

UK YOUTH DEVELOPMENT LEAGUE

Minutes of the 2015 Annual General Meeting

held at the Great Barr Hotel, Birmingham, on Saturday 21st November

Present: Norma Blaine MBE (President); Grace Hall (Chairman); Margaret Grayston (Vice Chairman); Lorraine Vidler (Finance Officer); Marian Williams (Administrator); plus the following members of the management committee: Malcolm Charlsh; Guy Ferguson; Stuart Hall; Bob Harvey; Alan Johnson; Leslie Roy; Joyce Tomala; Roger Simons (UKA representative); Terry Colton (UKA – to replace Roger Simons on YDL management group in 2016)

Plus: David Jeacock in attendance to advise on constitutional matters; Tony Shiret (EA National Council)

The following clubs were represented:

Northern region

UAG: City of Sheffield AC; Doncaster AC; Gateshead Harriers; Kingdom Athletic; Leeds City AC; Liverpool Harriers; Middlesbrough (Mandale); North Wales; Preston Harriers; Rotherham Harriers; Sale Harriers; Spenborough & District AC; Team Edinburgh; Team Forth Valley; Team Glasgow; Trafford AC; Wigan & District Harriers; Wirral AC

LAG: City of Sheffield AC; Doncaster AC; Gateshead Harriers; Leeds City AC; Liverpool Harriers; Middlesbrough (Mandale); Preston Harriers; Rotherham Harriers; Sale Harriers; Spenborough & District AC; Trafford AC; Wigan & District Harriers; Wirral AC; Wrexham AC

Midland region

UAG: Birchfield Harriers; Cannock & Stafford AC; Cheltenham & County Harriers; City of Stoke AC; Coventry Godiva Harriers; Derby AC; Hereford & County AC; Kidderminster & Stourport AC; Marshall Milton Keynes AC; Newport Harriers; Notts AC; Royal Sutton Coldfield AC; Rugby & Northampton AC; Solihull & Small Heath AC; South & East Wales; Swansea Harriers; Tamworth AC; Team Avon; Team DC; Tipton Harriers

LAG: Birchfield Harriers; Bristol & West AC/Mendip; Cannock & Stafford AC; Cheltenham & County Harriers; City of Stoke AC; Coventry Godiva Harriers; Cwmbran Harriers; Derby AC; Hereford & County AC; Kidderminster & Stourport AC; Marshall Milton Keynes AC; Newport Harriers; Notts AC; Royal Sutton Coldfield AC; Rugby & Northampton AC; Solihull & Small Heath AC; Swansea Harriers; Tamworth AC; Tipton Harriers; Yate & District AC

Scottish region

LAG: Dundee Hawkhill Harriers; Edinburgh AC; Pitreavie; Victoria Park Glasgow AC

Southern region

UAG: Bedford & County AC; Blackheath & Bromley Harriers & AC; Croydon AC; Havering AC; Shaftesbury Barnet Harriers; Team Norfolk; Victoria Park & Tower Hamlets AC; Windsor, Slough, Eton & Hounslow AC

LAG: Bedford & County AC; Blackheath & Bromley Harriers & AC; Bracknell AC; Croydon AC; Havering AC; Victoria Park & Tower Hamlets AC; Windsor, Slough, Eton & Hounslow AC

Apologies: Altrincham AC; Amber Valley & Erewash; Ayr Seaforth; Banbury Harriers; Bexley AC; Bournemouth, Poole & New Forest Juniors; Bromsgrove & Redditch AC; Cambridge Harriers; Cardiff AAC; Cardiff Archers; Charnwood AC; Chelmsford AC; Chesterfield & District AC; Colwyn Bay AAC; Daventry AC; Deeside AAC; Dudley & Stourbridge; East Cheshire Harriers & Tameside AC; East Dunbartonshire; Enfield & Haringey AC; Guildford & Godalming AC; Havant AC; Highgate Harriers; Horsham Blue Star Harriers; Invicta's Paddock; Isle of Man Youth; Lancaster & Morecombe AC; M60

Nomads; Macclesfield Harriers; Medway & Maidstone AC; Salford Metropolitan AC; South Lanarkshire; Southampton AC; St Mary's Richmond AC; Swindon Harriers; Team Bedfordshire; Team Oxfordshire; Walton AC; West Cheshire AC; West Wales; Winchester & District AC; Woking AC; Worksop Harriers; Yeovil Olympiads & Wells City Harriers

1. **Grace Hall, the chairman** welcomed everyone to the 2nd AGM of the UKYDL and introduced the management group and guests to the meeting. She explained that as time was likely to be a limiting factor that there would be a protocol for conducting the business at the meeting.

2. **Minutes of the 2014 AGM**

David Jeacock was added to the list of attendees, and the name for the delegate representing Team Isle of Man Youth was amended from Sharon Pryke to Cheryl Pryke, otherwise the minutes were deemed to be an accurate record, and their acceptance was proposed by **Arwel Williams (Liverpool AC)** and seconded by **Andy Parker (Preston Harriers)**.

For: 92; Abstentions: 2.

3. **Chairman's Report.**

Grace felt that in view of the long agenda and that all reports had been distributed prior to the meeting, she wasn't minded to read out her report but invited questions from the floor:

Tony Shiret (Chairman of EA Council) thanked all the volunteers for their work around the country, he then spoke in regard to the involvement of the EA national council, as in his opinion he felt that the report had some inaccuracies, he stated that EA council had got involved with YDL because of two issues – firstly as a request from some individuals on what they considered to be welfare issues, ie the distances travelled by athletes and the length of the competition day and secondly because he thought that YDL had asked for their involvement. There had been 3 conference calls; EA council had initiated a survey of English athletes in the Northern Premier divisions to ascertain their views and there had been attempts to put on a series of throws meetings, although ultimately these hadn't worked particularly well. They had put in a lot of hours in the consultation process and had tried to help and work with YDL. He welcomed the suggestion of a working group because clearly the YDL isn't working as it ought to at the moment and stated that EA council will continue to work with YDL if they chose to do so.

Geoff Morphitis (Shaftesbury Barnet Harriers) commented that the league records are interesting, but asked whether there was any comparisons between these YDL records and those from the two predecessor leagues. Grace Hall replied that she has the figures as they were prepared for last year's AGM but due to time restrictions she hasn't been able to update the document, and will try to get it done although the data was there should anyone wish to take this task on. She pointed out that some of the records will be hard to beat, but there is a pleasant upward trend.

Geoff then requested that the management committee produce a definitive statement regarding the overall aims and objectives of the league which should be at the start of the league constitution. Grace directed him to the constitution which does contain a statement about the objectives of the league, albeit a somewhat general statement. The working party will be looking at this amongst other things.

Steve Garrett (City of Sheffield AC) asked whether athletes could put their names forward for the WG. Grace affirmed that this was not a problem provided that they are over 16, and are aware of the time commitment, she also reminded the meeting that expressions of interest need to be sent to her by the end of November.

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 commented that the report had contained no reference to registration and how it would affect the league. Marian replied that the report reflected the 2014 – 2015 season and although the matter had been touched on, there are still ongoing discussions and nothing has yet been agreed about registration and how it related to our league she hadn't felt it appropriate to comment. Grace referred to the 2 meetings she had attended recently about this issue and the consensus was that we cannot at this stage facilitate it. Recording and checking registration would not be an acceptable option to host clubs and it would be too big a burden for the Administrator, whilst it has been trialled by some leagues, she felt that it was very unlikely that our member clubs would be happy to accept any changes at the moment. **Janice Kaufman (Gateshead Harriers)** queried how successful it had been when the Northern league had trialled it, as it had appeared to have been a heavy workload to administer. **Andy Parker (Preston Harriers)** confirmed that, as secretary of Division 1, there had been a lot of athletes to check and agreed that it would be too big a burden for YDL. **Arwel Williams (Liverpool Harriers)** suggested that if Power of 10 was linked to registration then the performances of non-members could simply be removed automatically. Grace stated that although it sounds straightforward, it is more complicated because the systems are not compatible, and there are so many variables. She felt that it would put an additional burden onto volunteers, which could ultimately mean we would lose their goodwill.

Roger Simons confirmed that details of the scheme are expected to be out by the end of the year.

5. Financial Report.

5.1 **Lorraine Vidler, the finance officer** introduced the financial report and responded to several questions that had been emailed in advance by **Geoff Morphitis**:

- *Have all clubs paid their subs for 2015? If not, how much is still outstanding / written off?* Lorraine confirmed that they had, although some were very late and had to be chased up.
- *Have UKA paid over the debt due to the YDL of £57505?* This arrived after the 30 September cut off, which is why it isn't showing on the accounts.
- *In the B/S it is stated that there's a Proposed Distribution to Areas and Clubs – what are the Areas?* Lorraine confirmed that Northern Ireland is classed as an area.
- *As regards the Final - Why is track hire up 9.6% on what was considered by all at last year's AGM as being an excessive cost?* The costs in this year's accounts include the Scotland and Northern Ireland Finals as well as the main national finals.
- *As regards the Final - What discount did we get for the failure at short notice to provide the agreed facilities?* **Joyce Tomala** confirmed that we secured an overall discount of 20% and a 50% reduction in the charges for radio hire. She also confirmed that we are currently looking at next year's finals with a view to reduce the costs still further.
- *As regards the Final - Why are officials expenses up 17.3% on what was considered by all at last year's AGM as being an excessive cost and when Clubs are required to bring officials with them in any event?* The officials for the Scottish and Northern Ireland finals are included. Clubs only bring one, or two, field judges which does reduce the costs a little.

- *As regards the Final – What are team expenses?* These are the payments to clubs for mileage to the finals.
- *As regards the Final – I see team expenses have been reduced by 67.3% or £5480, how was that achieved?* The mileage rate paid to attending clubs was reduced this year.
- *As regards the Final – It is stated in the report that the committee have reduced the costs of the final, while this is true by the total sum of £1614, this was only achieved by the reduction in team expenses.* The cost of the finals has been reduced but is distorted by the inclusion of the other two finals being included under this heading. (Joyce Tomala subsequently informed the meeting that the cost of the finals was £29 075.38 with an income of £2 854.36 this meant a gross outlay of £26 221.02 with £27 outstanding to pay. This represented a substantial reduction in the cost from last year.)
- *What are “League Match Costs”? If these are the costs that the YDL reimburse the Clubs, what % of the total costs are reimbursed and do we have an analysis?* League match costs refer to the general costs of running the league programme and includes items such as Handbooks, Programmes, Bib Numbers and, postage We don’t have an analysis of reimbursements to clubs at this time. Lorraine pointed out that only one third of the claims were received by the deadline, and so this was extended to 23 September and clubs were contacted to remind them to send in their claims. There were some problems with snail mail and missing claims.
- *What is the analysis between Track Hire and Mileage?* Lorraine stated that we will be looking at the comparison between hosting a match and travel costs and indicated that we will be asking clubs to include all their mileage and coach hire costs which will enable us to set up a model to adjust the figures. This year less than 20% of clubs put their mileage down. We do have some difficulties finding clubs to host fixtures and refunding a high % of the hire costs can incentivise the hosts. Geoff suggested that if Lorraine can produce an analysis of the breakdown of costs it would give us a baseline for moving forwards in 2017 and beyond.
- *Can we have an analysis of Administration Expenses given the increase of 28% from £20k to £25.6k.* Costs have risen because the league were without an Administrator for 3 months in 2014/15, the area co-ordinators were awarded a one off payment for undertaken extra work last year looking at restructuring the regions, and also the previous Chairman had declined to take her Administration expenses payment.
- *What is the contingency plan in the event that 2016 is the final year of the UKA grant?* There is a contingency of £75 000 to enable the league to continue for a further 2 years if no funding is secured. The accounts were late being sent out because UKA are currently carrying out an internal audit.

Clive Poyner (Team Norfolk) asked when we were likely to know what the financial situation will be in 2017. Grace replied that at the moment we do not know the answer to this, but it is something the working party will be looking at. She feels that it is likely that we will receive no funding so we need to look at a financial model that is sustainable from 2017 onwards.

5.2 **Steve Endacott (Team DC)** proposed that the accounts were adopted, **Doug Gunstone (Pitreavie)** seconded the motion.

The meeting voted unanimously in favour of adopting the accounts.

The **management group** proposed the following:

5.3 that subscriptions remain at £200 per team; seconded by **Joyce Tomala (South East Wales)**

- 5.4 repayments to host clubs are: 90% of track hire, 50% of First Aid costs; up to £100 for use of Photofinish and £50 for EDM; seconded by **Arwel Williams**. **Andy Parker** asked about reimbursement to clubs who owned their own P/f or EDM equipment, as they incurred maintenance costs. Lorraine confirmed that they would need to send in an invoice for hire charge with their claim.
- 5.5 1st 500 miles – no payment; any mileage over 500 miles @75p per mile; seconded by **Arwel Williams**.

Ken Goodger (Newport Harriers) asked if invoices could be emailed, it was confirmed that this was not a problem, but that all invoices must be readable.

All payments made by cheque must be made out to “YDL Athletics” as the bank is refusing to accept other references. A copy of the form will go onto the website with all necessary information about payment of registration fees which are due by the end of January.

Voting was unanimous for all proposals 5.3 to 5.5.

6. Resolutions.

- 6.1 **Pete Hancock (Preston Harriers)** spoke to the motion:

Proposed by Preston Harriers and supported by Blackburn Harriers & AC; Crewe & Nantwich AC; Liverpool Harriers & AC; St Helen's Sutton; Wirral AC

“We propose that the YDL Upper Northern Region Geographically be split into two: A Scottish Region and a North of England Region, with the structure matching that of the Lower YDL”.

Pete stated that this proposal had nothing to do with the reasons for building Hadrian's Wall, the hospitality they had received from the Scottish clubs was excellent and they had experienced some very good competitive matches in Scotland, and they had even suffered the unfairness of having three English matches and only one Scottish match when they should have been split equally.

He had considered withdrawing the motion when the survey had been published but upon further reading it had been clear that many of the English athletes thought that local matches could provide competition that was as good as that provided in the Premier 1 division, which he felt was probably correct.

He also stated that the Scottish athletes feel that they cannot get a similar level of competition locally and this too is probably correct.

The problem is that the English athletes don't travel and the numbers are down when matches are in Scotland, with all the English clubs being at least 15 athletes down, consequently the competition isn't as strong as in the English matches, furthermore those who do attend are being asked to double up in events which makes them even more reluctant to travel. The Scottish matches are not wanted by the English athletes, and suggested that Scottish athletes would also be more reluctant if they were from single clubs. He asked that delegates from the Southern and Midlands regions should seriously consider whether they should cast their vote on this matter so that the decision is made by Northern clubs only.

Arwel Williams (Liverpool Harriers) seconded the motion and made reference to the statistics produced by the league which showed that City of Sheffield had 62 athletes in Match 1 in Sheffield compared to 30 athletes in the 4th match in Glasgow, Sale had 59 in match 1 and 37 in match 4, while Preston had 51 and 37 athletes respectively. He also pointed out that a lot of athletes work at the weekend and are unwilling to give up the amount of time necessary to compete in a Scottish match.

Joyce Tomala responded by urging people to remember that the YDL is a national league, and as such offers different competition to local leagues. She pointed out that the situation is not unique to Northern clubs and exists in both the other regions.

The management group have set up a Hardship Fund to help offset the cost of overnight stays, which meant that clubs no longer had to be concerned over the financial impact and the issue over fixtures on Saturdays and in the build up to exams had been addressed by scheduling the early matches over Bank holiday weekends so no-one would be arriving home late with school the following day. The deadline for composite teams to be approved has now passed and so it isn't possible to reform different composites at this stage for 2016 so any attempt to form a Scottish region would be with just 4 teams, and that isn't viable.

Tony Shiret apologised for any distortion at the back of the room, and in particular at the distortion of the truth. He then spoke about the athlete's survey; he informed the meeting that EA council wanted to carry out a survey to ascertain the views of the athletes not the team managers, but he also felt that they needed to assess the impact on clubs not just the athletes. Travel and overnight stays are causing financial hardship, Gateshead have already pulled out of BAL and athletes are voting with their feet. City of Sheffield don't want to travel to Scotland, so this may well be irrelevant because nobody will want to travel to Scotland and they may end up being in a division on their own. He felt that Scottish teams also have a welfare issue, and this was one of the reasons EA council wanted to get involved because of the travel times and the length of the competition day.

He quoted the figures from the survey that 72% of English athletes say they are more likely to compete if the competition is local.

He then went on to describe the differences between the English and Scottish approaches to the survey. EA had sent it to all 950 athletes in both Premier divisions as well as the 2 clubs being promoted to Premier 2. Scotland had only distributed the survey to those clubs whose athletes were involved in travelling to England to compete. He disagreed that delegates from the Southern and Midland regions should abstain from voting, he has a son who competes and so, as a parent, he felt that all clubs should vote and take responsibility for athlete's welfare.

Norma Blaine (YDL President) asked how many members of EA Council attended matches, because she didn't feel that the problem is related to this motion but lack of numbers is a general problem and also a coaching issue, she quoted steeplechase as an example of this.

In response to the motion, **Paul Allen (Kingdom Athletic)** pointed out that statistics can be read very differently depending on the point you are trying to prove, and pointed to the fact that 60% had replied that travel distances didn't affect their decision to compete. In looking at the attendance figures he noted that Preston had only a few less athletes attending the match in Glasgow than at their own home match, and as they had finished last in every match of the season, travelling to Scotland had had no impact on their overall position, similarly with Sale who had consistently finished 5th in every match. In addition to this, given that the Glasgow match was the last of the season he also pointed out that numbers across the country were also down. He noted that apart from Liverpool and Preston, the supporters of this motion were actually clubs who aren't involved in any of the travel issues, so it would be difficult for their athletes to make an informed comment. He personally was delighted that City of Sheffield had qualified for the national final and that their athletes had embraced the league so enthusiastically.

Clive Poyner asked if there was any data available showing how far clubs travelled; as his club had travelled a significant distance over the course of the year, it was stated that this information wasn't to hand. **Doug Gunstone** stated that they had travelled over 1800 miles this year.

Sue Ramsey (City of Sheffield) informed the meeting that she had been advised that their club had had to pay out over £3 000 to participate in the Glasgow match in July (this was refuted as the figures submitted by Sheffield totalled just over £2 000 with over £1 100 being repaid by the Hardship Fund). She further stated that the return journey had arrived back very late at night on this occasion.

Lyn Orbell (Birchfield Harriers) asked which teams had been involved in the survey, and were they athletes who had competed in the YDL. **Tony Shiret** replied that all teams in both premier divisions plus the two teams who had gained promotion to Premier 2, and that it had included the older U15s who would be in the UAG next year. He stressed that EA Council wanted to survey the athletes not the clubs. There was some confusion expressed from the floor as to why the survey involved athletes who weren't involved with any of the travel to Scotland.

Steve Garrett (City of Sheffield) pointed out that they are not a rural, remote club and have a number of other clubs closer to them than Scotland so they don't feel they should have to travel long distances for competitions.

Janice Kaufman informed the meeting that while Edinburgh is closer, it takes longer to get there than going to Sheffield. She also felt that although Scottish athletes argued that they needed to come South for the better competition, they had actually won 63% of the events so were much stronger than the English teams. If the Scottish teams were in a separate division then they would be guaranteed to have a team in the national final.

Moir Maguire (Team Edinburgh) referred to comments made about composite teams being too large, in their composite they have 8 additional athletes from the other 2 clubs who would otherwise be unable to compete in this league. She also stated that travelling to good quality competition is important in athlete development, particularly for those with international aspirations, as this will certainly be necessary for these athletes, and the YDL does provide an opportunity for them to experience it and understand some of the problems they will come across in their athletics career.

Leslie Roy (Victoria Park Glasgow) suggested that the places in the National final should be earned and not an automatic right as suggested by Janice. She pointed out that there are a number of clubs making long journeys and, as suggested in last year's AGM, teams in Premier divisions should be prepared to travel further to get the better competition. She then suggested that we should possibly look at holding fixtures at central locations rather than being held in extremities, it may be time to start thinking outside the box. She expressed disappointment that EA Council had only surveyed clubs in the Northern region, ignoring clubs in similar situations in other regions.

Marian Williams then gave more details of the Hardship Fund and how the figures had been calculated. Of those who claimed, all clubs who had an overnight stay had been awarded £30 per athlete and official, the only exception to this was Isle of Man who had more specific problems with their journeys, and calculations were made on the number of flights booked.

Guy Ferguson (Nottingham AC) then spoke about the Midlands, pointing out that despite dividing the region into North/East and South/West last year to try to cut down the travel, the number of athletes participating had not changed which suggested that travel isn't the deciding factor. He also reinforced the point previously made that when comparing the number of athletes in match 1 to those in match 4 from all divisions, there was a drop in numbers across the board so there are other factors which distort the numbers.

Pete Hancock was then invited to sum up on behalf of Preston. Whilst he was sympathetic towards the teams in Norfolk and Cornwall, he felt that their problems may be insurmountable

whereas Preston feel that they have put forward a solution for the teams in the Northern region. There is already a Scottish region in the lower age group, which should be continued in the upper age group. He felt that this motion fitted the brief of a national league – a Scottish national league and an English national league.

The meeting then voted on the proposal

For: 27 Against: 43 Abstentions: 23

The motion was therefore defeated, however the Chairman stated that the working party would be looking at this matter.

6.2 **Proposed by Cannock & Stafford** and supported by Cardiff AAC; Marshall Milton Keynes AC; Swansea Harriers AC; Team Avon; Telford AC

“We propose that in the Upper Age Group each team is allowed up to 4 guests per gender (of either age group) per meeting. These may be used in any track events (eg two female athletes could guest in the 100m, one in the 200m and one in the 1500m)”.

Initially **Shaun Ainge** stated that Cannock & Stafford were happy to accept the management amendment and withdraw their proposal, but suggested that non-scorers should only be allowed 3 trials. Grace clarified the wording in the proposal and explained that the term ‘guests’ should actually be referred to as ‘non-scorers’ and must be members of the club they are declared for. David Jeacock confirmed that this substitution was acceptable, although there was nothing in either motion regarding the number of trials; Stuart Hall pointed out that it was standard practice that guests or non-scorers are limited to 3 trials. **Lesley Nunn (Yate & District)** argued that the supporting clubs would want the matter to be debated fully so the proposal was not withdrawn.

6.2.1 **The Management Group propose** the following amendment to this proposal:

“We propose that in the Upper Age Group each team is allowed up to 4 guests per gender (of either age group) per meeting. They may be entered for any event subject to the consent of the host club, in consultation with the relevant referee. The introduction of such guests shall not increase the length of the competition day, and so must be declared on the relevant declaration form, at least 48 hours in advance of the meeting to allow the host club to ascertain that there is sufficient space available.”

The amendment to the proposal was then introduced by **Marian Williams**. She stated that the original proposal once again favoured track athletes, who already had the advantage of having an additional scoring athlete in the U17 age group, and as many clubs had requested that non scoring places should be made available to field athletes the management committee felt that the proposal should be extended to cover both track and field with the proviso that the competition day must not be lengthened. The statistics show that for the vast majority of divisions, other than Premier divisions in Southern and Northern regions, this would present no problem as very few of the fields events were full and additional athletes could be accommodated within the existing timetable.

Jack Frost (Sale Harriers) felt that having to declare non scoring athletes 48 hours was unworkable since many team managers wouldn’t know who was in the team that far ahead. **Lesley Nunn** complained that every time a proposal was submitted for the AGM the management committee tried to amend it to suit themselves. Marian assured her that this was not the case, the amendment was submitted in response to the many complaints received that field athletes weren’t treated equally. In response to the comments about teams not being known in advance

Grace urged everyone to consider the difficulties recorders had to deal with when teams were not sent in advance, and stated that some team managers treated match recorders very badly and paid no heed to the problems they endured. **Geoff Morphitis** expressed his surprise that teams aren't declared in advance, but felt that 48 hours was not sufficient notice to give to a possible non scoring athlete as to whether or not they could compete. He suggested that it wouldn't work in the Premier divisions but may be something to bring in for the lower divisions. He felt that we shouldn't be asking host clubs to take on the extra responsibility of deciding whether non scorers would be allowed.

A number of people asked for clarification about the numbers, did the proposal intend for 4 additional non scoring athletes or was it for 4 additional non scoring places? It was confirmed that it was for 4 additional performances which may be from the same athlete or a number of different ones.

Voting on the amendment then took place:

F: 26 Ag: 60 Ab: 4

The amendment was thus defeated and voting then took place on the original proposal from Cannock & Stafford:

F: 47 Ag: 29 Ab: 12

The motion was carried

6.3 Proposed by the Management Group

"We propose that Rule 11.1 With the exception of the U17 field events, where the competition is limited to a single string, 2 competitors per team shall be permitted and both will score.

be amended to:

11.1 In all field events, 3 competitors per team shall be permitted, all of whom will score. If there are two U17 competitors, then both shall compete in the U17 age group, if there are three U17 competitors then one shall compete in the U20 age group and two shall compete in the U17 age group."

Guy Ferguson spoke on behalf of the management committee. He pointed out that the current rules allow for 2 athletes in both U20 and U17 in track events, in field event U17s were only allowed one competitor which is iniquitous and given that most clubs have insufficient U20 athletes it invariably resulted in U17s competing up an age group using the heavier implements. This proposal was discussed in area meetings last year but had missed the boat as far as being voted in as a proposal, so the management group had submitted it this year as it had been well received in the discussions. We are aware that there will be a possibility for team managers to cynically manipulate the declarations to score more team points but our priority was to look after the needs of the athletes.

A number of clubs spoke in favour of the motion, **Moir Maguire, Janice Kaufman, Peter Hancock, Fiona Smith (Royal Sutton Coldfield), Ken Goodger and Mark Exley (Rugby & Northampton AC)** commenting that this was a good proposal and was going to benefit the athletes and the possibility of team managers seeking to manipulate the scores should not detract from this. Janice and Peter suggested alternative scoring methods, but it would complicate scoring further, Fiona wondered whether we couldn't use the international scoring tables but it was pointed out that there isn't a results programmes able to do this at the moment.

Hilary Nash (Bristol & West/Mendip) asked for clarification on the scoring, given that there would be variable numbers in the B string events.

Brian Eggleton (City of Stoke) asked how the additional trials would be worked out, Janice suggested that if the proposal was accepted then the management group should then address the issue of additional trials.

Mark Exley (Rugby & Northampton AC) stated that there must not be an assumption that the B athlete would necessarily be competing just to make up the numbers, but could quite possibly be the second best competitor in the whole competition, he also requested clarification as to whether the B athlete would have to compete within their own age group, or whether they would be able to choose. It was confirmed that they would compete in their own age group.

The voting for the proposal was overwhelmingly in favour.

- 6.4 **The Management Group** proposed a number of changes to the competition rulebook, and bearing in mind the limited amount of time available for discussion Grace asked the meeting if they would be happy voting each section in as a block as many of the changes were simply to clarify or simplify the wording. The delegates agreed that this was acceptable.

1. GENERAL

- 1.3** 'All clubs/teams must affiliate to their National Association and their athletes must be members of their club as set out in Rule 3 of UKA 2014 rulebook.'

To be amended to:

- 1.3** *All clubs/teams must affiliate to their National Association and their athletes must be members of their club as set out in **the current UKA rulebook.***

- 1.6.2** 'All relay teams must compete in the same colour vests'

To be amended to:

- 1.6.2** *All relay teams must compete in the same **club/team colours, as per UKA rules.***

- 1.15** 'Any other complaint should be made in writing on club headed notepaper to the League Chairman and signed by 2 principal officers of the club; this complaint will be taken as indication that the club management is in agreement and the necessary action/investigation will be carried out as deemed appropriate'.

To be amended to:

- 1.15** *Any other complaint should be made in writing on club headed notepaper to the League Chairman and signed by 2 principal officers of the club **within 2 weeks of the incident;** this complaint will be taken as indication that the club management is in agreement and the necessary action/investigation will be carried out as deemed appropriate.*

- 1.16** 'Video recordings made at any League meeting shall not be accepted as evidence in any dispute raised with officials or referees at that meeting.'

To be amended to:

- 1.16** *Video recordings **and/or photographic evidence** made at any League meeting shall not be accepted as evidence in any dispute raised with officials or referees at that meeting.*

Voting was in favour of these changes.

2. RESPONSIBILITIES OF HOST CLUBS

The host club is the meeting organiser as shown in the League programme.

ADD:

The league will provide a detailed guide to hosting which will be made available to all host clubs.

- 2.7** 'On the evening of the fixture, the host club shall send the match and all individual results to the League Administrator; League Area Co-ordinator, Athletics Weekly and the League Webmaster preferably by email.'

Insert 'Power of 10', and delete the word 'preferably' thus to be amended to:

- 2.7** *On the evening of the fixture, the host club shall send the match and all individual results to the League Administrator; League Area Co-ordinator, **Power of 10**, Athletics Weekly and the League Webmaster by email.*

- 2.9** Corrections to published results should be sent to the League Administrator.

ADD: 'within 2 weeks of the fixture taking place' thus to be amended to

- 2.9** *Corrections to published results should be sent to the League Administrator **within 2 weeks of the fixture taking place.***

Voting was in favour of these changes

3. ELIGIBILITY OF ATHLETES

- 3.1.1.** 'Competitors can be either first claim members of their club or second claim (2nd claim) members whose first claim club is not a member of the League. Clubs are limited to 4 male and 4 female second-claim athletes (for clarification, this refers to the number of second claim athletes per match)'

To be amended to:

- 3.1.1.** Competitors can be either first claim members of their club or second claim (2nd claim) members whose first claim club is not a member of the League. Clubs are limited to 4 male and 4 female second-claim athletes per match

Voting was in favour of this change

4. COMPOSITE TEAMS

- 4.1.2** Composite teams gaining promotion to a Premier division may not increase the number of teams in their composition or change the teams in the composition.

- 4.1.3** Existing Premier division teams cannot increase the number of clubs in their composition in subsequent seasons.

Both rules to be combined and amended to:

- 4.1.2** **Composite teams in Premier divisions, including those gaining promotion to a Premier division, may not increase the number of, or substitute any of, the teams in the composition.**

Geoff Morphitis queried whether this rule meant that a Premier division team could never increase the teams in the composition. Marian replied that if they wished to do so they would have to come down into a lower division to amend the composition of their team. **Ken Goodger** pointed out that the rule already exists, this proposal is just to simplify the current rule.

Voting was in favour of this change

5. OFFICIALS

5.4.1 'Each club, including the host club, shall provide one Track Judge, one Timekeeper and a team of five Field Judges. One of the Field Judges must be graded at Level 2b or above with Health and Safety certification. For the host club these are in addition to the officials in 5.3.1, 5.3.2 and 5.3.3 above.'

To be amended to

5.4.1 *Each club, including the host club, shall provide one Track Judge, one Timekeeper and a team of five Field Judges. One of the Field Judges must be graded at Level 2b (or equivalent) or above with Health and Safety certification. For the host club these are in addition to the officials in 5.3.1, 5.3.2 and 5.3.3 above. **All Judges should be available to officiate throughout the meeting. Field judges should be available to assist in additional events as required by the Field Referee.***

Hilary Nash commented that as teams know their commitment in advance, it wouldn't be easy to impose on officials to be available for a full day, some are not fully committed officials but just wish to support their team, and fulfil their obligations only.

Andy Ward (Middlesbrough) and Roger Simons pointed out that the rule doesn't make it mandatory, it only says that they should be available.

Leslie Roy pointed out that the sport desperately needs officials and we need to be using league meetings to try and bring more into the sport and help them to move up to a higher grade.

Jack Frost (Sale Harriers) thought that asking all judges to be available all day wasn't reasonable, **Geoff Morphitis** also suggested that where there are long gaps between events it is unreasonable to expect officials to hang around all day in case they are needed to help out.

Arwel Williams proposed that the removal of the sentence "All judges should be available to officiate throughout the meeting". Seconded by **Ken Goodger**

The meeting voted in favour of accepting the new proposal to become the substantive motion:

5.4.1 *Each club, including the host club, shall provide one Track Judge, one Timekeeper and a team of five Field Judges. One of the Field Judges must be graded at Level 2b (or equivalent) or above with Health and Safety certification. For the host club these are in addition to the officials in 5.3.1, 5.3.2 and 5.3.3 above. **Field judges should be available to assist in additional events as required by the Field Referee.***

Voting was in favour of this amendment with just 2 abstentions.

ADD IN

5.4.2 Competing athletes may not also be judges, until such time as their competition events have been completed.

After some debate about this, where it was pointed out that an athlete may only be competing in a 4 x 400m relay but would therefore be available for the majority of the day. **Lorraine Vidler** proposed that this was amended to:

5.4.2 Competing athletes may not compete and judge at the same time.

It was pointed out that Judges should be over 16 to be covered by insurance.

Voting was in favour of this amendment.

5.4.3. (New) Five (5) match points will be credited for each official provided up to a maximum of 35 points

To be amended to:

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 2B (or equivalent) field official, reducing the points to 30 maximum.*

There was a discussion about the difficulties some clubs have in providing a level 2B official. **Hilary Nash** suggested that to lose 25 points for not providing a level 2B field judge was a disincentive for clubs who can provide 7 officials but not including a level 2B. This view was supported by **Terry Winmill (Doncaster)**. It was re-iterated that the league is a development league for officials as well as athletes and we do need to try and recruit and retain officials. **Barry Parker (Derby AC)** stated that a 2B is only essential for the long throws so clubs shouldn't be penalised if they don't have a 2B field judge if they are not covering those events. Our rules however do state that clubs must provide a level 2B field judge and points have been deducted for not doing so. **Pat Childs (Leeds AC)** said that they had been trying to encourage their officials to submit the paperwork for regrading from 2A to 2B, but there had been complaints that the paperwork was putting people off. **Tony Shiret** informed the meeting that there is a review of officials' strategy currently taking place. **Roger Simons** suggested that he and Arwel should take the views to TAG. **Arwel Williams** pointed out that it isn't too difficult to achieve a 2B and the paperwork isn't too onerous. **Andy Parker (Preston Harriers)** disagreed with this and pointed out that it takes a few hours to complete, he also thought that the responsibility of checking that officials were working lay with the meeting manager, **Leo Carroll (Wirral AC)** reminded everyone that the current rules state that all teams must provide a level 2B field judge.

The motion was then put to the meeting for a vote:

For: 42 Against: 35 Abstentions: 2

6. NUMBERS

6.3 'Clubs must supply safety pins for their own athletes.'

To be amended to:

6.3 *Clubs must supply safety pins, **or similar**, for their own athletes.*

Voting was in favour of this change.

7. DECLARATIONS

7.1. 'Declaration sheets are obtainable on the website and should be sent, where possible, by email to the host club 24 hours before the start of the meeting.'

Delete 'where possible', and insert 'at least' thus to be amended to:

7.1 *Declaration sheets are obtainable on the website and should be sent by email to the host club **at least 24 hours** before the start of the meeting.*

DELETE rule 7.1.1 If email is not available, manual declarations must be deposited 30 minutes before the start of the meeting. Manual sheets are obtainable from the website, or the League Administrator.

Voting was in favour of this change.

Hilary Nash asked why the rules aren't asking that declarations be sent in Results Box format. Grace replied that although it was preferable because it reduced the workload of the recorder significantly, some team managers use an Apple Mac and the results box doesn't work in this format.

7.5 'In the event of an athlete competing without having been declared correctly on the official sheet, all points gained will be deducted.'

Delete 'on the official sheet' and further amend to:

7.5 *In the event of an athlete competing without having been declared correctly, **points will be deducted in accordance with the table in rule 11.5.***

Item 11.5 was brought forward to be discussed in conjunction with this proposal:

11. SCORING

11.5 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 amended to

11.5 *Should any athlete exceed their event restrictions as laid out in Appendix 1, points will be **deducted in accordance with the Table below.***

Athletes declared incorrectly, or not at all, in events	5 points deducted
2 x U17 athletes competing in U20 track events	5 points deducted
An athlete exceeding their event restriction as specified in Appendix 1	10 points deducted

Marian informed the meeting that this item had been proposed to simplify the current system which is an administrative headache for both recorders and for herself when checking the results

for accuracy. She confirmed that guest events are included in the total in response to **Andy Ward's** question.

There was some debate as to the number of points athletes would be deducted if their 'extra' event(s) included a relay. Marian confirmed that at present athletes who exceed their quota of events are deducted the points from all events that they compete in after their allowed number of events, plus their highest scoring event. If this includes a relay then those points are deducted. Some delegates were concerned that 10 points wasn't a sufficient penalty. **Stuart Hall** asked if an amendment could be made to the proposal such that the points deducted would be 10 for every event over the restricted number. **David Jeacock** said that this would be a substantial change and couldn't therefore be amended at this meeting.

Given the confusion about the points' deductions, the proposals 7.5 and 11.5 were withdrawn.

10. CANCELLATION OF MEETINGS/EVENTS

10.2 Points will not be awarded for any individual event (or relay) cancelled or not held.

To be amended to:

10.2 *Points will not be awarded for any individual event (or relay) cancelled prior to the day of the fixture.*

ADD

10.3.4 **Points for any events cancelled on the day of the meeting will be awarded according to the declarations at the start of the meeting. Athletes scoring points will be deemed to have competed and the event will count as part of their maximum number of events.**

Voting was in favour of this change.

7 To consider the following amendments to the constitution.

Proposed by the Management Group

11. BUSINESS OF GENERAL MEETINGS

11.1.5. To consider and if thought fit to approve any Resolutions concerning the Constitution and The Competition Rules provided that no proposal to amend the Constitution shall be brought forward earlier than the Annual General Meeting in 2014 without the prior approval of the management group.

Delete the wording "..... provided that no proposal to amend the Constitution shall be brought forward earlier than the Annual General Meeting in 2014 without the prior approval of the management group." Thus to be amended to:

11.1.5. To consider and if thought fit to approve any Resolutions concerning the Constitution and The Competition Rules.

Voting was in favour of this constitutional change.

ADD IN

11.4 *Any proposal rejected at an AGM in any year, may not be re-presented in the same or similar format to a general meeting within a 26 month period.*

Renumber 11.4 onwards as 11.5 onwards.

ITEM 11.4 was withdrawn by the management committee

15. MANAGEMENT GROUP

Composition:

15.2.2 Up to ten other people elected at the Annual General Meeting in accordance with paragraph 11.1.7 to include Area Coordinators, Website Manager, Welfare Officer, Rules & Officials Coordinators.

To be amended to:

15.2.2 **Up to eight other people elected at the Annual General Meeting in accordance with paragraph 11.1.7 to include Area Coordinators, Website Manager, Welfare Officer, Rules & Officials Coordinators.**

Voting was in favour of this constitutional change.

8. The 2016 Annual General Meeting will take place on 19 November 2016.

The meeting closed at 16:04 and the Chairman wished everyone a safe journey home.



Youth Development League AGM 2015.

Chairman's Report.

Good afternoon everyone and welcome to the UK YDL AGM.

I will start by congratulating the winners from this year's National Finals weekend, which saw Edinburgh AC crowned lower age group champions, and Windsor Slough Eton & Hounslow upper age champions. The upper age group match also gave us Shaftesbury Barnet Harriers men and Blackheath and Bromley Harriers and AC women taking the gender split titles, and they have now been nominated to UKA as the 2016 representatives for the European Junior Clubs Cup competition. The 2015 European competition took place in September and Shaftesbury Barnet Harriers were 3rd in the men's competition and Blackheath & Bromley Harriers & AC also 3rd in the women's competition. Congratulations to all the teams for their successes this year.

As ever 2015 has seen many ups and downs and some of our statistics are a pleasure to read, others not so. But I was very encouraged to see that 37 of the 50 competing athletes in this year's European Junior Championships had come through YDL, with a number of them currently holding the YDL age group records. Which leads me onto the league records, and happily our records are still on an upward trend. Thirty seven events have been bettered this season, some of them more than once, with 16 male and 21 female events, along with a number of equalled records. This information can be found on the league's web site in the documents section, well done to all the athletes who can now see their name on that listing.

As we have now been in existence for three seasons, I feel it is time to try and move forward. There have been numerous suggestions for improvements received from various bodies, including member clubs and the England Athletics National Council, but these have been inconsistent and take no account of the overall aims of the league.

We are a development league with the objective of fostering and promoting athletics for young athletes, and even though UKA currently has a Competition Strategy Group considering possible improvements which will include league competition, we need to start to think about this ourselves.

I am therefore advising you that I will be establishing a working party, consisting of representatives of members of the League, to conduct an overall review of the current league structure and rules with a view to identifying where improvements to the current position might usefully be made. The ultimate aim is to have a proposal for the 2016 AGM, leading to a sustainable league.

I hope that you, the member clubs representatives, will be fully supportive of this, and if so I would like to receive expressions of interest from members who are willing to become part of the working party by the end of November. I must stress however that this will be a significant commitment, but if you are interested, please contact me, grace@ukydl.org.uk





Marian has already mentioned the divisional results recorders in her report, but I also want to say thank you to them, they made my life a little easier this summer as well. I would like to see this initiative carry on into 2016, especially as there is a chance there may changes to the rules regarding registration of athletes in 2016. This may impact on host clubs recorders having to do even more work and volunteers have enough to do without any further burdens.

As usual we must not forget the many clubs and athletes who compete and never progress to national finals. Some of those win their respective divisional titles, gain promotion, while other are relegated, and to all those athletes and clubs, thank you for taking part, and to ensure you receive some recognition, we are awarding Divisional Winners trophies before the AGM starts, your participation is being rewarded.

Finally, once more, a big thank you to all the officials and volunteers who have made it possible for our matches to take place and to the management committee members who have worked so hard during my first year as Chairman.

Grace Hall.



scottishathletics



Administrator's Annual Report to the AGM November 2015

(For documents referenced in this report, please see accompanying paperwork)

I would like to start my report by summing up what I feel the league is all about. This may be at variance with what you the constituent members think, but it is a starting point for possible dialogue, and it sums up what has been the focus of my job for the past year.

I believe that our primary aim has got to be about providing competition opportunities for athletes that are pitched at an appropriate level for their abilities; and, as our name implies, we are about helping the development of those athletes, and officials, in order to achieve their potential. Sounds simple enough, but we all know that nothing is ever that straightforward – we are dealing with young people with a wide range of experiences, difficulties and expectations, not to mention those of their parents, coaches and team managers.

As ever, much of my time from January to August is taken up with fixtures, making sure clubs have all the necessary paperwork to help them with their home matches, and along with area co-ordinators, helping to make sure that all clubs have a support network to help with last minute problems as they occur. Naturally a lot of time is taken up by results: receiving them, checking them, amending them and liaising with clubs who have transgressed the rules, and dealing with athletes, parents, coaches and team managers who want changes made to the results. My Inbox every day is full to overflowing – so much for computers making life easier, whatever did we do before the internet?

I've been very fortunate this year to have had 8 volunteers come forward to work as divisional recorders, and I would like to express my sincere thanks for all their hard work and effort. On the whole I think it's worked well, obviously there have been teething problems but I know that it has streamlined the results process in those divisions; the recorders got to know the team managers and athletes and the teams have got to know the recorders, as the season progressed they knew what was expected of them in every match, there was a consistency of expectations and a mutual dependency was established. The big bonus for me was that it took some of the pressure off me over checking the results and dealing with amendments. It was more successful in the North, and to some extent the Midlands but unfortunately we couldn't find anyone in the Southern region to take on the role.

Altogether this season, of the 84 fixtures scheduled in the UAG, 83 went ahead despite the appalling weather on the last match day; of the 110 matches in the LAG, 108 were completed. That's an awful lot of data to check through, and I would like to express my thanks to all the volunteers who, sometimes under very difficult circumstances, managed to get through relatively unscathed and produce the results quickly and efficiently. One more person who has worked tirelessly in this process is our Chairman, Grace, who is also our results co-ordinator, and I am very appreciative of the many, many hours she puts into helping both me and our host clubs into getting the results sorted.



One change we introduced to the UAG this year was to hold the first two fixtures on a Saturday. This was in response to requests from some clubs to avoid the late night returns on a Sunday during the build up to the external exams and we felt we owed it to those athletes to give it a try and see if the initiative was successful. It met with a very mixed response – some were certain that it would prevent their athletes from competing because of Saturday jobs, others were equally convinced that it would benefit their athletes. Our questionnaire sent out after match 2 produced some interesting results - although there was no overwhelming strength of feeling one way or the other, there were more clubs in favour of holding all UAG fixtures on a Sunday which is what we have reverted to this year.

This year we re-organised the Midlands clubs into 2 parallel sections broadly based on the North/East and the South/West. On some levels it has worked very well, with journey times for a number of clubs, reducing significantly, but there is a trade off, and the stats show quite clearly that the participation levels and standard of competition especially in the Premier divisions has been reduced. (Ref 1 Percentage of events covered) Ironically most of the negative comments I've received have been from the very clubs who were most instrumental in pushing for the re-organisation. Maybe the grass isn't always greener on the other side of the fence!

We also took the time to look at the Southern non premier divisions and tried to re-organise them along geographical boundaries, we have achieved some success but there are always going to be winners and losers in these situations. We have introduced more 7 & 8 team divisions to boost the standard of competition, and also to take some of the pressure off officials. We received many more positive comments than negative ones, so it can't be all bad.

In the North, we already had a clear geographical split in the non-premier divisions, this has presented some problems in the Eastern divisions with just 5 teams competing in each of them, ideally we would prefer 6 as a minimum but given the low numbers of available athletes in some clubs 7 or 8 teams in the lower divisions makes for a much better competition. We have really struggled to find a solution to the travel situation in the Premier divisions, given that we need to offer athletes the best competition opportunities, and also to ensure that we're not replicating what already exists. We have also been under pressure to break the Northern region into smaller, more localised divisions, but that flies directly in the face of the above. Roger Simons talked directly to a number of athletes and team managers at one of the Northern Premier 1 matches, and EA, together with SA, carried out a survey to get the athletes' views. The results of this are on our website, but there was no clear mandate for change from the athletes, with the majority stating that the journey time and the possibility of an overnight stay were not factors in their decision to compete (Ref 2 – Survey results). It is also clear that creating 3 Premier divisions based on geography would reduce the level of competition for our top athletes significantly, so how would that be in their best interests?

We set up the Hardship Fund earlier this year and this has gone a long way towards alleviating the financial pressure, and it has to be said that this is not just an issue for the Northern Premier 1 clubs - when you look at the costs incurred by the Isle of Man LAG team to bring their athletes over to the mainland, you begin to realise how much some teams value the opportunity to compete in a national league. All teams had the opportunity to apply to the Hardship Fund, but we had to apply the criteria quite strictly and look at where it was needed the most.





We are very conscious that in the UAG the participation levels are not great in some events and we've received data from a number of sources – Rob Whittingham who has provided us with accurate figures on the number of U17 and U20 athletes competing in the league; Mick Bromilow who has given us data on journey times and distances and Guy Ferguson, one of our committee members, has done a lot of work to produce statistics on participation levels in the UAG, event by event. This doesn't mean we are being complacent about the UAG, far from it, but at the moment we accept that there are more immediate issues to be resolved in the UAG. We are all passionate about trying to do what is best for the sport of athletics, but trying to marry up all the divergent views as to how we can achieve this feels, at times, as if we're trying to plait jam.

I'd now like to draw your attention to some of the findings, all of which have been published on the website:

With regard to participation – whilst the Premier divisions hold up relatively well, the same cannot be said about the lower divisions with 6 divisions covering less than 30% of all events contested ([Ref 3 – number of U17 & U20 athletes by club](#)). One of the main reasons for this is that most clubs simply do not have sufficient number of athletes to cover all the scoring places, exacerbated by having to find four athletes in every track event, it is especially acute in the U20 age group where some clubs have less than ten U20 athletes in total. When we increased the number of track athletes to four, two years ago, we really did most clubs no favours, even our largest clubs struggle to find the 32 athletes needed to fill the longer track events. The breakdown of the number of U17 and U20 athletes is also on the website.

When we look at the individual events, ([Ref 4 – Participation stats by event](#)) Guy Ferguson has ranked them all in order of popularity and again you can see that, apart from Pole Vault, the least popular events are track events, specifically the technical events such as Hurdles and Steeplechase with 3000m and 1500m not faring too well either. I would contend that this is also about the number of athletes required to fill these events, and suggest that some action is needed to make them more dynamic. It is a misconception to think that the throws are not well supported as the statistics show, with SP, JT and DT holding up quite well although there are dips in some lower divisions and the Midlands figures are generally lower than the other regions. I suggest that we should not be making the throws the 'fall guys' in our programme, and we should not be implying that they are less important than other event specialists. The need to develop throwers is no less necessary than the need to develop jumpers, sprinters and hurdlers for example, so as a development league we should not be offering less opportunities to compete, without a valid alternative in place. No-one is denying that the timetable, in the Premier divisions particularly, leads to a long day, we're not averse to looking at ways of reducing it but no-one has yet come up with an alternative that suits. If we all had 8 lane tracks with an outside cage, it would be simpler, but we don't and with stadia coming under increasing pressure from local authorities and trusts it's unlikely that will change.

One of our rules in the constitution talks about a team 'failing to reach the minimum level of participation' – how do we quantify this? Should the teams who have contested less than 10% of





the events across the season be competing in this league? Should we encourage them to form a composite with another club to enable their athletes to continue in the league, or should we welcome the fact that they are at least offering their athletes an opportunity to compete in a national league? Somehow we have to balance the needs of the smaller clubs against the over-riding need to have well contested matches with a good turnout of athletes. We all know that the U17 and U20 age group covers a difficult time in an athlete's life for multiple reasons, but if there is no competition outlet, then we are failing them.

One clear message, often repeated, across the 3 years of the league's existence is that one size does not fit all, and so maybe we need to start thinking about diversifying. How we deal with the Premier division teams need not necessarily be the same as for those in lower divisions. We are under no illusion that things are right yet, but changing things can be a lengthy process, and we welcome the suggestion of a small working party to address the issues across the board. We have been under a lot of pressure from EA council to shorten the length of the day in the Premier divisions, but everyone comes to the negotiating table with different ideas and a different agenda. Ultimately it is you, the clubs, who will decide how you want the league to progress. Quite rightly clubs want to get the best possible 'deal' for their athletes, but we must not lose sight of the fact that we are a national league and have to cater for the needs of clubs from all corners of the UK – from Cornwall to Inverness, from Norfolk to West Wales and everything in between. As I said, we all care passionately about the sport, that's why we're here, but we have to cater for the needs of the individual from the beginner to the elite, as well as safeguard the sport for the future.

Marian Williams
YDL Administrator



Finance Officer's Report 2015

In December of 2014 a sum in excess of £55,000 was paid to clubs in respect of claims for track hire, mileage, first aid, photofinish and EDM. However as you can see from the accounts the amount actually paid is in excess of £61,000. The management committee had decided that we should pay as many claims as possible in order for clubs to benefit. This year the decision was made to send a reminder to all clubs after the closing date to remind them about making a claim for the 2015 season. This led to another 20+ clubs making a claim. So the intention this year is to make in excess of £80,000 back to clubs.

In addition a hardship fund was introduced this year to help clubs that either had to have an overnight stay or had to travel by air or ferry. I am pleased to say that over £16,000 was paid to clubs who had applied and the management committee felt met the stated criteria. The rest of the monies will be set aside to be added to the £20,000 available next year

Subscriptions again have cause problems. By the closing date I had received less than 60% of the total number of subscriptions due. I am making a plea to all clubs this year that if you are paying by cheque that the cheque is made payable to YDL Athletics and if paying by BACS you ensure that the reference is the name of the club. If you are part of a composite and you are paying the fee please use the name of the composite team.

During the year the committee has looked at the cost of the finals and have tried to find ways of cutting the costs. We have managed to reduce the costs this year but still need to find other ways of reducing the costs.

This is the final year of the agreed funding. As of yet I am unaware of what is likely to happen in the 2017 season. We need to ensure we have set aside a sum of money that will allow us to run the league for another year.

Finally I wish to thank the committee for their support this year.

Lorraine Vidler
Finance Officer

YOUTH DEVELOPMENT LEAGUE
ACCOUNTS FOR THE YEAR ENDED 30 SEPTEMBER 2015
BALANCE SHEET AS AT 30 SEPTEMBER 2015

			2015	2014
			£	£
ASSETS				
Fixed Assets				
Computer Equipment	- Net Book Value	Note 2	353	613
Current Assets				
Cash at Bank	- Current Account		7,687	99,430
	- Deposit Account		<u>90,750</u>	<u>43,086</u>
			98,437	142,516
Debtors		Note 3	57,505	-
Current Liabilities				
Amounts Due Within One Year:				
Creditors		Note 4	6,436	7,798
Proposed Distribution to Areas and Clubs			<u>75,000</u>	<u>57,000</u>
			<u>81,436</u>	<u>64,798</u>
Net Current Assets			<u>74,506</u>	<u>77,718</u>
			<u>74,859</u>	<u>£78,331</u>
CAPITAL ACCOUNT AND RESERVES				
Accumulated Funds				
Balance as at 1 October 2014			78,331	49,059
(Deficit) / Surplus for Year			<u>(3,472)</u>	<u>29,272</u>
			<u>£74,859</u>	<u>£78,331</u>

.....
L. Vidler 7 November 2015
Treasurer

Independent Examiner's Report

I have examined the books and records of the Youth Development League for the year ended 30 September 2015, 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.

.....
B M Abbott 7 November 2015

YOUTH DEVELOPMENT LEAGUE
INCOME AND EXPENDITURE ACCOUNT
FOR THE YEAR ENDED 30 SEPTEMBER 2015

	2015		2014
	£	£	£
INCOME			
Affiliation Fees		62,150	62,670
Grants from UKA		115,000	115,000
Interest Received		164	86
		<hr/>	<hr/>
		177,314	177,756
		<hr/>	<hr/>
EXPENDITURE			
Administration Costs			
Committee Expenses	4,749		5,794
Postage and Phone	227		665
Stationery	186		342
Administration Expenses	<hr/> 25,600		<hr/> 20,000
		30,762	26,801
		<hr/>	<hr/>
Contribution to Clubs for Track Hire and Mileage		80,819	65,883
		<hr/>	<hr/>
League Match Costs		22,474	23,319
		<hr/>	<hr/>
Cost of Staging Finals	Note 5	29,695	31,309
		<hr/>	<hr/>
Hardship Payments		16,020	-
		<hr/>	<hr/>
Miscellaneous Expenditure			
Website and Software	35		374
Accounts Fee	450		450
Depreciation	330		307
Sundries	<hr/> 201		<hr/> 41
		1,016	1,172
		<hr/>	<hr/>
		180,786	148,484
		<hr/>	<hr/>
(Deficit) / Surplus to Accumulated Funds		<hr/> (£3,472)	<hr/> £29,272

YOUTH DEVELOPMENT LEAGUE

ACCOUNTS FOR THE YEAR ENDED 30 SEPTEMBER 2015

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 Equipment 33%

	2015		2014
	£	£	£
2 Fixed Assets - Computer Equipment			
Cost			
Brought Forward		920	-
Additions		70	920
Carried Forward		<u>990</u>	<u>920</u>
Accumulated Depreciation			
Brought Forward		307	-
Charge for the Year		330	307
Carried Forward		<u>637</u>	<u>307</u>
Net Book Value		<u>£353</u>	<u>£613</u>
3 Debtors			
Grants Due from UKA		<u>£57,505</u>	<u>-</u>
4 Creditors			
Finals		5,857	7,348
Committee Expenses		129	-
Independent Examiner's Fee		450	450
		<u>£6,436</u>	<u>£7,798</u>
5 Cost of Staging Finals			
Income			
Gate Receipts and Sale of Programmes		2,554	2,700
Franchises		305	510
		<u>2,859</u>	<u>3,210</u>
Expenditure			
Track Hire and Staffing Costs	7,326		6,685
Medals and Trophies	3,728		3,661
Programmes	663		758
Competitors' Numbers etc.	144		410
Officials' Expenses and Catering	17,200		14,662
Administration	500		-
Team Expenses	2,663		8,143
EDM Hire	330		200
		<u>32,554</u>	<u>34,519</u>
Net Cost		<u>£29,695</u>	<u>£31,309</u>