we were recommending an increase in the payment for the use of Photofinish.

David Little (Team Dorset) commented that the cost of hiring Photofinish and a technician was in the region of £300 so the league's suggested rise would still only cover 50% of the cost.

He also queried the mileage rate payable and Karl assured him that payments were made on the total number of miles travelled across the season and not just per match, the amount paid was for all mileage travelled in excess of 400 miles, so a claim for a total mileage of 650 miles would result in a payment for the 250 miles excess. He stated that if a team had any unique circumstances, then an approach could be made to the league.

5.2 Adoption of the Accounts

- **Lorraine Vidler (Basildon)** proposed that the 2019 accounts be adopted
- **Paul Allen (Kingdom Athletic)** seconded the motion.

Votes Against: 0

Abstentions: 0

The meeting voted unanimously in favour of adopting the accounts

5.3 Subscriptions for 2019/2020.

“The Management Committee proposes 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 finals or promotion matches.”

Paul Baxter (City of York) seconded the management proposal

Votes Against: 0

Abstentions: 0

The meeting voted unanimously in favour of the motion

5.4 Travel and Hosting.

“The Management Committee propose to reimburse travel expenses for the 2020 season as follows:

5.4.1 *Less than 400 miles – no payment;*

400 miles or more - 50p per mile

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

“The Management Committee proposes that, for the 2020 season, the host club reimbursement should be paid as follows:

5.4.2 *A fixed amount of £200, and a variable amount of £30 for each team timetabled to compete at the match, plus £150 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 2020 season”*

David Little (Team Dorset) seconded the management proposal

Votes Against: 0

Abstentions: 0

The meeting voted unanimously in favour of the above motions.

6. Resolutions.

6.1 No Motions were tendered from clubs.

6.2 Management Committee proposals for rule changes:

RULE 1: GENERAL

Rule 1.6 –

Club colours must be worn by all competitors

To be replaced with:

Club colours must be worn by all competitors *as per UKA rule 143 S1 (3).*

Rule 1.6.3

Any athlete failing to wear a club vest may not compete.

To be replaced with:

Any athlete failing to wear club *colours* may not compete.

Marian explained that this proposal was to make the rule less open to erroneous interpretation by individual officials at fixtures, as some competitors had been penalised unnecessarily by some chief officials during the season.

Tom Soutar (Blackheath & Bromley) wondered whether this rule may make things worse as the UKA rule makes specific mention of vests, however Grace pointed out that by referring

to the rule 143 S1(3) in the motion this should prevent any confusion, especially to any new personnel who may not be fully aware of the rule.

Several delegates raised the query about athletes who were unable to find a suitably sized vest and the varying ways to get around the problem. **Leslie Roy (Victoria Park Glasgow)** expressed astonishment at what she had heard and suggested that it may be put to the officials' conference that common sense should prevail at fixtures. **Paul Farres (City of Portsmouth)** suggested that most team managers would be carrying spare vests to matches, although he acknowledged that they may not necessarily be in the right sizes. **Nick Corry (Blackheath & Bromley)** commented that a development league should be about flexibility, to encourage people in the sport.

It was suggested that rule 1.6.3 was superfluous and only repeated what was already in the rule 1.6.

Paul Allen (Kingdom Athletic) proposed that Rule 1.6.3 be deleted rather than be amended

Kevin Thomas (Rotherham) seconded this amendment.

Voting then took place on Rule 1.6 proposal from the management

Paul Blakey (Derby) seconded the proposal

Votes Against: 0

Abstentions: 0

The meeting voted unanimously in favour.

The meeting then voted on the amendment that Rule 1.6.3 be removed from the rules:

Votes Against: 0

Abstentions: 0

The meeting voted unanimously in favour.

RULE 4: COMPOSITE TEAMS

Rule 4.1.3 –

If a club within an existing Premier division wishes to form a new composite team, they will be deemed to be a new team and will therefore apply to join the league at entry level.

To be replaced with:

If a club within an existing Premier division wishes to form a new composite team, ***they will need to submit their application in the usual manner to the league for consideration and, if successful, will re-enter the league at one division lower for the following season.***

Marian gave a brief outline as to why this had been proposed, it was intended to equalise the situation across all regions.

Questions were then taken from the floor:

Paul Farres (City of Portsmouth) asked what the corollary would be for an existing composite team, if they chose to split.

Alan Johnson (Trafford) gave an example of this from the Northern region, where the primary, or original, team remained in their current division and the other team dropped down.

David Little (Team Dorset) asked how this would affect promotion and relegation. Marian responded that the vacancy in the Premier division would be made up by another team being promoted in their place.

Andy Ward (Middlesbrough) asked what the situation is if a composite team already in a Premier division wanted to add a team to their number, Grace pointed out that this is already covered in the rules.

Alan Johnson (Trafford) seconded the proposal

Votes Against: 0

Abstentions: 0

The meeting voted unanimously in favour.

RULE 5: OFFICIALS

Add:

Rule 5.4.6 –

Clubs/Teams who consistently fail (for at least 50% of matches) to provide at least one level 2 field judge, plus one other qualified field judge and at least one track judge and/or one timekeeper; at YDL matches during the year of competition; will not be eligible for promotion, or to participate in Promotion Matches or Finals.

If officials do not sign in in the correct manner (see clarification in 5.4.4 above) they will be deemed to be unqualified.

All official's qualifications will be checked using the UKA licence checker:

<https://myathletics.uka.org.uk/licencecheckofficial/>

Marian gave a brief introduction to this proposal and then took questions from the floor. **Grace** had also received a comment that this rule would be a double jeopardy for officials. She also referred to the checking mechanism for all officials and suggested that clubs can also check their own.

David Little (Team Dorset) suggested that as all officials are checked at matches was it likely that any team would gain enough points to be promoted if they didn't provide enough officials. He was assured that there were cases where it had happened.

Lesley Nunn (Yate & District) suggested that the signing in sheets should be improved. **Alan Johnson, the results co-ordinator**, then explained that the updated software for 2020 would ask for officials to be declared in the same way as athletes and could then be checked earlier to avoid any duplication of effort and save time for results recorders. Officials could then easily be selected and replaced for each match. He also pointed out that the sheets can be printed from the software which will give names & URNs.

Kevin Thomas (Rotherham) pointed out that some officials were added on the day depending on who turned up and **Pat Childs (Leeds City)** asked about any extra officials who may sign in.

Alan replied that officials who were added at the match could be done in the same way as athletes so long as they were on the system, otherwise they would sign in as per previous years and be checked post-match. He also explained that there would be spaces for additional officials to sign in. The system would allow chief officials from host clubs to check in advance how many officials, and at what level, they could expect, and could then make adjustments in advance where necessary.

Annette Brown (Solihull & Small Heath) added that it had been extremely helpful this year for chiefs to be able to see in advance who was likely to turn up, however she did feel that the portal hadn't been available early enough. She also commented that at times there had

been some uncertainty with timekeepers and track judges as to how many of each discipline would be there, Marian pointed out that this was specific to Midlands clubs but should be sorted by the system of pairing teams. **Mark Exley (Northampton)** also commented that many teams had turned up with spare officials, so it had worked out at matches.

Stuart Nunn (Yate & District) pointed out that some officials signed in but then either turn up late and leave early, or in some cases don't turn up at all, Marian assured him that in circumstances she had been made aware of, the points hadn't been awarded, she further suggested that so long as chiefs sign the sheets to confirm that all those declared had worked, it would be followed up and, if necessary, any erroneous points removed.

Jen Field (Halesowen) thought it was unfair that clubs who provided extra officials couldn't be awarded extra points, and **Pat Childs (Leeds City)** asked what happened when officials turned up to work but were sent away. **Mark Exley (Northampton)** suggested that in circumstances where there were additional officials it would be a good opportunity for mentoring and training.

Clyde Gordon (Shaftesbury Barnet) asked whether this referred just to Double headers and if there should be a separate rule for them. It was confirmed that it was more prevalent in single matches.

Paul Baxter (City of York) seconded the proposal

Votes Against: 0

Abstentions: 1

The meeting voted overwhelmingly in favour.

RULE 6: NUMBERS

Rule 6.1 –

The League will supply competition numbers/letters for all competing clubs in quantities to last the whole season. They must be worn, front and back, in all events except High Jump and Pole Vault where one is permissible worn either on the front or back.

To be replaced with:

The League will supply competition numbers/letters for all competing clubs in quantities to last the whole season. They must be worn, front and back, in all events *except in Jumping Events* where one is permissible worn either on the front or back.

This rule was proposed to bring YDL rules into line with UKA rules.

Jo Davis (Swansea) seconded the proposal

Votes Against: 0

Abstentions: 0

The meeting voted unanimously in favour.

RULE 9: COMPETITION EVENTS

Rule 9.4 –

In throws and horizontal jumps, 3 trials are allowed in the Lower Age Group and 3 trials in the Upper Age Group, with a further 3 trials being offered to the top 3 athletes in the U20 competition and the top 3 athletes in the U17 competition subject to the requisite standard being achieved in the first 3 rounds (See Appendix 2).

To be replaced with:

In throws and horizontal jumps, 3 trials are allowed in the Lower Age Group and 3 trials in the Upper Age Group, with a further **1 trial** being offered to the top 3 athletes in the U20 competition and the top 3 athletes in the U17 competition subject to the requisite standard being achieved in the first 3 rounds (See Appendix 2).

Mike Harris (Trafford) suggested that the length of the timetable was part of a wider issue and shouldn't be a deciding actor. His club felt that this was discriminating against field athletes and thus unfair. He suggested that it would be preferable to look at the standards for progression to see if they should be tightened up.

Paul Baxter (City of York) concurred with Mike's statement and suggested that it may reduce the number of athletes competing. **Mark Exley (Northampton)** also agreed that it was likely that better athletes may not compete under these circumstances.

Norma Harris (Stevenage & North Herts) further added that this was one of the reasons they entered the league so that their throwers had a better competition. She suggested that host clubs try to utilise EDM more as this cuts down the time of throwing events, she added that the athletes welcomed EDM and enjoyed using it.

Paul Farrer (City of Portsmouth) felt that it went against the principles of development.

Clyde Gordon (Shaftesbury Barnet) wondered why the league were trying to pre-empt a potential rule from UKA about the length of the competition day.

Lesley Nunn (Yate & District) suggested that this proposal went against what was in the Administrator's report regarding development. She brought to the attention of the meeting a throws development day which had now been organised to directly clash with the league which would also have a detrimental effect on that league fixture and wondered why this had been planned in this way.

As no-one was willing to second this proposal, it was defeated.

At this point, Janice asked for a show of hands to indicate whether the delegates felt it worth updating the standards for progression. Most were in favour.

RULE 10: CANCELLATION OF MEETINGS/EVENTS

Rule 10.1.1 –

The host club will contact the Administrator who will contact the Area Co-ordinator as soon as an issue arises.

To be replaced with:

The host club will contact the **Area Co-ordinator** who will contact the **Administrator** as soon as an issue arises.

Rule 10.1.2 –

The Administrator will agree a course of action with the Area Co-ordinator.

To be replaced with:

The **Area Co-ordinator** will agree a course of action with the **Administrator**.

Clyde Gordon (Shaftesbury Barnet) seconded the proposal

Votes Against: 0

Abstentions: 0

The meeting voted unanimously in favour.

RULE 11: SCORING

Rule 11.9 –

In the event of a tied match score in the National Final or the Scottish Qualifier the greatest number of 'A' string first places will decide the finishing order. If this does not resolve the matter, then it will be decided on the greatest number of 'B' string first places. If still unresolved, then 'A' string second places, 'B' string second places and so on, until a decisive result is achieved

To be replaced with:

In the event of a tied match score in ***all finals and promotion matches*** the greatest number of 'A' string first places will decide the finishing order. If this does not resolve the matter, then it will be decided on the greatest number of 'B' string first places. If still unresolved, then 'A' string second places, 'B' string second places and so on, until a decisive result is achieved

Nick Corry (Blackheath & Bromley) seconded the proposal

Votes Against: 0

Abstentions: 0

The meeting voted unanimously in favour.

7 Constitutional amendments tabled by the management committee.

7.1 Proposed by the management group: In the interest of equality, the Management Group propose that the 16 instances in the Constitution, and 1 instance in the Rules where the words Chairman and Vice Chairman appear, shall be changed to Chair and Vice Chair.

Paul Allen (Kingdom Athletic) seconded the proposal

Votes Against: 0

Abstentions: 0

The meeting voted unanimously in favour.

8 **Also, in the interests of equality**, the management group proposes to equalise those U13 track events where athletes compete over the different distances that fall outside governing body rules.

Grace Hall outlined the background to this proposal; she had initially been approached by a parent of an U13 girl who wanted to know why we discriminated against U13 girls as her daughter wasn't allowed to run 1500m like the boys. She received a further 3 queries during the course of the season. This was brought to committee and agreed that she would investigate further. She contacted the governing body who replied that there should be equality between the genders. Over the course of the season, it became clear that it was becoming an issue of being the same as other leagues, rather than looking at it as an equality issue, however there are a number of other leagues who also use non-standard distances, so this is a flawed argument.

This proposal therefore is purely one of whether we equalise the events in question, and not the process of equalising.

Clyde Gordon (Shaftesbury Barnet) asked which event the initial query was about. Grace informed him that it was the 1200m. **Paul Austridge (Blackheath & Bromley)** then asked for if this proposal would also involve the sprints and hurdles, but it was confirmed that the hurdles distances are in the UKA rule book and fall outside this proposal. It was clarified that the events in question were 75m/100m; 150m/200m and 1200m/1500m.

Shaun Ainge (Cannock & Stafford) agreed that the U13 girls and boys should run the same distances in these events but that he didn't agree that the boys' events should be reduced to that of the girls.

Grace then informed that meeting of the research she had undertaken into this, she had consulted coaches from all levels up to national coaches. There had been strong arguments that U13s are not mini adults, they don't train as adults and shouldn't be expected to compete over Olympic distances, they should be coming into the sport essentially to have fun and by expecting them to compete as seniors do, we're not doing them much of a service. It appears that Athletics is one of the very few sports that doesn't differentiate between age groups in their respective events. She reiterated that this proposal was about the principle of equality and not about the actual distances, although she was happy to take a consensus at the end of the debate.

Mike Harris (Trafford) pointed out that the U13 girls' distances had been initially set in the Girls only league, and it was agreed that even up to 100m there was a degree of endurance involved which could result in young athletes doing too much training. He agreed that U13s should not be treated as adults and endorsed the opinions Grace had referred to. His feeling was that the boys should come down to the U13 girls' distances not the other way around.

Jen Field (Halesowen) commented that they do the same distances in Cross Country, although it was pointed out that wasn't always the case.

Grace stated that there is no uniformity across all competitions, but someone has to make the decision as to what is right, not necessarily what may be popular. She referred to the governing body's decision to amend the rules regarding U15 boys who originally competed over 400m until it was reduced to 300m. She felt that the governing body would not do something about the short sprints until someone made a stand. She had promised the parents who had initially sent the queries that she would bring the matter to the AGM to ascertain if the league wished to stop the discrimination that currently exists, then we will look at how we do this.

Jen then asked what would happen about the relays, but the Chair replied that these are primarily regarded as a fun event at the end of the competition. The Vice Chair then pointed out that at this age athletes rarely run hard into, or out of, the changeover and so they are not running hard over the full distance.

David Little (Team Dorset) felt that they all run the longer distances in other leagues so must be training for them already.

Janice Kaufman, in her capacity as a sprints coach, refuted this and stated that U13s would generally train for speed over 60m, which made 75m a very good event which suits their energy systems, and helps them when they move into the next age group and start to mature. 100m is endurance at this age, so let us be the innovators and let the athletes run over the shorter distances which suit them more.

Nick Corry (Blackheath & Bromley) asked why we were only looking at these events for U13s, as there were others, such as hurdles which were different, however Grace pointed out that these were covered by governing body rules and we could not control that.

Leslie Roy (Victoria Park Glasgow) commented that we should take this back to the governing body for consideration. She expressed some concern that there seemed to be some suggestions in the room that U13s should be training seriously, and not for enjoyment.

Lyn Orbell (Birchfield) also agreed that we should not be treating children as adults, and not necessarily bowing to parental influence, who may not be the best informed as to what is best for their children. She referred to the Po10 rankings which shows numerous examples of athletes who had been at the top during their younger years but aren't even in the sport any longer because they'd been pushed too hard.

Tim Soutar (Blackheath & Bromley) commented that if we're being asked to provide an answer to UKA's Equality & Diversity division maybe we should be suggesting to them that they should be referring this matter to Safeguarding; as a sport, we should be making children's development a priority, this is a serious question to be considered.

Paul Farrer (City of Portsmouth) felt that parents are often motivated by Power of 10 rankings, and it's this which is driving a lot of the parents' discontent, rather than the consideration of what is best for the athletes, so rules shouldn't be changed to suit them.

Grace had checked the rankings and compared the U13 girls' distances, there were a number of competitions offering 75m, 150m and 1200m. She believes from what she is hearing that we are expecting too much of the younger athletes.

Lesley Nunn (Yate & District) felt that we should bear in mind that U13 athletes includes children in year 6.

At this point Grace asked for a show of hands to gauge the opinion in the room, before going to a formal vote on the proposal tabled:

33 people voted in favour of reducing the boys' distances in line with the girls'

5 voted to increase the distances for the girls, to bring them in line with the boys

7 voted to leave it as it was.

Julian Starkey (Bracknell) seconded the tabled proposal

Votes against: 9

Abstentions: 2

The meeting voted substantially in favour of the motion.

Grace informed the meeting that she would continue her research before taking this to the next management meeting when a decision would be made as to what events would be on the timetable for U13 athletes.

9 **Election of management committee members for 2019-2021. Nominations received for: -**

General Committee **Leslie Roy**
Joyce Tomala

Election of General Committee member (to 2021).

(Casual Vacancy currently filled by Julian Starkey).

Nominations received for: **Julian Starkey**

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

Grace reminded the meeting that there is still at least one vacancy on the management group, she asked if anyone was interested in serving on the committee to please contact her to discuss it.

10 **The 2020 Annual General Meeting will take place on Saturday 21st November 2020.**

The AGM closed at 14:11.

The Chairman thanked everyone for their input to the meeting, and invited delegates to stay for the open discussion forum on the future of the league, which was due to commence after a short break.