

UK YOUTH DEVELOPMENT LEAGUE

Minutes of the 2016 Annual General Meeting

held at the Great Barr Hotel, Birmingham, on Saturday 19th 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: Guy Ferguson; Stuart Hall; Bob Harvey; Alan Johnson; Leslie Roy; Joyce Tomala; Terry Colton (UKA representative)

Plus: David Jeacock in attendance to advise on constitutional matters;

The following clubs were in attendance:

Northern region (41 teams represented)

City of Sheffield & Dearne AC; City of York AC; Colwyn Bay AC; Deeside AAC; Doncaster AC; Gateshead Harriers; Hallamshire Harriers; Kingdom Athletic; Leeds City AC; Leigh Harriers; Liverpool Harriers; Middlesbrough (Mandale); North Wales; Preston Harriers; Rotherham Harriers; Sale Harriers; Spensborough & District AC; Team Edinburgh; Team Forth Valley; Team Glasgow; Trafford AC; West Cheshire; Wigan & District Harriers; Wirral AC; Wrexham AC plus Bernard Harris (Deeside AAC - non voting)

Midland region (47 teams represented)

Amber Valley & Erewash AC; Banbury Harriers; Birchfield Harriers; Blaenau Gwent; Bristol & West AC/Mendip; Burton AC; Cannock & Stafford AC; Charnwood AC; Cheltenham & County Harriers; Coventry Godiva Harriers; Cwmbran Harriers; Derby AC; Gloucester AC; Halesowen A & CC; 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; Team Avon; Team Banbury & Bicester; Wolverhampton & Bilston AC; Yate & District AC

Scottish region (8 teams represented)

Arbroath & District; Central AC; Dundee Hawkhill Harriers; Edinburgh AC; Lasswade; Pitreavie; Shettleston Harriers; Victoria Park Glasgow AC

Southern region (23 teams represented)

Bedford & County AC; Blackheath & Bromley Harriers & AC; Bracknell AC; Croydon AC; Harrow AC; Havering AC; Hillingdon AC; Horsham Blue Star Harriers; Shaftesbury Barnet Harriers; Southampton AC; Team Dorset; Team Norfolk; Victoria Park & Tower Hamlets AC; Victoria Tower Highgate

Apologies: Malcolm Charlish (YDL committee); Nigel Holl (UKA); Barry Parker (EA Midlands region); Chris Power (NI area co-ordinator); Altrincham AC; Cardiff Archers; Chesterfield & District AC; City of Stoke AC; Dudley & Stourbridge; East Cheshire Harriers & Tameside AC; East Lothian; Guildford & Godalming AC; Havant AC; Holland Sports; Isle of Man Youth; Kilmarnock; Leamington AC; M60 Nomads; Macclesfield Harriers; Medway & Maidstone AC; Montrose & Perth Strathtay Harriers; Salford Metropolitan AC; St Mary's Richmond AC; Stevenage & North Herts AC; Team DC; Tonbridge AC; Walton AC; West Wales; Windsor, Slough, Eton & Hounslow AC; Woking AC; Worcester AC

1. **Grace Hall, the chairman** welcomed everyone to the 3rd AGM of the UKYDL and reminded delegates that there would be a protocol for conducting the business at the meeting.

She then asked the delegates to be upstanding to hold a minute's silence in memory of Stacey Burrows and Lucy Pygott, two young athletes from Aldershot, Farnham & District who had recently died in a tragic accident whilst training.

2. **Minutes of the 2015 AGM**

The minutes were deemed to be an accurate record, and their acceptance was proposed by **Arwel Williams (Liverpool AC)** and seconded by **Andy Ward (Middlesbrough Mandale)**.

For: 92; Abstentions: 2.

3. **Chairman's Report.**

As the report had been distributed prior to the meeting, and in view of the long agenda Grace asked if there were any questions from the floor regarding the report.

Joe Fallon (Wirral) commented that we need to strongly suggest to EA that they should renew the funding to run the league, as in his club's opinion, they do very little for grass roots as it is.

Grace explained that it is Sport England who set out the criteria for grant funding and not EA. Four years ago, under the original funding agreement, we were deemed to be a new initiative which is no longer the case. As the criteria for grants is now focussed much more on mass participation, we had to identify an area where we fit into the new criteria. She suggested that clubs should speak to their area councils.

Tim Soutar (Blackheath & Bromley) suggested that clubs should speak to their local MPs as this is where the directives are emanating from.

Tony Bush (Harrow) pointed out that EA receives thousands of pounds from their members so clubs should be expressing their opinions and concerns regarding funding to EA.

Grace replied that we have been working hard to exert some pressure, and although initially we weren't even being considered in the bidding process, we are now part of the bid. We have been told that by 2021 we will need to be totally self-funding, and we have submitted a bid based on that presumption. As a league we are going to have to make some difficult choices over the next few years.

In response to a question from **David Little (Team Dorset)** as to how much money we would have received over the four year period, Grace informed him that it amounted to £460 000 in total, but with costs continuing to rise we would be looking to have to generate a larger amount in the next four years to match that. We have given as much as possible back to clubs as that was part of the original agreement. David pointed out that this would be an approximate payment of £500 per club annually, assuming that we retained the same number of clubs.

There are a number of avenues to explore, including looking at ways to reduce our costs.

4. **Administrator's Annual Report**

Marian Williams, the administrator, also suggested that as this report had also been sent out in advance, she too would just take questions.

Geoff Morphitis (Shaftesbury Barnett) asked whether the new results software would ask for athletes' URNs. This was confirmed. The successful tender had been awarded this week to 'On Track' on a one-year rolling contract, there had been a number of expressions of interest, with two companies on the final shortlist, one of whom is looking to work with EA and UKA but we felt that this software may not be suitable as yet.

Paul Baxter (City of York) asked whether the new system would be compatible with Apple Mac. It was confirmed that it would. It is an Excel based software which will require declarations to be made up front to allow athletes' details to be checked prior to the fixtures.

5. Financial Report.

5.1 **Lorraine Vidler, the finance officer** informed the meeting that all claims would be paid by December 1st. There were a few clubs who had submitted claims with over-inflated mileage totals, she had adjusted these and would be speaking to the clubs concerned.

UKA had requested a slight change in the accounts and so the figures for the Scottish and Northern Ireland area finals were now included in the general match costs rather than as part of the National finals costs. With reference to the national finals costs, she informed the meeting that the actual figures indicate that the 2016 finals appear to be quite a lot cheaper than the previous year but this is not actually the case as we were in receipt of a large discount which we won't get next year. She then asked if there were any questions from the floor.

Keith May (Horsham Blue Star) asked whether, in light of the likely future funding arrangements, the committee had looked at removing the National finals altogether as they cost such a huge amount for a small number of clubs. Lorraine responded that we had been advised to keep them as they are our best hope of attracting sponsors.

The committee have looked at a variety of cost cutting options whilst still maintaining an element of support to clubs, especially those who have particular difficulties, the example quoted being Isle of Man. Suggestions from some clubs had included whether we should support host clubs at all, but with the cost of tracks rising and also varying significantly this could make it very difficult to find hosts for all our fixtures.

Grace Hall also pointed out that whilst the Lower age group final is an end in itself, and it's possible that an area final would suffice for this age group. However the Upper age group final is a pathway to the European Junior club championships. It may be that another option to consider is to reduce the number of teams competing in the final which would enable us to look at other cheaper tracks as alternatives. She urged clubs to discuss this and send their suggestions back to the management committee. She also pointed out that EA had also stated that we should not at this stage be looking to get rid of the finals as they are currently our only selling point, we are hopeful that EA may be able to source some sponsorship for us.

Ken Goodger (Newport Harriers) suggested that in the absence of a sponsor then we only have 2 options, increase the cost of participation or reduce what we pay back, or a combination of both. Lorraine agreed that this was the case but until we have the actual figures we cannot say to what extent either of these will be applied. However, the refunds to clubs for this year will be paid out of the grant money received in 2016.

5.2 **Noel MacKackley (Wolverhampton & Bilston)** proposed that the accounts were adopted, **Doug Gunstone (Pitreavie)** seconded the motion.

The meeting voted unanimously in favour of adopting the accounts.

5.3 **The management group proposed the following:**

Subscriptions for 2016/2017. The Management Committee proposes that subscriptions remain at £200 per team plus such sum as the Management Committee may fix to attend a regional final or promotion match. This subscription is based on three league fixtures in 2017, with area finals to determine the teams going forward to the National Finals.

In the event of the meeting deciding that we continue with four fixtures, the Management propose that subscriptions for 2017 will be £250 per team.

There was some discussion regarding the subscription fees:

Lesley Nunn (Yate AC) pointed out that the Midlands proposal was the only one put forward by the Working Party which addressed the cost of area finals and promotion matches which seemed unfair.

There was some uncertainty as to how the decision would relate to any revised structures. Also if the decision was to reduce to 3 fixtures which fixture would be dropped? **Janice Kaufman (Gateshead)** suggested that the 3rd fixture was a problem in the UAG as it clashed with the schools' combined events. **Keith May (Horsham Blue Star)** felt that if the 4th fixture was lost then the league would be over for most athletes by the end of June. This would be the case as the July date would be used for Area Finals or Promotion matches.

Pete Hancock (Preston) proposed that this item be deferred until after item 6.1. **Clive Poyner (Team Norfolk)** seconded this.

The meeting voted overwhelmingly to defer this item until after the regional structures had been discussed.

5.4 To approve the **Management Committee's proposal** to reimburse travel expenses for the 2016 season retrospectively: -

5.4.1 *1st 500 miles – no payment; any mileage over 500 miles @75p per mile*

5.4.2 *Host club reimbursement - The Management Committee proposes that, for the 2016 season, the host club reimbursement should be paid at 85% of track hire; 50% of First Aid; £100 for the use of Photo Finish and £50 for the use of EDM in the 2016 season.*

Seconded by **Arwel Williams (Liverpool Harriers)**.

The meeting voted unanimously in favour of this proposal.

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.

6. Resolutions.

6.1 Proposals regarding league structure

6.1.1 **Midlands. Mark Exley (Rugby & Northampton)** spoke to this motion. He reported that the proposed structure for the Midlands region had come about as a result of a consultative process. All clubs had been invited to a series of roadshows to discuss the structure and the resulting document was the product of this consultation. The geography of the region is somewhat bizarre with Devon and Cornwall being part of the Midlands.

Both age groups had been taken into account, although with more clubs in the Lower age group this inevitably meant more divisions. One of the main objectives was to ensure that the strongest teams qualified for the National finals, but also to ensure that clubs are placed in the most appropriate divisions, and the proposal was modelled on the existing structure with the addition of area finals between the two Premier divisions and Promotion/relegation matches.

Lesley Nunn (Yate) pointed out that any charges for additional matches should also be applied to all structures across the country, but **Grace Hall** pointed out that the management committee will review the level of additional payments (if any), and Midlands clubs wouldn't be penalised.

John Smith (Sale Harriers) reminded clubs that it should only be Midlands clubs who voted for this proposal.

The meeting then voted on the proposal

For: 49 Against: 4 Abstentions: 54

The motion was carried. Mark Exley asked the clubs who had voted against the motion to come and see him so that he could try and answer any concerns.

6.1.2 **Southern. Clive Poyner (Team Norfolk)** said that the Working Party had met 6 or 7 times, and consulted with clubs 3 or 4 times over the year via electronic media, they had tried to reach a consensus, taking on board the concerns over travelling times and distances and ultimately the uncertainty over finances. They had eventually come up with a simple structure for the UAG only which consisted of just 1 Premier division of 6 clubs with the remaining clubs forming 5 divisions in a lower tier. The Premier division would have 4 matches, the bottom two teams would be relegated and the top two teams would gain automatic places in the national final. Below this, the single tier of divisions would ideally have 8 teams in each, organised on a geographical basis, and consist of 3 matches plus a promotion match for the top placed clubs to find the two teams to gain promotion into the Premier division. The maximum travel time should be 1½ hours, with 8 clubs there should be more officials which would benefit everyone and more athletes to make for a better competition, it would also mean that all clubs would have direct access to the Premier division. If clubs only had a 6-lane track then they could look to host at an alternative track with 8 lanes. They also suggested that all divisions use the Premier timetable which would mean that they would finish early. They hadn't looked at the Lower age group at all.

David Little (Team Dorset) felt that there hadn't been any consultation about the structure, and that the lower tiers could become stale as they would always be competing against the same opposition. He queried why there hadn't been any mention of the alternative structures sent out recently, as they offered an alternative option. **Marian Williams** explained that the options she had sent out were only a fall-back position in the event that this motion wasn't successful. It had been sent out so that clubs would be able to make an informed choice, and there wouldn't be a substantial delay in sorting out fixtures and venues.

Tony Benton (Havering) queried how the relegations would work as those being relegated may not match those gaining promotion, he also felt that this structure wasn't going to benefit everyone as not all divisions will be equal. **Keith May (Horsham Blue Star)** re-iterated his concern over a season that ended in June, and **Tony Bush (Harrow)** stated that his club too were not happy with the proposal to only have 3 fixtures for the majority of clubs; he reminded everyone that before the YDL was formed, U17s had 9 opportunities to compete, and this was now reduced to just 4, they did not feel that to reduce it still further would best serve the athletes. **Grace Hall** replied that this was partly down to costs but also because of the increased pressure on the fixture calendar and workload of officials.

Geoff Morphitis (Shaftesbury Barnet) queried what would happen if this structure was rejected? How would clubs be able to express their preference on the other two options. **Marian** replied that all clubs in the Southern region had been sent the fall back options and had been asked to express their opinions; if, and only if, the Working Party option was not accepted then she would go back to clubs and request that they decide which of the two fall back options they prefer. She stressed that the structure isn't a constitutional issue as evidenced by the changes in previous years to both the Midlands and the Southern LAG.

The meeting then voted on the proposal

For: 7 Against: 12 Abstentions: 90

The motion was defeated.

6.1.3 **Northern. Janice Kaufman (Gateshead)** introduced the Working Party proposal for the Northern region. The Working Party had explored the various challenges that faced the league, including returning the U17s into the Lower age group, removing events to shorten the competition day, looking at the rules around composite teams and second claim athletes and other issues which appear on the agenda later. She identified the particular challenges experienced in the region, which are predominantly around the long competition day and excessive journeys and associated costs. The first questionnaire threw up some interesting challenges as it was clear that the Scottish teams already in the league wished to continue to be able to compete against new and different opposition in a national league and not become a small unit on their own, while other Scottish teams felt that long journeys prevented them joining the league, but the league rules prevented them from joining the existing teams as second claim athletes, so there are a whole swathe of Scottish athletes who are prevented from participating in the league. They have expressed a willingness to travel in order to achieve this, as English clubs do not want to travel to Scotland, and also feel that there is an issue with the large composite teams in Scotland, however there appears to be no appetite to review this issue nationally. The responses from clubs meant that they had felt that the region needed to be structured in such a way that made it financially viable for all teams to participate in the league, and in particular they wanted to avoid excessive travel during exam periods. They had produced their proposal as a compromise to try and meet the needs of all teams in the Northern region. The proposal itself suggested a regionalised structure for rounds 1 and 2 to be run as a virtual league, in round 3 the teams would be re-organised to create a Premier East and Premier West divisions which gave athletes the opportunity to compete against different opposition. Round 4 would then become an area final to find the teams to compete in the national final. There would be no overnight stays for any English clubs and the travel costs for Scottish clubs would be more affordable. The Scottish clubs felt that a geographical East/West split would work if Glasgow and Team Forth Valley were in the West and Edinburgh and Kingdom Athletic were to remain in the East. Janice accepted that the proposal is admin heavy but there are key advantages, not only does it avoid the necessity for excessive travel during exam periods, but also it means that the athletes in the lower divisions have the opportunity to compete against athletes in the bigger clubs, because not all the top ranked athletes compete for the Premier division clubs. There are no overnight stays for English clubs, and the Scottish teams get to meet different opposition in rounds 3 and 4, travel costs will be more affordable and only really apply in rounds 3 & 4. The virtual league tables could run throughout the year and would work easily with the new Excel based results software. Virtual competitions are a concept that most athletes are very familiar with. She finished by asking everyone to consider the needs of the all athletes in the North and Scotland, and vote for the structure that best meets the needs of the athletes and the aims and objectives of the league.

Arwel Williams (Liverpool Harriers) then spoke to the amendment to this proposal. He stated that although the UKYDL had been introduced 4 years ago it clearly hasn't worked especially in the North, and it was very apparent that in terms of regional structure one size doesn't fit all. Liverpool feel that the Working Party proposal wouldn't work for the athletes and will alienate them, because the athletes in the

better clubs would be competing against clubs from lower divisions. The 2016 season however had worked well as a local league for the North West clubs with no long journeys needed to get to matches. He referred to a meeting of the English clubs in the Northern region held in October where the Working Party proposal had been overwhelmingly rejected by the clubs who were there. This amendment would create a third Premier division consisting of the four Scottish teams plus Premier East and Premier West divisions. After the third round of matches, there would be an area final to determine the teams to go the national final, plus plate finals for the remaining teams in the premier divisions. He felt that there would be sufficient teams in Scotland to make up the shortfall in the number of team in a Scottish division. It was also pointed out that Scottish clubs have an advantage in the third fixture as it always clashed with the English Schools' Combined Events, which makes it an unfair competition.

John Smith (Sale Harriers) in seconding the proposal stated that this amendment would provide fairer competition all round; he didn't agree that the Working Party proposal would benefit athletes from the lower clubs because they would have to compete against very big clubs so it just wouldn't work, and it wouldn't work for the bigger clubs as they would be competing against much weaker opposition. The Eastern clubs would have 6 English teams in their divisions with no Scottish clubs and there was no reason why a Scottish division wouldn't work because it did in the Lower age group.

The proposal was then opened to the floor for discussion.

Phil Howe (East Cheshire) queried whether this proposal referred to both age groups or just the UAG, and also whether there would still be promotion and relegation between divisions. It was confirmed that it was just the UAG and the LAG would continue as is, and the promotion and relegation would continue.

Paul Allen (Pitreavie) commented that this was the same on-going debate that had been brought to the AGM for the last three years. He re-iterated that Scottish clubs have no issue with travelling as they accept that it is an outcome of being part of a national league. He further pointed out that the Northern region is the smallest of all the regions and to further sub divide into three smaller units would weaken its structure still further. He disputed the point made earlier that there are other Scottish teams interested in joining the league, having investigated this further there are only 4 Scottish teams interested in taking part in the UAG, and this is not viable as a separate division in its own right, much less a Premier division. There are also implications for other regions who also have composite teams in their make up with long distances to travel.

Andy Ward (Middlesbrough Mandale) pointed out that the June fixture clashes with the English Schools combined events and so would not involve any Scottish athletes.

Joyce Tomala (Cwmbran) pointed out that the Northern region doesn't solely comprise of English and Scottish clubs, there are also Welsh clubs involved. She also reiterated that this is not purely an issue concerning the Northern region, as the Midlands too has a very wide geographical spread. Approving this amendment could have wide ranging implications for other regions.

Janice Kaufman (Gateshead Harriers) stated that the Working Party brief was to find a workable structure for each region so the pathway to the finals could be different in each case.

Arwel Williams (Liverpool Harriers) raised the question as to why there are U17s competing on the same day as the LAG in Scotland which takes away opportunities for

U13 and U15 athletes. **Leslie Roy (Victoria Park Glasgow)** replied that there are some U17 events scheduled as part of an open meeting on the same day as the LAG fixtures but they are for athletes who are at a very low level within their clubs and not of a suitable standard to compete in the UAG. **John Smith (Sale Harriers)** suggested that athletes should compete for their own clubs and not as part of a composite team which would result in more clubs competing in the league. **Leslie Roy (Victoria Park Glasgow)** responded that there appears to be an assumption that all Scottish clubs have a lot of U17 and U20 athletes which is categorically not true for the vast majority of Scottish clubs who would not be viable on their own. The majority of clubs have very, very few athletes and it is usually only 10 – 12 athletes from each club who compete in the composites.

Peter Roughnong (Sale Harriers) asked what happens to the U15 athletes when they become U17? Leslie replied that they go to Shaftesbury Barnet!

Paul Davies (Team Forth Valley) reminded everyone that we are a national league and not a series of local leagues, and as such there is the opportunity to enable the U17 & U20 athletes to travel and compete against different athletes to those they would meet on a regular basis. In Scotland, with a total population less than that in London, it is viewed as part of athlete development and the YDL provides the opportunity to compete against their English counterparts, the only real alternative being to compete in the English Championships which isn't an opportunity available to all. All Scottish Olympians have been through UKYAL or NJAL, demonstrating that the national leagues have facilitated the development of talent through participation. Scottish teams are anxious to remain part of the wider Northern league and will invest their money to travel to the matches in England. The Scottish teams did have reservations about the Working Party proposal, and had suggested an alternative option which would retain an East/West split but with only two Scottish teams in each. He felt that both English and Scottish athletes would benefit from this arrangement. He reiterated that only having four teams in a Premier division is not viable.

His final point reminded everyone that this motion was challenging the integrity of the league and so it was important that all clubs should exercise their right to vote, and he asked that clubs reject this amendment which would prevent the Scottish athletes from participate fully and benefitting from being in a national league.

Moira Maguire (Edinburgh AC) stated that they had been an integral part of this league and its predecessors for many years, and wished to retain the opportunity for their athletes to compete against the best athletes. She presumed that if both proposals were rejected then we would return to the status quo of Premier 1 and Premier 2. It was confirmed that if both were rejected then we would return to the status quo.

Linda Rushworth (Sheffield & Dearne) suggested that having 4 Scottish teams with 2 English teams was not an ideal solution, it wasn't competing against Scottish teams that was a problem for them but the overnight stays involved.

Janice Kaufman (Gateshead) also reiterated that the current clash with the June fixture meant that the English teams were severely weakened.

Joe Fallon (Wirral) appreciated that the discussion is centred around the UAG, but his club felt that the travel in the LAG is potentially a bigger problem with 11 year olds travelling long distances with very little match experience. **Marian** pointed out that they could be just 10 years old in the LAG.

Paul Allen (Pitreavie) reminded the meeting that although the divisions were currently named East and West, they were in fact Premier 1 and Premier 2. There had been no unilateral agreement to rename them East & West, so in reality Liverpool and Sale have just gained promotion to Premier 1 (renamed East for 2016) and Sheffield and Team Forth Valley have been promoted to Premier 2 (renamed West in 2016).

Arwel Williams (Liverpool Harriers) in summing up asked the meeting to reject the Working Party proposal and as the Scottish teams hadn't come up with an alternative proposal he urged everyone to vote to accept the amendment. He reiterated that the LAG wasn't part of the proposal as he felt that having 14 year olds travelling long distances and staying overnight was a bigger issue with clear welfare problems.

The meeting then voted as to whether they wanted the amendment to become the proposal.

For: 31 Against: 28 Abstentions: 58

The motion was carried, and so the amendment to the proposal would now become the substantive motion. As the debate had taken longer than anticipated it was decided to take a short comfort break whereupon the meeting would return to further debate, and then vote upon, the amendment.

Upon reconvening the meeting Grace opened the floor to any new debate on the Liverpool proposal. **Peter Hancock (Preston)** thought that the vote had already been taken and the amendment had been approved.

David Jeacock clarified the situation that the vote taken had been to ascertain whether the amendment to the proposal was to become the substantive motion. It was not a vote as to whether this amendment was accepted or not.

Janice Kaufman (Gateshead Harriers) pointed out that the previous East/West split had not been universally agreed, specifically in relation to the route to the national final. It had been for 2016 only as that was how the teams had ended up after promotions and relegations from 2015 and as there was a working party it had been accepted for 2016. **Grace** replied that the league management committee was tasked with organising the league and as had happened over the last 4 years, changes had been done. She wasn't aware of any complaints regarding the structure this year, but it was something that the management committee could discuss. Janice asked for confirmation that Glasgow would remain in the East, Grace confirmed that they would unless there were further comments on that.

Leslie Roy (Victoria Park Glasgow) requested clarification on this. If the meeting voted against the proposal then would this go back to the management to discuss, or would it be open to further debate.

Grace replied that it was her opinion that it would follow the example of the Midlands and Southern region and would be referred back to clubs for further discussion, but at the moment the status quo would be as per the results of the 2016 season.

Marian stated that it was important that we found a solution which worked for the majority of clubs and athletes. This matter had come up in every AGM so we clearly haven't found a workable solution, and it was equally clear that not all were happy with today's suggestions, so if that meant further discussions with clubs then that so be it. She also pointed out that any club has the right to request a move to a different division or region. **Grace** confirmed that the management group would have to look at this.

Tony Bush (Harrow) called for the matter to go to a vote.

Fiona Smith (Royal Sutton Coldfield) felt that this is clearly an emotive issue and felt that, although clubs in other regions had been asked not to vote, the matter had implications which could affect all regions and so felt that clubs should vote according to their beliefs.

The meeting then voted on the Liverpool proposal

For: 33 Against: 39 Abstentions: 38

The motion was defeated.

There was a query as to the number of votes cast, **David Jeacock** pointed out that they are not necessarily going to match the previous vote for a variety of reasons.

Ken Goodger (Newport) felt that this issue has clearly not been resolved and suggested that the management committee needs to bring the clubs together for further discussion to try to find a suitable resolution which is satisfactory to all clubs concerned.

It was decided to return to item 5.3 on the agenda

Subscriptions for 2016/2017. The Management Committee proposes that subscriptions remain at £200 per team plus such sum as the Management Committee may fix to attend a regional final or promotion match. This subscription is based on three league fixtures in 2017, with area finals to determine the teams going forward to the National Finals.

In the event of the meeting deciding that we continue with four fixtures, the Management propose that subscriptions for 2017 will be £250 per team.

The motion was seconded by **David Little (Team Dorset)**.

Geoffrey Morphitis (Shaftesbury Barnet) stated that the £200 for 4 matches represented excellent value for money. Given that subscriptions generate £63 000 and the grant brings in a further £115 000, if we are to become self-financing then we would have to look at raising the cost of subscriptions by approximately £400 to retain what we have now. He also commented that costs are also rising and are likely to continue to do so in future years so we also have to look at alternative means of saving money such as cutting travel subsidies, track hire refunds, the cost of the finals and other cost cutting methods which are within our control. He stated that £200 is an unrealistically low figure and would vote against this proposal.

Tony Bush (Harrow) said that his club did not want to reduce the number of fixtures to 3, and would like to propose that we stick with 4 fixtures, to which **Grace** replied that the proposal also included an option to raise the subscriptions if clubs voted to stick with 4 fixtures. She agreed with Geoff's figures about the realistic cost being £400 - £500 per team, however it must be borne in mind that if subscriptions increase substantially then many clubs wouldn't be able to afford this and would have to pull out, so in reality we would gain nothing. Until we get the information about funding, we can't make specific plans, other factors which had prompted the move to reducing to 3 fixtures included the congested fixture list and the lack of officials able and willing to cover all the matches, and the complaints from parents about matches in school holidays.

Ken Goodger (Newport) suggested that item 5.3 should be taken in 2 parts, but **David Jeacock** pointed out that it was one resolution; **Grace** replied that if clubs did not

accept the management proposal to reduce to 3 fixtures then the fees would have to be increased.

Bryan Forsbrook (Cheltenham) asked whether the Midlands clubs would be disadvantaged as they had agreed to go to 3 matches with an additional charge for area finals and promotion matches, **Grace** assured him that the management committee would not expect them to pay more than the other regions. **Paul Davies (Team Forth Valley)** commented that the proposal is asking for £200 for 3 matches, if some teams are getting a fourth match then that will cost £50 extra.

Paul Howe (East Cheshire) asked how many clubs were likely to withdraw if the fees went up.

Grace responded that at present we have no empirical evidence at present to answer that question accurately.

There were a number of suggestions as to how the pricing structure on subscriptions could be applied in future from **Andy Parker (Preston)** who suggested we could look at a two tier structure based on membership numbers, **Mick Bromilow (Marshall Milton Keynes)** who thought it could be based on the number of athletes who competed in the previous season, plus there were details about another league who charge £450 per season but this covers all match costs. **Andy Ward (Middlesbrough)** felt that if the fees became too large many teams would pull out and join local leagues instead.

Steve Janes (Bedford & County) proposed that we increase the subscription fees to £250 for 4 matches. This was seconded by **Arwel Williams (Liverpool Harriers)**.

The meeting then voted on this proposal

For: 106 Against: 4 Abstentions: 0

The motion was carried.

6.2.1. Rule 12.1 Clive Poyner (Team Norfolk) spoke briefly to this item on behalf of the Working Party. This proposal, for the Upper age group only, is as a direct result of comments from clubs to increase the number of non-scoring places to from 4 to 6 in track events only to give more opportunities for competition. It was felt that field events would cause a problem as they could potentially increase the length of an already long day.

Geoffrey Morphitis (Shaftesbury Barnet) then proposed the amendment:

“That in the Upper Age Group each team is allowed to enter a non-scoring athlete in up to four events (of either age group) per gender per meeting. No more than two of these events, per gender, may be field events. If more than one such athlete is entered in an event, for the purposes of this rule, each athlete shall be deemed to be entered in a separate event. These athletes shall be included on the declaration sheet.”

He questioned why their proposal was to be considered as an amendment rather than an item in its own right, but Grace explained that both proposals were in regard to rule 12.1 and as such should be taken together. He felt that it would have been helpful to have known in advance what the working party were proposing as it could have had a bearing on what they had proposed.

He pointed out that the original rules penalised athletes in field events and this proposal was intended to help to redress the balance. He suggested that the participation statistics produced by the management committee show that there are very few events with a full quota of athletes and therefore there is capacity to take

any potential additional athletes, indeed the Southern Premier division 1 had done so in summer, albeit illegally. He was amenable to amending the figure to 6 athletes with up to 3 in field events if the meeting chose to do so.

Mark Exley (Rugby & Northampton) asked if Geoff was a field official as it was clear that the length of time an event took, was dependent on the number and quality of officials working on that event, especially in long throws. Geoff confirmed that he was indeed a qualified field official, and that it would be a shame to penalise field athletes because of the quality of officials.

A number of delegates suggested that increasing the number of throwers could cause problems if every club had additional competitors in the same event, and it was also pointed out that a non-scoring athlete was more likely to be a better athlete than those who were competing for a point, and would take more throws than many of them which would lengthen the time of an event.

Marian pointed out that in many of the lower divisions the number of competitors was very low so there was a huge capacity for non-scorers, and it was also pointed out that with a small field there wasn't sufficient recovery time for athletes and the addition of non-scorers would be of benefit to all the athletes competing.

Leslie Roy (Victoria Park Glasgow) asked whether it was worth considering applying a maximum number of competitors in each event. She felt that the proposal was very good especially in lower divisions where there was a lot of scope for additional competitors.

Tony Bush (Harrow) suggested that as the league operates under UKA rules then in terms of equity this proposal should be supported.

Tony Benton (Havering) then submitted a counter proposal *"that in light of the Working Party proposal to increase the number of non-scoring places to six per gender, then this amendment should also increase to six non-scoring places of which no more than three of these, per gender, may be field events.* **Geoff Morphitis (Shaftesbury Barnet)** seconded that counter proposal.

The meeting then voted whether to accept this counter proposal with the amended wording

For: 78 Against: 30

The motion was carried.

The meeting then voted on this new proposal

For: 75 Against: 30

The motion was carried.

6.2.2. **Appendix 2.**

"The YDL Working Party propose that Appendix 2; Rules of Competition; revised progression standards are introduced from 2017".

Clive Poyner (Team Norfolk) stated briefly that the Working Party felt that it was necessary to introduce a revised table of Standards for Progression which were based on the Power of 10 top 150 athletes.

Mark Exley (Rugby & Northampton) seconded the proposal.

Hilary Nash (Team Avon) felt that increasing the standards would potentially put athletes under more pressure as, if fewer athletes were to qualify for additional trials, there would be a tendency to rush them through and they would not be given sufficient recovery time between trials, and while this may work to the benefit of the officials, it would work against the interests of the athletes.

Geoff Morphitis (Shaftesbury Barnet) asked where the empirical evidence was to back up the necessity for the changes. A number of delegates questioned the need to change the existing standards, and it was disputed that the revised figures bore any relation to the 150th mark in the Power of 10.

The meeting then voted on the proposal

The voting was overwhelmingly against the motion.

The motion was defeated.

6.2.3. Appendix 3 *“The YDL Working Party propose that in the interest of the welfare, safe guarding and appropriate athlete development minimum standards to score will be introduced in 2017 for the following events in Premier Divisions on a trial basis.”*

Tim Soutar (Blackheath & Bromley) introduced the proposal on behalf of the Working Party; he stated that this proposal was for the Upper age group in Premier divisions only and stressed that there was no intention to prevent athletes who are learning an event from competing, nor is it the intention to disincentivise them from competing in an event for which they have trained, all performances recorded would still be submitted to Power of 10, however for both athlete development and welfare reasons, they did wish to disincentivise team managers from putting forward athletes for events in which they have no competency.

He then put forward the reasons for submitting this proposal:

1. The YDL is a development league which should be taken seriously. The long standing culture of ‘competing for a point’ doesn’t sit well with the development ethos.
2. Welfare should be a top priority, there is no benefit to either clubs or athletes if they are injured in an event for which they have not been trained, or if the athlete is disincentivised from turning up to a competition for fear of being asked to do something they don’t want to do.
3. This proposal takes away from team managers, and others, the feeling that they have to ask athletes who aren’t competent to do those events.
4. It takes the burden away from officials who have to decide if an athlete is competent or not.
5. There is also the liability risk which affects everyone who would be taken to have a Duty of Care towards the athletes. While the risk may be small, the consequences could be catastrophic, where, potentially, insurance companies could resist paying compensation for accident or injury in some cases.

He indicated that England Athletics are looking at utilising Flying Coaches to assist clubs who have difficulties in finding coaches for some events.

The supporting documents sent out should be ignored as the standards contained within them were too high, but that clubs should vote on the principle of introducing ‘Standards to Score’.

Mick Bromilow (Marshall Milton Keynes) had looked at the standards sent out to clubs, and on checking them against Power of 10 had concluded that they were far too high, he suggested that if this proposal is accepted, then a minimum standard for an event should exclude between 5% - 10% of athletes in the age group.

David Little (Team Dorset) asked if this were for both age group as there was nothing on the agenda to indicate this. It was pointed out that the tables in the supporting documents sent out only showed values for U17 and U20 athletes, and so by

inference it could be concluded that this was for UAG only, and for the Premier divisions only in the first season.

Tony Benton (Havering) expressed some sympathy with the sentiment but felt that there would be no allowance for unfavourable conditions and that it would be a disincentive to athletes who found that they had subsequently competed for no points because of extenuating circumstances. He also questioned why an athlete would compete if they were not going to score points for their team.

Jack Frost (Sale Harriers) spoke in favour of setting minimum standards to score points but they do need to be significantly lower.

Ken Goodger (Newport) thought that the motion hadn't been sufficiently thought through and questioned how the specific events had been selected, especially as Triple Jump hadn't been included. He felt that if there was concerns about team managers putting undue pressure on athletes to compete in events outside their capabilities, then that is the issue that should be tackled. He gave an example of where the introduction of standards in the Welsh Senior League was largely responsible for the demise of that league and wished to avoid the same fate for the YDL. He also felt that putting in standards could result in an increase in the dropout rate, and gave an example from his club where this could have been so.

Paul Allen (Pitreavie) pointed out that the Scottish Mens League had introduced standards to score and this had ultimately killed the league.

Tim Soutar (Blackheath & Bromley) reminded the meeting of the possibility for litigation but **Paul Davies (Team Forth Valley)** refuted this and stated that the introduction of standards would not necessarily prevent any potential litigation, and if they were too low, this would not help. He also felt that until an athlete has had an opportunity to compete in an event they do not know how good they could be. It is the team manager's role to make a judgement as to whether an athlete is capable of doing an event, and it really doesn't matter if the league put in minimum standards or not.

The meeting then voted on the proposal (subject to more suitable standards being applied):

For: 24 Against: 68

The motion was defeated.

6.2 Management Committee proposals for rule changes:

Rule 2.6 & Rule 2.7

Grace explained that these proposals had been brought to the meeting to bring the rules in line with current practice following an agreement with Power of 10 and Athletics Weekly during 2016. **Marian** then confirmed that the number of amendments needed had significantly dropped when we had adopted this change during the course of the year and this had worked well for everyone.

The motion was seconded by **Joyce Tomala (South & East Wales)**

David Little (Team Dorset) suggested that the rule should include the word 'provisional' in relation to the results sent out by host clubs.

Lesley Nunn (Yate) suggested that host clubs may wish to check the results themselves first before sending them out, however it was pointed out this rule wouldn't prevent them from doing that, it was merely to match what is happening now in most cases.

The meeting then voted on the proposal

The voting was overwhelmingly in favour of the motion.

The motion was carried.

Rule 4.1.3

Lorraine explained that this rule was being added to cover a gap in the current rule book which didn't currently cater for this situation.

The motion was seconded by **Keith May (Horsham Blue Star)**.

The meeting then voted on the proposal

The voting was overwhelmingly in favour of the motion.

The motion was carried.

Rule 11.2

Marian explained that this rule was being amended to clarify the rule which was currently unclear.

The motion was seconded by **Keith May (Horsham Blue Star)**.

The meeting then voted on the proposal

The voting was unanimously in favour of the motion.

The motion was carried.

Rule 11.3/11.4/11.4.1

Marian explained that the rules were being amended to simplify the current situation which is misunderstood by both team managers and athletes. It will bring the shorter track events into line with endurance races and field events. The rule change is unlikely to favour any team who incorrectly declares their athletes.

The motion was seconded by **Keith May (Horsham Blue Star)**.

The meeting then voted on the proposal

The voting was overwhelmingly in favour of the motion.

The motion was carried.

7. To consider the following amendments to the constitution.

Proposed by the Working Party

The YDL Working Party propose that constitution item number 2 should be amended:

2. Objects

The objects of the League shall be:

- 2.1 To provide inter club competition for Clubs for athletes who are in the under 20, under 17, (herein after referred to as "Upper Age Group") and under 15 and under 13 age groups (hereinafter defined as "Lower Age Group") as defined in the UKA Rules of Competition, with the exception of school teams who cannot be a member.
- 2.2 To foster and promote athletics for athletes who are in the under 20, under 17, under 15 and under 13 age groups.
- 2.3 To do all things that is incidental or conducive to the attainment of the objects of the League or any one of them.

To be amended to:

- 2.1 *To provide inter club competition for Clubs for athletes who are in the under 20, under 17, (herein after referred to as "Upper Age Group") and under 15 and under 13 age groups (hereinafter defined as "Lower Age Group") as defined in the*

UKA Rules of Competition, with the exception of school teams who cannot be a member.

- 2.2 ***To provide a premier, club based competitive pathway from young athletes to under 20. Offering a high quality competition accessible to athletes of all standards, and an opportunity to retain athletes in the sport to senior level.***
- 2.3 ***To encourage the development, from a whole sport perspective, of athletes, clubs, officials and other volunteers, by working with our governing bodies.***

Grace gave the background to this item, and explained that for 2 years the management committee had been berated for the Aims and Objectives of the league not being relevant. The Working Party had produced a new set of Aims and Objectives based on the returns from the questionnaires sent out to clubs.

The motion was seconded by **Guy Ferguson (Nottingham)**.

David Little (Team Dorset) suggested that the word 'premier' should be removed as it implied that it was concerned with the Premier divisions.

Grace explained that the wording cannot be amended at this meeting.

The meeting then voted on the proposal

Voting was unanimously in favour of this constitutional change.

8 **Election of officers for 2016/2019.** Nominations received for: -

Chairman	Grace Hall
General Committee (4 positions)	Malcolm Charlish Stuart Hall Alan Johnson

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

Grace informed that meeting that as Guy Ferguson had decided to stand down from the committee there now exists a vacancy on the management group, if anyone is interested in filling that vacancy would they please contact her to discuss the position.

Ken Goodger (Newport) offered a vote of thanks to the Officers and management group for the work they had done over the last 12 months.

9. **The 2017 Annual General Meeting will take place on Saturday 18th November 2017.**

The meeting closed at 15:55 and the Chairman wished everyone a safe journey home.



Youth Development League AGM 2016.

Chairman's Report.

Good morning everyone and welcome to the UK YDL AGM.

I will start by congratulating the winners from this year's National Finals weekend, which saw Southampton AC crowned lower age group champions, and Blackheath & Bromley Harriers & AC upper age group 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 2017 representatives for the European Junior Clubs Cup competition. The 2016 European competition took place in Spain on the 17th September and Shaftesbury Barnet Harriers won the men's competition with Blackheath & Bromley Harriers & AC securing 2nd place in the women's competition. Congratulations to all the teams for their successes this year in YDL and beyond.

As ever 2016 has seen many ups and downs and some of our statistics are a pleasure to read, others less so. However I was very encouraged to see that 30 of the 33 competing athletes in this year's European Youth Championships, plus 29 of the 36 for the World Juniors, 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 they are still on an upward trend. Twenty nine events have been bettered this season, some of them more than once, 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 now appear on that listing.

It has been a very busy year, mainly due to the formation of the Working Party which received your support last year. The volunteers who came forward have tried to find the answers to the perceived problems with the league, but like the management committee have realised that it is a hard task to fulfil. They also realised that one size does not fit all, and have sought ways to try and give each area an option that will enhance the competition and fulfill the objectives that were identified. I hope that you, the member clubs representatives, take this into account when the proposals are debated today, and if the proposal does not affect your area, it will be perfectly acceptable not to vote on matters that do not affect you.

I did warn whoever volunteered that it would be a significant commitment, and so it has proved to be, it therefore gives me great pleasure to thank all the members of the Working Party for the work they have done, it was appreciated.

The other major change that took place this season involved the implementation of the Governing Body Registration rule. One of our funding partners, England Athletics, undertook the task of checking that athletes were registered in accordance with the Governing Body rules. It was a mammoth task, but in the majority of cases, clubs who were advised that an athlete was





unregistered, ensured that payment was made to the relevant Home Country within the timescale allowed in the rules. As some of you may remember, we advised that from this season we would be looking for a computerised results system which would cope with registration checking. The sub group who took on the search for such a results program are now within striking distance of placing a contract, which will enable host clubs to check that declared athletes are registered by utilising the athlete URN. It does of course mean that team managers need to be in possession of the relevant information from their clubs officers; good communication at club level will be required in 2017.

As some of you will be aware, the 4 year funding cycle finishes this year. To enable the league to go into the bid for the next round of funding, we had to provide a range of information to England Athletics and UKA this summer. The main change being that as we were in receipt of funding already, we now needed to look at how we become self-financing. As a consequence of this we had to provide information on how we would achieve the required result, and of course one of those decisions was a reduction to three rounds of competition. It is always hard to accept major changes, but with only four years to achieve what is required of us, that is what we are recommending in 2017. There are of course other ways of dealing with the problem, hefty subscription increases, reduction of the assistance given to clubs and of course getting rid of the finals. However a reduction in rounds was also seen as a starting point to assist with other areas we all struggle with, officials, a very congested fixtures calendar and not enough volunteers. The Management Committee are tasked with managing the league, and that is what we are trying to do without compromising the integrity of the competition for member clubs.

It would be very remiss of us to do nothing but sit back and hope, in fact that would be very foolhardy. We are not expecting to hear if our application has been successful until February/March 2017, where we may then be faced with a large reduction in funding, or if we are lucky, a more gradual reduction over the next four years. Whatever happens, we have to achieve our independence.

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

Finally, none of this would happen without the officials, volunteers and funding partners, UKA and England Athletics, who have made it possible for our matches to take place, and to the management committee members who have worked so hard to pull it all together.

Grace Hall.





Administrator's Annual Report to the AGM November 2016

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

As we come to the end of the 4th year of our existence, we are faced with some very difficult decisions. Our aim is still to provide the best possible competition for all our athletes and to offer the right environment for them to improve and progress to be the best they can be. For some this will be to represent their country at the highest level - and Grace has already alluded to the number of athletes who have come through the ranks at YDL competitions to compete for GB at Youth and Junior level, whilst for others it may be enough to improve upon their PBs season upon season. Our league has to cater for a whole range of people – none more important than any other, the challenge remains as to how we do this.

Finances have been at the forefront of our minds this year as the original funding arrangements have now come to an end, and we've had to think long and hard about how we can cut our expenditure down whilst still offering the service to athletes and clubs. Some tough decisions will have to be made by everyone involved and you, the clubs, have a role to play in this decision making process.

One of the proposals we have put to you, the clubs, is that we cut down the league programme to just 3 rounds. A number of clubs have requested that we use the 4th match date to organise area finals to ensure that the best teams in each region qualify for the national finals, others have suggested that we hold promotion matches to ensure that all the teams are competing in the most appropriate division; whilst it's obvious that all regions do not have to work in exactly the same way, there must be some parity and equality of opportunity across them all.

There have been some tough conversations about travelling distances, it would be lovely to think that no-one has to travel for longer than an hour to get the best competition, but for some teams that can never happen – some athletes alone can travel for over an hour to get to their club before they set off, and for some teams the nearest club to them is well over an hour away. Whilst we've made a great effort to ensure that the lower divisions are organised on a geographical basis, without the resultant division being a mere repetition of other local leagues, we are also aware that for the athletes in Premier divisions to get the best competition, it will inevitably involve longer journeys. Unfortunately as a national league, we need to be inclusive and offer the opportunity to compete at a relevant level to all athletes.

We are the biggest league in the country, with 129 teams competing in the UAG, and 189 teams in the LAG, which amounted to a total of 267 clubs in 2016. Some teams have over 70 athletes regularly turning out for them, most have a more modest number and some have only a handful of athletes, all however want to do the best for their team. Some athletes are novices to their events but with the right support will develop their skills and improve in leaps and bounds over a season, others are already highly proficient and will therefore make much smaller improvements in their performances, but again we need to cater for both ends of the spectrum.





As in previous years, between January and April I have been kept very busy making sure that clubs are given all the support they need to organise, or to attend, matches, and the area coordinators and I are kept busy dealing with the myriad of questions from both experienced old hands and total newcomers into their roles. It's sometimes difficult to remember that whilst we believe everything is perfectly clear and understandable, others coming into it with fresh eyes don't always find it so.

April through to September is always a very busy period dealing with results and a whole host of other issues often arising from fixtures. Last year we agreed to change the format of the field events in the UAG to allow for different combinations of the age groups; this seems to have been very well received, although some clubs initially struggled to understand how it worked, eventually most managed to get to grips with this rule. Probably the biggest hurdle for us all was the change in the ruling on registration, thankfully Grace took the pressure off me in this and threaded her way through the many complications to resolve a lot of the issues painlessly for most clubs. I hope that for 2017 everyone is now fully cognisant with the rules and there will be less infringements to be resolved, although from past experience, that may be wishful thinking!

There were 76 UAG and 103 LAG fixtures plus 2 area finals and 2 national finals, which makes for an awful lot of data to go through. The vast majority of fixtures were checked and finalised within 3 weeks of each match, although I was still receiving a handful of requests for changes up to the end of September. Our small band of divisional recorders once again worked hard within their divisions to make sure that the results were accurate, and I owe them a debt of gratitude for taking some of the pressure off me. We managed to get agreement from Power of 10 and Athletics Weekly that our results could be sent through slightly later this year which allowed for some changes to be made by host clubs within the first 24 hours; this made a big difference as many of the amendments were made before they arrived in my Inbox.

We will have a new results software package for 2017, partly as a consequence of the new demands placed on us around registration, but also for financial reasons. The new system will be rolled out in the New Year and details will be available on the website in plenty of time for host clubs to familiarise themselves with it.

Grace has alluded to the Working Party in her report, and it has been interesting to note that the recommendations for the UAG structures have been quite varied from region to region. The Midlands clubs have looked to expand on their re-structuring of last year, the Southern clubs have come up with a recommendation to largely remove the linear component of our existing structure, whilst the Northern clubs are trying to come up with an equitable structure that goes some way to resolving their geographical problems, without penalising teams who by virtue of their location will always be on the periphery of the structure.

Participating statistics are never far from our minds, we once again monitored the number of athletes participating in each match for each division (Stats 1), and also looked at the number of competitors in each event in every match (Stats 2) to try to identify areas where we may need to change what we offer. There is an argument to be made as to whether we look at aligning the format of the track events with the field events, as it's clear that many clubs are not able to field full teams of four athletes in many track events and with the option of utilising non scoring places





this could be an area which merits further investigation. It may also be useful to look at this division by division, and feedback from clubs is always welcome, on this and any other matters.

Once again it is the UAG that has come under the most scrutiny, not because we value the LAG any less, but the comments and complaints that come in are heavily stacked in 'favour' of the UAG and consequently this remains the biggest area of concern.

Every year I am amazed at the amount of responsibility undertaken by volunteers in our sport, and the fact that you are all here today is testament to the passion and commitment that exists in clubs, both small and large, throughout the country. Thank you to all the volunteers in our clubs, to the team managers who work tirelessly for their athletes, to the officials without whom none of the matches could take place, and also to the parents who regularly support their efforts. I would also like to express my personal thanks to the members of the management committee, who are also volunteers with many other commitments both within and without the sport.

Thank you all for your hard work over the last 12 months.

I would just like to leave you with this final thought – I'm in no doubt that we all want the best possible deal for the athletes, and if we can find ways of working together to this end, our sport will be strong enough to withstand whatever is thrown at it.

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads 'Marian Williams'. The signature is written in a cursive style and is positioned above a thin, horizontal blue line.

Marian Williams
YDL Administrator



YDL Finance Officer's Report 2016

In December of 2015 a sum of just under £89,000 was paid to clubs in respect of claims for track hire, mileage, first aid, photofinish and EDM. This amount is higher than last year as a decision was made to remind clubs about making claims.

In September this year a sum of just over £24,000 was paid for Hardship Claims. The results of these payment is that there is a reduction in the amount available to carry forward for next year.

Payment of subscription fees was much better this year, with the majority of clubs having paid by the end of February. However, there are still the persistent late payers. This year the subscriptions must be paid by the end of February or there is a chance that your club will not be able to compete in the League.

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 again this year but still need to look for other ways of reducing these costs.

As referred to by both the Chair and the Administrator we are at the end of the 4 year cycle of funding agreed when the League was set up. At this moment in time we are unaware of the exact amount of funding we will be getting for the forthcoming season. However, we are aware that it is likely to be substantially lower than the last four years, therefore cuts need to be made in our expenditure. The committee have looked at different ways of reducing costs - reduction in the number of matches, increase in subscriptions fees and continuing to reduce the cost of the finals. Whatever is decided at this AGM there will significant reduction in the amount of monies available to reimburse clubs next season.

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 2016
BALANCE SHEET AS AT 30 SEPTEMBER 2016

		2016	2015
		£	£
ASSETS			
Fixed Assets			
Computer Equipment	- Net Book Value	280	353
	Note 2		
Current Assets			
Cash at Bank	- Current Account	35,105	7,687
	- Deposit Account	<u>100,036</u>	<u>90,750</u>
		135,141	98,437
Debtors	Note 3	115	57,505
Current Liabilities			
Amounts Due Within One Year:			
Creditors	Note 4	450	6,436
Proposed Distribution to Areas and Clubs		<u>75,000</u>	<u>75,000</u>
		<u>75,450</u>	<u>81,436</u>
Net Current Assets		<u>59,806</u>	<u>74,506</u>
		<u><u>60,086</u></u>	<u><u>£74,859</u></u>
CAPITAL ACCOUNT AND RESERVES			
Accumulated Funds			
Balance as at 1 October 2015		74,859	78,331
(Deficit) for Year		<u>-14,773</u>	<u>-3,472</u>
		<u><u>£60,086</u></u>	<u><u>£74,859</u></u>

.....
L. Vidler 12 November 2016
Treasurer

Independent Examiner's Report

I have examined the books and records of the Youth Development League for the year ended 30 September 2016, 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 12 November 2016

YOUTH DEVELOPMENT LEAGUE
INCOME AND EXPENDITURE ACCOUNT
FOR THE YEAR ENDED 30 SEPTEMBER 2016

	2016		2015
	£	£	£
INCOME			
Affiliation Fees		63,400	62,150
Grants from UKA		115,000	115,000
Interest Received		286	164
		178,686	177,314
EXPENDITURE			
Administration Costs			
Committee Expenses	5,894		4,749
Postage and Phone	123		227
Stationery	369		186
Working Party	1,735		-
Administration Fees	24,600		25,600
		32,721	30,762
Contribution to Clubs for Track Hire and Mileage		81,596	80,819
League Match Costs		27,319	22,474
Cost of Staging Finals	Note 5	26,546	29,695
Hardship Payments		24,100	16,020
Miscellaneous Expenditure			
Website and Software	260		35
Accounts Fee	450		450
Depreciation	457		330
Sundries	10		201
		1,177	1,016
		193,459	180,786
(Deficit) to Accumulated Funds		(£14,773)	(£3,472)

YOUTH DEVELOPMENT LEAGUE

ACCOUNTS FOR THE YEAR ENDED 30 SEPTEMBER 2016

NOTES TO THE ACCOUNTS

1 Accounting Policies

Basis of Preparation of Accounts

The accounts have been prepared under the historical cost convention.

Fixed Assets Depreciation Policy

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

Computer and PA Equipment 33%

	2016		2015
	£	£	£
2 Fixed Assets - Computer Equipment			
Cost			
Brought Forward		990	920
Additions		384	70
Carried Forward		<u>1374</u>	<u>990</u>
Accumulated Depreciation			
Brought Forward		637	307
Charge for the Year		457	330
Carried Forward		<u>1094</u>	<u>637</u>
Net Book Value		<u>£280</u>	<u>£353</u>
3 Debtors			
Grants Due from UKA		<u>£115</u>	<u>£57,505</u>
4 Creditors			
Finals		-	5,857
Committee Expenses		-	129
Independent Examiner's Fee		450	450
		<u>£450</u>	<u>£6,436</u>
5 Cost of Staging Finals			
Income			
Gate Receipts and Sale of Programmes		2855	2,554
Franchises		350	305
		<u>3,205</u>	<u>2,859</u>
Expenditure			
Track Hire and Staffing Costs	5,621		7,326
Medals and Trophies	3,552		3,728
Programmes	613		663
Competitors' Numbers etc.	366		144
Officials' Expenses and Catering	16,139		17,200
Administration	500		500
Team Expenses	2,500		2,663
PA Hire	250		-
EDM Hire	210		330
		<u>29,751</u>	<u>32,554</u>
Net Cost		<u>£26,546</u>	<u>£29,695</u>