



# UK YOUTH DEVELOPMENT LEAGUE

## Minutes of the 2022 Annual General Meeting

held at the Holiday Inn M6 J7 Hotel, Birmingham, on Saturday 26<sup>th</sup> November

**Present:** Janice Kaufman (Vice Chair); Karl Ponty (Finance Officer); Marian Williams (Administrator) plus the following members of the management committee: Stuart Horsewood; Alan Johnson; Julian Starkey; Nichola Skedgel (UKA) plus:

The following clubs were in attendance:

### Midland region (17 teams represented)

Birchfield Harriers; Cannock & Stafford AC; Coventry & Leamington; Derby AC; East Wales; Gwent Harriers; Kidderminster & Stourport AC; Leamington C&AC; Marshall Milton Keynes AC; Northampton AC; Rugby & Northampton AC; Solihull & Small Heath AC; Swansea Harriers; Swindon Harriers; Team Avon; Telford AC; Yate & District AC

### Northern region (9 teams represented)

East Cheshire Harriers & Tameside AC; Gateshead Harriers; Kingdom Athletic; Liverpool Harriers; North Wales; Rotherham Harriers; Trafford AC; Wigan & District Harriers; Wrexham AC

### Southern region (9 teams represented)

Bracknell AC; Brighton & Hove AC; City of Portsmouth AC; Poole AC; Portsmouth/Winchester; Shaftesbury Barnet Harriers; Team Dorset; Winchester & District AC; Windsor Slough Eton & Hounslow AC

### Scottish region (2 teams represented)

Dundee Hawkhill Harriers; Pitreavie AAC

**Apologies:** Grace Hall (Chair); Stuart Hall (Website manager); Leslie Roy (Scottish area co-ordinator); Arbroath & District AC; Basildon AC; Basildon Beagles; Bicester AC; Blackheath & Bromley Harriers; Bolton United Harriers; Border Harriers; Bournemouth, New Forest Juniors & Salisbury; Bristol & West AC/Mendip; Bromsgrove & Redditch AC; Burton AC; Charnwood AC; Cheltenham & County Harriers; City of York AC; Crawley AC; Daventry AAC; Doncaster AC; Dudley & Stourbridge Harriers; East Grinstead; Halesowen A & CC; Hastings AC, Havering AC; Inverness Harriers; Kilmarnock Harriers; Lasswade AC; Leicester Coritanian AC; Leeds City AC; Macclesfield Harriers; Rushcliffe AC; Salford Metropolitan AC; Shrewsbury AC; South Wales; Spensborough AC; Southampton; St Marys Richmond AC; Stevenage & North Herts AC; Sutton in Ashfield AC; Tamworth AC; Team Bath; Team East Lothian; Team Green; Team North Cumbria; Tipton Harriers; Walton AC; West Cheshire AC; Wirral AC; Woking AC; Woodford Green w Essex Ladies.

1. **Janice Kaufman, the vice-chair**, informed everyone that Grace had had to pull out of today's meeting due to illness; she thanked everyone for making the effort to come to the AGM, she then introduced members of the committee seated around the room.

### 2. **Minutes of the 2021 AGM**

There were two amendments noted – Page 2 Item 2 and Page 5 Item 5.4.2 should read Jo Wood, not Jo Davis as seconder to the motions. The minutes were deemed to be an accurate record, and their acceptance was proposed by **Jo Wood (Swansea)** and seconded by **Joyce Tomala (East Wales)**.

The minutes were approved by the meeting and signed by the Vice-Chair, in the Chair's absence.

### 3. Chair's Report.

In Grace's absence, **Janice Kaufman** highlighted that this was the 10<sup>th</sup> year of the YDL competition. 2022 had been a more normal season, albeit with a reduced number of volunteers on the committee, a long and arduous one culminating with the finals held in Manchester for both age groups in September. The winners of both being Blackheath & Bromley Harriers & AC, so congratulations to them. We wait for confirmation about the 2023 European Clubs competition held using the new DNA format, if it does take place Blackheath & Bromley will be nominated to take part as they did this year.

She commented that the impact that Covid had had on our sport was significant and would take some time to recover from, consequently we were starting from a low point when looking ahead. The number of new records in 2022 was, not unexpectedly, lower than in previous years.

She re-iterated Grace's thanks to our member clubs and to the management group.

Janice reminded everyone that EA were holding a Competition Conference next weekend looking at planning for the future.

There were no supplementary questions. Alan Johnson did however comment that the LAG final had been a very close result with Blackheath and Bromley just coming out on top having benefitted from one of their officials finally receiving confirmation of his Level 1 status in the week leading up to the event.

### 4. Administrator's Annual Report

**Marian Williams, the administrator**, suggested that as this report had been sent out in advance, she felt it was probably unnecessary to go through it in detail, but asked if anyone had any questions about it. Some commented that they hadn't seen the reports in advance, however Marian reminded everyone that each team's contacts had received them several weeks earlier and **Julian Starkey** pointed out that it had been on the website for a number of weeks also. Janice commented that scrutinising the results had been, as usual, an onerous task, especially bearing in mind some problems experienced with the software. Marian reminded everyone that it was vital that the results and paperwork was sent promptly after a match as there can be a very tight turnaround between some rounds and the Area finals.

### 5. Financial Report. **Karl Ponty, the finance officer**, pointed out that the accounts showed the figures for the last 4 years, which allowed a direct comparison between the last 2 full years of competition ie 2019 and 2022. There had been some tidying up to do but we are now at the level where everything is complete.

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

He pointed out that the number of matches being held around the country had fallen, and he had directly related this to the reduction in income as the number of teams registered to compete in the league had fallen. The increase in match fees from the AGM in 2021 had simply covered the shortfall but generated no additional income. When the number of teams decrease, the income is reduced but the central costs don't and are then spread across fewer clubs, there is a cost for running a league of this size. There had been a significant reduction in claims for travel costs in 2022. He suggested that as most teams don't travel by coach to fixtures, the outlay to clubs was relatively low. On the other hand, the hosting costs had risen, and this was the reason behind the proposal to increase match fees to enable the league to pay out more to host clubs. He was pleased to note that the use of technology at matches had shown a slight increase.

Details of this were outlined in the proposals.

## 5.2 Adoption of the Accounts

- **David Ashbourne (Leamington C&AC)** proposed that the 2022 accounts be adopted
- **Clyde Gordon (Shaftesbury Barnet Harriers)** seconded the motion.

Votes Against: 0

Abstentions: 0

The meeting voted unanimously in favour of adopting the 2022 accounts

With reference to the proposal to increase the amounts payable to host clubs, **Shaun Ainge (Cannock & Stafford)** asked if there was a maximum amount payable to host clubs, Karl replied that for a 6-team division using all the technology devices, the maximum amount would be £920, obviously matches with more teams would have an increased amount according to the number of teams.

**David Ashbourne (Leamington)** commented that his club had bought an EDM machine, and it was starting to pay for itself as other hosts had hired it for their matches.

**Sandra Woodman (Team Avon)** asked if they could apply to YDL for a grant to help with the purchase of electronic starting equipment. Janice suggested that they should contact EA to see if they could help.

**David Little (Team Dorset)** asked if double header matches doubled the length of the competition day. Marian replied that the Southern Premier league would not be involved in any double headers as, in the South, it was only for Division 2A and 3A due to an issue with available hosts and tracks, the athlete numbers are a lot smaller than the Premier division. She asked Shaun Ainge to comment as his club had been involved in double header matches for the last 3 seasons in both age groups. He commented that they had worked well given the number of athletes and had helped to ensure there were sufficient officials to cover events. They had initially started using the Premier timetable which was a slightly longer day.

**Sandra Woodman (Team Avon)** commented that they had been involved in double header matches with a Premier and a division 1 team. They had used a start team with 3 assistants.

**Alan Johnson (Trafford)** referenced a double header in the Northern region LAG involving a Premier team and a lower division team. They had run the match perfectly well with 1 starter and 1 assistant.

**Marian** pointed out that the cost to the league for double headers was less as there was only one standard fixed amount for track hire and technology costs to cover.

**Karl** however felt that we needed to be mindful that if tracks weren't utilised then they may not survive, so double headers had a negative impact on that. He further commented that the variable payment (currently £30) per team which was given to cover the cost of officials' refreshments would be the same if there was one venue or two.

**Julian Starkey (Bracknell)** thought that it wasn't widely understood that the variable payment was to cover the cost of officials' food and asked for it to be minuted so that clubs would be aware. He further commented that the UAG timetable was a long timetable for Photofinish, given that they had to set up the equipment for the start of the match and then pack away afterwards; Karl agreed that it needed looking at. He also commented that we shouldn't be asking our outlying clubs to host for environmental reasons, although as Marian pointed out, these tracks too needed to be supported with reference to Karl's earlier comments.

## 5.3 Subscriptions for 2021/2022.

***"The Management Committee proposes that subscriptions be increased to £125 per match per team, plus such sum as the Management Committee may fix to attend any subsequent matches to include finals or promotion matches."***

**Mark Exley (Northampton AC)** seconded the management proposal

Votes Against: 2

Abstentions: 0

The meeting voted overwhelmingly in favour of the motion

#### 5.4 Travel and Hosting.

*“The Management Committee propose to reimburse travel expenses for the 2023 season as follows:*

5.4.1 *Less than 400 miles – no payment;*

*400 miles or more - 50p per mile*

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

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

**Paul Allen (Kingdom Athletic)** seconded the management proposal

Votes Against: 0

Abstentions: 0

The meeting voted unanimously in favour of the above motion.

*“The Management Committee proposes that, for the 2023 season, the host club reimbursement should be paid as follows:*

5.4.2 *A fixed amount of £350, and a variable amount of £35 for each team timetabled to compete at the match, plus £200 for the use of Photo Finish, £80 for the use of EDM and £40 each for the use of track and/or field wind gauges”*

**David Ashbourne (Leamington C&AC)** seconded the management proposal

Votes Against: 0

Abstentions: 0

The meeting voted unanimously in favour of the above motions.

**Karl** gave forewarning to those present that whilst income was reducing, the central administrative costs were not, so from 2024 he would be proposing that individual clubs should become members of the league to cover administration costs, so each club, including those in composite teams, would pay a membership fee towards the cost of matches, this would result in a reduction in the match fees. **Joyce Tomala (East Wales)** suggested that some work should be done to look at the size of the clubs in composite teams as many of them are small clubs who in all likelihood couldn't afford a greater expenditure. She felt it was important not to overcharge.

**David Little (Team Dorset)** agreed with Joyce and felt that this should also be a matter for further consultation with the membership as Karl would need to sell the idea to clubs for 2024.

**Alan Johnson (Trafford)** commented that treating composite teams differently to clubs wasn't good, he suggested that would become over complicated and would require a lot of work.

**Janice** reminded everyone that as this would be a constitutional change it would require a two-third majority to be approved.

**Joyce** suggested that the management group should take on board the comments from this meeting. **Karl** then reported on a £50 000 grant from EA which we will hopefully be receiving shortly; on a similar basis to the UKA grant previously awarded. **Janice** explained that the funding streams work differently now with a changing relationship between EA and UKA. The grant received from UKA came from Sport England channelled to us via UKA, now it comes direct from EA. Discussions are taking place between Home Countries.

**Joyce Tomala (East Wales)** informed the meeting that funding is totally different in Wales, and possibly Scotland, as there is no money available to support competition below elite level, in addition there is a reduction in funding this year. She had confirmed this with the Chief Executive, in her role as a member of WA Council and their T&F committee. **Karl** disagreed with her comments, adding that WA has more funding per athlete than EA.

**Paul Farres (City of Portsmouth)** commented that the EA grant is not an act of kindness, more of a repayment for all the work done by volunteers at grass root level.

**Nichola Skedgel (EA)** confirmed to the meeting that the grant comes from Talent funding. EA are seeking to develop their partnership with YDL, and there will be discussions as to how to support not just England, but all areas of the UK within the contract. The money is still from Sport England. The affiliation fees from clubs goes in part towards supporting clubs and competition providers in a variety of ways. With regard to the money EA make through the affiliation fees etc, they do support a number of initiatives from clubs across the country, as well as support for the regions and schools' organisations.

**Alan Johnson (Trafford)** pointed out that the £50 000 grant was a retrospective payment for 2022.

## 6. Resolutions.

### 6.1 Resolutions from Clubs - none

### 6.2 Management Committee proposals for rule changes:

#### 4 COMPOSITE TEAMS

- 4.1 Composite teams as registered with UKA may be accepted as members of the League, subject to scrutiny and approval by Management Committee.

#### To be replaced by:

- 4.1 ***Applications and renewals for Composite teams must be submitted to the League Administrator by 30 September, for the following year. Each submission will be subject to scrutiny and approval by the Management Committee before it is forwarded to UKA for registration. There is no guarantee that existing composite teams will be approved for entry to the league.***

Marian explained that this was simply to remind all teams about the deadline for applications, and to re-inforce the fact that all applications are considered each year on merit.

**David Little (Team Dorset)** seconded the proposal

Votes Against: 1

Abstentions: 2

The proposal was approved

## 5 OFFICIALS

- 5.3.4 The above officials do not qualify for match points – see 5.4.

#### To be amended to:

- 5.3.4 ***Apart from the Track Referee and Chief Timekeeper, the above officials do not qualify for match points – see 5.4.***

- 
- 5.4.1 Each club, including the host club, shall provide one Track Judge, one Timekeeper and a team of 5 Field Judges. One of the Field Judges must be at Level 2 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.

**To be amended to:**

**5.4.1 *Each visiting club shall provide one Track Judge, one Timekeeper and a team of 5 Field Judges, while the host club shall provide a team of 5 Field judges. The field team must include 2 qualified field officials to satisfy the licence requirements, and one of those must be at Level 2 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.***

---

5.4.3 Points will be awarded for up to 7 officials who sign in as a Track judge, Timekeeper or Field judge on the league H & S signing in sheets, subject to satisfying the criteria above.

Eight (8) match points will be credited for each qualified official who signs in for the relevant discipline up to a maximum of 56 points. Unqualified volunteers who sign in for any of the above duties shall be awarded four (4) match points.

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

**To be replaced by:**

**5.4.3 *Points will be awarded for up to 7 officials who sign in as a Track judge, Timekeeper or Field judge on the league H & S signing in sheets, subject to satisfying the criteria above.***

***Eight (8) match points will be credited for each qualified official at Level 1 or above who signs in for the relevant discipline up to a maximum of 56 points.***

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

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

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

**Mark Exley (Northampton)** queried what would be the outcome for a visiting club who provided one of the chiefs. Marian replied that this would make it simpler, as the host clubs will now just have to provide a substitute for that club (rather than 2 officials as now).

**Clyde Gordon (SBH)** asked whether there was a need for timekeepers if photofinish was going to be used more widely?

**Julian Starkey (Bracknell)** reminded everyone that it was important that TK have the opportunities to improve their competency as not all meetings will have photofinish. TK use the Photofinish results to compare their hand times against the electronic times. Timekeepers are also required for the longer distances to all lap times.

**Shaun Ainge (C&S)** asked if the officials at double header matches would also be adjusted. Marian agreed that they would as each double headed match had its own bespoke information which would be circulated to all the clubs involved.

**Annette Brown (Solihull & Small Heath)** said that she understood the situation with Track judges and Timekeepers but felt that the difficulty was with trying to find 5 field judges, to include 2 who must be qualified. Clubs are struggling to fulfil their requirements.

**Paul Allen (Kingdom Athletics)** commented that his team have 12 volunteers going through the process of qualification and they work in rotation at matches, so none are working a full day. Janice confirmed that Gateshead operate similar approach.

**Sandra Woodman (Team Avon)** said that they try to recruit older athletes. They're also looking to produce a 'Dummies' Guide to the events for reference. Janice asked if she would be willing to send it to Marian as it would be of benefit to a number of clubs.

**Kevin Thomas (Rotherham)** asked if a club can be credited for a timekeeper who was working on Photofinish, Marian confirmed that this was fine so long as there were the requisite number of timekeepers to fulfil the licence requirement.

**Clyde Gordon (SBH)** suggested organising training on club nights when parents may be more likely to attend.

**Ron Oliver (Kidderminster & Stourport)** pointed out that the courses are online, so it wasn't easy to use training nights, however Janice commented that it was possible to run a blended course to suit the circumstances.

**David Little (Team Dorset)** commented that having to provide 2 qualified officials is making it even more difficult. Marian reminded him that this was a licence requirement and not something we can control.

The change to the points for field events in rule 5.4.3 should help clubs to encourage volunteers to step up. **Janice** reminded everyone that YDL still has some funds for training officials and interested clubs should contact her.

**Kevin Thomas (Rotherham)** asked what would happen if there weren't enough field officials on an event? **Paul Farres (CoPortsmouth)** suggested that there needs to be a pragmatic approach and the referee has the option of moving officials from other clubs to over any shortfall.

**Marian** stated that some field cards are very difficult to read, in terms of which officials sign in for each event and would prefer if all officials on a field event write their names clearly on the cards, rather than just sign the card which is often unreadable. **Lesley Nunn (Yate)** suggested that officials write their names on the back of the field cards so they are legible.

**Lynne Orbell (Birchfield)** asked why the regulations for BMC are more relaxed than for other competitions? No-one was in a position to answer that.

**Nichola Skedgel (EA)** informed the meeting that EA are looking at a variety of issues round licencing of matches and are considering a level below 1 for development purposes. They are also looking at the option of post event reporting.

However, **Mark Exley (Northampton)** reminded everyone that we need to be mindful of the Health and Safety issues around the long throws in particular.

**Margaret Grayston (Wigan Harriers)** seconded the proposal

Votes Against: 0

Abstentions: 0

The proposals were unanimously approved

## 6 NUMBERS

- 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 in Jumping Events where one is permissible worn either on the front or back. (Addendum: - due to a change in UKA rules, competitors in all field events may just wear one number front or back)

### To be amended to:

- 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 track events; in Field Events one is permissible worn either on the front or back.***

This proposal was to bring the rule in line with UKA rules

**Martin Smith (Swindon Harriers)** seconded the proposal

Votes Against: 0

Abstentions: 0

The proposal was unanimously approved

## 7 Proposal from the management group to look at the future structure of the league:

***“That for the 2024 season clubs commit to the league being re-structured to better reflect the competition requirements of developing athletes. This restructure will be consulted on widely across the sport and an Option(s) presented for final approval at an EGM to be held following the end of the 2023 league season”.***

**Janice** gave the rationale behind the proposal:

It is now 10 years since the inception of the UKYDL and the league has evolved incrementally over that time. However, we have seen a steady drop in the number of clubs and teams competing, especially those from the more rural areas of the UK.

Notwithstanding the impact of the COVID pandemic we have also seen a decline in athletes numbers participating and it will take a few years for the sport to recover, particularly in the more technical events. The drop-out rate for U17 and U20 athletes has also increased over the past couple of years and whilst this is mainly due to other factors we need to be mindful that competition opportunities reflect athletes requirements, both in terms of performance and social activity.

The U15 age group has historically been the most successful in terms of participation but provides limited opportunities for athletes, how many times have clubs had to leave their 3rd or 4th best Long Jumper or thrower behind as they haven't had the opportunity to compete or are persuaded to compete in a different event.

The current league rules assumes that every club/team has 2 athletes in every event and the scoring reflects that, sometimes leading to athletes being put in an unfamiliar event for the points. Clubs no longer, if they ever did, operate like that with some clubs specialising in middle distance, sprints or have throws or jumps academies.

Before COVID it had been the committee's intention to hold roadshows with clubs, athletes and parents to garner opinion on a Way Forward for the league that best suits the changes in society over the past 10 years. This is now more important and if we are given the mandate then we will set up Webinars, Conference calls and some face-to-face meetings over the winter/spring to come up with a revised format for approval at an EGM to be implemented for the 2024 season.



Some of the questions that we will ask and explore solutions to are:

- How do we provide the best experience for U13 athletes at a more local level, enabling them to explore more events and for their parents to become more involved in officiating and running the events?
- Are we able to incorporate some limited U11 events into the above?
- How do we provide more opportunities for U15 athletes to compete in their favoured event?
- How do we make the competition more relevant for clubs who specialise in events and appeal to clubs in the more remote areas of the UK?
- How can we organise U20 competition to provide opportunities for all U20 athletes in the UK, whether they are going for performance or competing socially with friends?
- Can we include some U18 competitions to help aspiring athletes and bridge the gap in technical events from U17 to U20?

Given the cost of living and the increase in transport costs and the environmental impact can the league use technology more to restructure and compare competitions across the UK by increasing the number of matches held regionally, especially for the lower age groups.

Position the age groups so that any changes in the Rule Book for 2024 around age groups can be easily incorporated.

To enable any changes proposed for 2024 it would mean a change to the scoring mechanism so that scores are based on performance points in a similar way to that which multi events or para events are scored, rather than points for finishing positions. We will be running a trial in the results next season to see how that affects any scoring, although initial re-scoring of some of the matches in 2022 has indicated that the overall result is unaffected.

As Karl pointed out in his finance report the financial sustainability of the league relies on being more creative in how we invest our members monies, so we seek permission from the clubs to carry out this review and we recommend that the clubs vote with the committee on the proposal.

**David Ashbourne (Leamington)** asked if no agreement was reached during the consultation period, would things stay as they are now? Janice replied that 'No Change' would be one of the options put to the EGM.

**Lesley Nunn (Yate)** asked how clubs can vote for this proposal when there is insufficient information as to what they would be voting for? The information given suggested that U13s would be removed from YDL competition, and her club wasn't happy with that. She hoped that it would be more meaningful that the consultation in 2011 when there were many objections that were ignored.

**Paul Farres (CoPortsmouth)** asked what form the consultation would take. There were some misgivings about the suggestions being made and it would be helpful to know how clubs would be able to participate in the consultation. Janice replied that there would be several webinars or Teams meetings organised to accommodate as many clubs as possible, it was also an option to organise Face to Face meetings on a local level.

**Sandra Woodman (Team Avon)** asked why, in the light of a possible change to the Age Groups, it would not be more sensible to wait until that had been decided because it may be necessary to change things again. Karl replied that if we knew the timeline for that decision then we would be able to make our decisions based on that, but we could end up waiting indefinitely. Nichola thought that it could be around the end of July.

**Mark Exley (Northampton)** commented that the situation in 2012 was a different scenario and was hopeful that this time clubs would be listened to as part of the consultation process. It was confirmed that the EA meeting on 3 December was not connected to this proposal.

**Karl Ponty (Derby)** suggested that there were a lot of issues which needed airing, and people will need to contribute, **Paul Farres** remarked that it wouldn't be possible to please everyone.

**David Little (Team Dorset)** felt that the U13/U15 age group worked well and thought it would be a retrograde step to remove them from the YDL. He suggested that the argument given about encouraging U15s to stay in the sport was flawed, as it is reflected in many sports and is due to many external factors. **Janice** commented that we need to make sure the competition suits the athletes.

**Alan Johnson (Trafford)** stated that Trafford are happy with the LAG, the issues are with the UAG. **Janice** replied that U13s at Gateshead have to travel 2 hours on a bus to get to a match and this made the day much longer for them.

**Craig Scott (Swindon)** asked if this proposal was just a request to look at possible changes, and not necessarily a mandate to change.

**Mark Exley (Northampton)** commented that it seemed as if some people were looking at a return to the YAL format, but that had a much more limited timetable for U13s and was a longer day, He suggested that this wasn't a good idea.

**Karl Ponty** replied that the competition was a long day for U13s, and while the LAG may be considered a good day it doesn't involve all athletes. He pointed out that there are less opportunities for U13s than U17s which is contrary to development. We need to look at the athlete journey.

**Paul Farres (CoPortsmouth)** asked if it would be possible to organise consultation meetings between local clubs. Marian suggested that a series of Zoom meetings would work well both for local clubs and for those further afield. Karl felt that it was important to find the best procedure to consult with all clubs.

**Sandra Woodman (Team Avon)** commented that her club was more interested in restructuring the timetable rather than changing the age groups, so the starting point should be to go back to clubs to see what concerned them.

**John Gercs (Rugby & Northampton)** asked what structures were currently being looked at? But Karl replied that there were many different opinions on that, so we would need to listen to the clubs as no-one had all the answers. There were other issues that need to be looked at, eg where and how do clubs recruit officials?

**Annette Brown (Solihull & Small Heath)** asked how the consultation process would be funded? Karl replied that the EA grant could be used for that. Annette felt that the wording of the proposal suggested that change would happen whether or not clubs wanted it. She submitted an amendment:

***That for the 2024 season clubs commit to the league being POTENTIALLY re-structured to better reflect the competition requirements of developing athletes. This restructure will be consulted on widely across the sport and an Option(s) presented for final approval at an EGM to be held following the end of the 2023 league season.***

This was seconded by **Clyde Gordon (SBH)**.

Votes Against: 6

Abstentions: 2

The amendment was approved

Voting then took place on the reworded proposal:

Votes Against: 6

Abstentions: 0

The updated proposal was approved

As this was an important change to that which was sent out, it was agreed that the Administrator would circulate this information to all clubs to make them aware of the change. They can then start discussing this.

Karl commented that it could be useful if discussions involved those not in the league as well as our own membership.

Janice then stated that consultation will take place during winter and spring before meetings start up again.

## **8 Constitutional amendments:**

### **8.1 Proposed by the management group:**

***The Management Group propose that all references to UKA's representation on the UK YDL committee in 6 instances in the Constitution be removed, namely:  
points: 8.4; 9.3; 10.3; 14.12; 15.23; 15.5.***

For a number of years YDL have not had a UKA representative on the committee who was in a position to assist the league. At this point in time only one of the two UKA committee places are filled, and that by an EA member of staff. The management committee feel that we would be better served by using the co-option facility in the constitution.

**David Little** asked if UKA would still be kept informed about our discussions.

With no further questions the meeting moved straight to a vote:

Votes Against: 0

Abstentions: 1

The proposal was approved

14.1 An Officer or a member of the Management Group shall cease to hold office:

14.1.2 In the event that a member does not hold a current valid CRB

**To be amended to:**

***14.1.2 In the event that a member does not hold a current valid DBS.***

This change is to correct the wording in the original rule.

Votes Against: 0

Abstentions: 0

The proposal was unanimously approved

### **15.2 Composition:**

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.

**To be replaced by:**

***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.***

Votes Against: 0

Abstentions: 0

The proposal was unanimously approved

15.2.4 Should any Home Country not have a representative on the Management Group after voting has taken place at the Annual General Meeting then the Member Clubs in that Country may elect an additional member of the Group so long as they have at least six Clubs as Members of The League (composite Clubs counting as one Club).

**This clause to be removed.**

**The removal of this clause will require a renumbering of 15.2.5 to 15.2.3**

The rationale for the above changes is due to the difficulty in filling vacancies in the management group and it was felt that it would be in the members' interest to reduce the number of specific roles and use sub committees to move forward with the workload. The reduction in the composition of the management committee would also assist the management in ensuring they were quorate.

In respect of 15.2.4, the committee could also utilise co-option in relation to any home countries requesting a presence on the committee.

**David Little (Team Dorset)** queried the numbering, but it was correct in that number 15.2.5 would become 15.2.3 if this was approved.

As there were no subsequent questions on either of the above, the meeting moved to a vote:

Votes Against: 0

Abstentions: 0

Both proposals were unanimously approved

## 18 FINANCES

18.2 The Finance Officer shall keep accounting records which are sufficient to show and explain the League's transactions and are such as to disclose with reasonable accuracy at any time the financial position of the League at that time. The records shall contain details of all sums of money received and expended by the League and the matters in respect of which such receipt and expenditure takes place and a record of the assets and liabilities of the League. The accounting records of the League to be inspected by an appropriate member of staff within UKA before the General Meeting.

**To be replaced by:**

18.2 ***The Finance Officer shall keep accounting records which are sufficient to show and explain the League's transactions and are such as to disclose with reasonable accuracy at any time the financial position of the League at that time. The records shall contain details of all sums of money received and expended by the League and the matters in respect of which such receipt and expenditure takes place and a record of the assets and liabilities of the League. The accounting records of the League to be inspected by a suitably qualified accountant who will prepare an independent examiners report.***

This to bring the wording into line with current practice.

Votes Against: 0

Abstentions: 0

The proposal was unanimously approved

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

**General Committee:**

**Alan Johnson (to 2024) serving as Northern Area Co-ordinator** – nominated by Sale Harriers Manchester; Trafford AC; Wigan Harriers & AC

**Stuart Horsewood (to 2024) serving as Southern Area Co-ordinator** – nominated by City of Portsmouth AC; Winchester & District AC

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

**PLUS**

**One vacancy to 2023** – to serve as Midland Area Co-ordinator

**One vacancy to 2024**

No nominations had been received for the above 2 vacancies; if anyone is interested in taking a role on the committee, they are advised to contact Grace Hall, Chair of UK YDL for further information. The UK YDL website contains information about the Roles and Responsibilities of all committee posts.

- 9 The 2023 Annual General Meeting is scheduled to take place on Saturday 25<sup>th</sup> November 2023.**  
(This to be confirmed)

**The AGM closed at 14:15**

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

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