

**Agenda for the**  
**Bury Area Chess League**  
**Annual General Meeting 2021**

**Date and Time: 7pm 20 July**  
**Venue: Zoom**

- 1. Welcome**
  - a. Present
  - b. Apologies
  
- 2. Minutes of the previous AGM, 26 August 2020**
  - a. Adoption of minutes subject to any corrections
  - b. Matters arising from those minutes
  
- 3. Officers' Reports – any prepared will be circulated but with the exception of the Treasurer's Report only arising questions will be discussed; some of these may not be necessary given we have had a null year**
  - a. Chairman
  - b. Treasurer
    - i. Report and Proposed fees for next season
  - c. Fixture Secretary and Roger Goldsmith Organiser
  - d. Grading Officer
  - e. Internet Officer
  - f. Congress Organiser
  
- 4. Further Matters for the Consideration of the Meeting**
  - a. Resumption of Over the Board Play
  - b. Rule Changes necessary to accommodate new monthly grading system
  - c. Proposed changes to rules 1.5 to 1.6
  
- 5. Election of Officers**
  
- 6. League and RGT Entries**
  
- 7. Upcoming Events**
  
- 8. Patrick Ribbands**
  
- 9. Any other Business**

Minutes of the  
**Bury Area Chess League  
Annual General Meeting**

Held 26 August 2020 online @ 7:30pm on Jitsi.org

## 1. Welcome

### a. Present

Club	Attendees	Count
Bury (max 7 votes)	Steve Lovell (SL), Bob Jones (BJ), Colin Roberts (CR), Steve Ruthen (SR), Dick Myhill (DM)	5
Cambridge (6)	Norman Hutchinson (NH), Stephen Pride (SP), John Daugman (JD), Philip Fallon (PF)	4
Ely (3)	Mark Szymanski (MS), Oliver Lenton (OL)	2
Linton (7)	Alan Richardson (AR), Paul Kemp (PK), Chris Davison (CD), Margherita Boroni (MB), Paul McMahon (PM), Michael Osborn (MO)	6
Stowmarket (2)	David Green (DG), Stephen Lewis (SLe)	2
Sudbury (2)	N/A	0
Total (27)		19

### b. Apologies

Ed Player (Bury)

## 2. Ratification that this online meeting may serve as our AGM due to exceptional circumstances

This was unopposed.

## 3. Minutes of the previous AGM, 16 July 2019

AR commented that these seemed to him an accurate record of events and noted that while a few actions had been required all appeared to have been addressed. With no comments to the contrary, the minutes were accepted and no matters arising were raised.

## 4. Officers Reports

### a. Chairman (AR)

As the chairman's report included no items for voting and mostly served as an introduction to other items on the agenda, AR was happy to move to the next agenda item without discussion.

b. Treasurer (PK)

PK presented the accounts for the 2019-20 season, noting the small surplus of £23. However, the balance is healthy, and suspecting both that any 2020-21 season would be a short one and that club finances may be tighter, PK proposed to waive club fees for any league competitions which are held. However, if there are any fees from the ECF relating to non-ECF members playing matches, those fees will be charged to clubs as usual. This proposal passed unopposed.

c. Internet Officer (SL)

SL commented at that issues raised at the last AGM about the bonus point had been handled by the LMS, and noted only a small number of issues with the LMS relating mainly to confirmation of fixtures (no chasing email, hard for the confirming captain to find the match to confirm it) and to determining the Player of the Year standings from the available views of the data. The LMS developers are aware of these issues and are working to improve the system.

d. Congress Secretary (SL)

The surplus for the 2019 event mostly related to rebates from PayPal due to overcharging in previous years. Without those the figures would have shown that the congress approximately broke even. The 2020 event has been cancelled, due to COVID-19 and the financial risks associated with expensive venue hire and low turnout. An online event for 2020 is being considered.

We hope to hold a congress in 2021. However, as the future course of the pandemic is unknown, there is still a material risk of outright cancellation, which could see league funds entirely consumed by non-refundable venue hire costs and other outgoings. The Executive proposed, and the meeting approved, that the 2021 congress should run in accordance with a business plan supported by the Executive. The plan should assess the level of financial risk in proceeding with the 2021 event, particularly such risk associated with COVID-19, and outline actions being taken to mitigate that risk.

**Action: Congress team to put together such a plan in spring 2021.**

## 5. Further Matters for the Consideration of the Meeting

a. Trophies Report and Recommendation

NH briefly outlined the problems he has experienced as trophy officer, noting the difficulty of keeping track of trophies and the expense of engraving, particularly if done on the high street rather than with a specialist. Adding to this the poor state of the trophies and low regard in which they seem to be held, the executive asked the meeting to consider four proposals in relation ceasing to award trophies. OL spoke in favour of retaining trophies, feeling that it would be unfair to retain only the Division 1 trophy as many players (and indeed some clubs) are not in a position to compete for this. After some discussion, the meeting approved the following approach:

- That all team trophies other than for Div 1 and Roger Goldsmith Div 1 cease to be awarded.
- That memento Player of the Year trophies continue to be awarded.

The meeting further approved the proposal that retired trophies (Div 2, Div 3, Goldsmith Div 2, Jamboree) be offered first to clubs who have won them most frequently, but with the proviso that no club should receive more than one, unless the offer has been declined by other clubs.

**Action: Admin Sec (OL) to locate trophies and implement the above proposal for retired trophies.**

b. Flattening the Executive structure to facilitate engagement with clubs

AR outlined a proposal to amend rules 1.4 and 1.5, and therein to remove the concept of a “core Executive”, which has created a two-tier leadership structure, and replace this with a single tier in which all officers are considered members of the Executive with equal standing

NH and SP expressed some concern that not all officers were equally needed at all meetings, and that removing the notion of a core member would therefore make it harder to arrange meetings and force some officers to attend meetings in which they had little to contribute. CR commented that the trophies officer, for example, was on the Executive not only to fulfil that office but also represent his club and to generally contribute to all decisions related to the running of the league.

The meeting generally supported the proposal to move to a single-tier executive but found the wording of 1.4 in particular problematic and asked for a change to 1.5 for quoracy to require two thirds of the executive to be present at a meeting (rounded down).

In response to BJ’s comment that clubs not represented on the Executive should be allowed to contribute a representative, SL responded that this was already permitted under rule 1.6. SP noted that the wording of rule 1.6 was also problematic, suggesting that to participate in meetings a club representative must also bring a proposal to the meeting. It was agreed that this was not what was intended in the rule and that a revision should be made.

**Action: SL to redraft rules 1.4, 1.5, 1.6 within the expectations of the meeting.**

c. Suspension and Resumption of League Activities

i. Results of consultation

These were included in the papers for information, but it was not necessary to review these here.

ii. the Completion, or otherwise, of the suspended 2019-20 season

AR outlined the basic options that the meeting is presented with (a) to “cancel” or “void” the suspended season, (b) to attempt to complete it when over the board chess resumes or (c) to determine final outcomes based upon the available results.

Voiding the season was felt to be undesirable since such a large proportion of the matches had been completed, while completing the season when over the board chess resumes was rejected because club and therefore team membership is likely to be very different by that time and the resulting completion would be merely notional. Only two methods for determining the outcomes of the 2019-20 season based on available results were given any backing: NH and others argued for teams being ranked based upon the percentage of available points they had scored. CR and others argued that this would create unfairness as some teams will have played a weaker team twice and others will have played a stronger team twice. CR’s counter proposal was, for the purposes of deciding the final ordering of teams, to use only the first meeting of teams and to disregard the result of any second meeting. Opinion was sufficiently divided that it was necessary to hold a vote, which resulted in a victory for the percentage based approach, mostly on the grounds that it made it unnecessary to disregard any match results and tended to “even-out” any large differences in performance between the first half of the season and the remainder.

JD asked for, and received, confirmation that while titles would be awarded on this basis, no promotions or relegations would be effected and when the league resumes the make up of the divisions will be approached with the aim of giving putting all teams into divisions where they are well suited to play.

iii. Formation of a committee to make decisions about next steps

AR explained that it would be neither possible nor desirable for the league to mandate the return of a club to league chess and that therefore it would be necessary for all clubs to be engaged in discussions of when league chess can resume.

JD raised a possible concern about a club effectively vetoing the resumption of normal activities by refusing to recommence play under conditions that other clubs found acceptable. AR agreed that while it would obviously be preferable to include all clubs at the point of resumption, it will be for the committee to decide whether that is necessary. Including all clubs in the discussion will at least mean that clubs are aware of this situation should it arise.

CR was keen to ensure that any committee saw its primary duty as deciding upon when it will be safe to resume normal league activities and not to determine the exact shape that those activities should take. PK agreed but wanted to expedite the process of commencement by making sure that relevant officers (principally the Match Secretary and Roger Goldsmith Organiser) are involved in these decisions and so can begin making plans at the earliest opportunity.

Most discussion focussed on the make up of the proposed committee, with consensus eventually settling on the following membership:

- A representative from each club

If not already included as a club representative, the following officers will also be included.

- Chair
- Match Secretary
- Roger Goldsmith Organiser

**Action: All clubs to notify AR of who will be the representative of their club on this committee. AR to establish channels of communication and meetings (face to face or online) if felt necessary.**

iv. Consideration of online chess until normal activities resume

PK explained options available to the league, either to run its own competitions or to join with competitions which have already been established, with the latter being the recommendation of the Executive. PK and SL recommended that clubs consider entering teams into the Icen Live League event and that individuals could also enter the Icen Live Classic. The Icen League is an all play all league with divisions determined by ECF grades of players involved with a team. Matches are double-headers using a time control of 15m+10s. The Icen Classic is a Swiss individual event using a time control of 45m+15s. These may attract different players, though people could feasibly play in both. These competitions are available to clubs across Norfolk, Suffolk, Cambridgeshire, parts of Lincolnshire and possibly also Bedfordshire.

SL asked whether with these competitions available it was necessary for the BACL to run any additional events of its own whether using different time controls or employing a different format. He offered to run an online Jamboree if there was interest. PK, echoed by SL, suggested that having too many events risked spreading players too thinly and could result in poorly supported events.

The meeting agreed that there was no need for BACL sponsored online events.

**Action: Clubs to consider entering teams into the Icen Live League and inviting individuals to join the Icen Live Classic. Clubs with members who are interested but who cannot support a full team may wish to contact PK or SL about joining a Linton or Bury team as a “guest”.**

## 6. Honours

Based on the decisions made about completing the 2019-20 season, PK was able to confirm the following competition winners.

Competition	Winning Team	Player of the Year
Division 1	Bury Scarabs	Jaden Jermy
Division 2	Cambridge Oddfellows	Trevor Robbins
Division 3	Linton Lemurs	Oren Pilowsky-Bankirer
RGT Division 1	Linton Linnets	
RGT Division 2	Linton Lapwings	

PK commented that no decisions had been made about Game of the Season, and that he had planned to extend an invitation submit games for consideration at around the time play was suspended. He proposed extending this invitation now with a deadline at the end of September, and the meeting approved this.

**Action: PK to email clubs inviting their members to submit games from the 2019-20 season for consideration in the game of the season competition.**

## 7. Election of Officers

Other than those who had already stepped down from their roles, all other officers were happy to continue. MS who had taken over as acting Match Secretary MS was happy to continue in that role. OL agreed to stand for the role of Admin Secretary. All were (re)elected en bloc.

Office	2019-20 Officer	Status	2020-21 Officer
Chair	Alan Richardson		Alan Richardson
Vice-chair	Vacant		Vacant
Match Secretary	Chris Davison	Stepped down	Mark Szymanski
Admin Secretary	Stephen Pride	Stepped down	Oliver Lenton
Treasurer	Paul Kemp		Paul Kemp
Congress Director	John Wickham		John Wickham
Congress Secretary	Steve Lovell		Steve Lovell
Internet Officer	Steve Lovell		Steve Lovell
Roger Goldsmith Organiser	Mark Szymanski		Mark Szymanski
Grader	Bob Jones		Bob Jones
Handbook Editor	Bob Jones		Bob Jones
Jamboree Organiser	Bob Jones		Bob Jones
Trophy Officer	Norman Hutchinson	Stepped down	Vacant / Role Retired

## 8. Upcoming Events

No upcoming events were noted.

## 9. Any other Business

### a. Refreshments at over the board games

SL relayed an item from the Bury club about availability of refreshments, which we'd like to see made easier at some venues. This was acknowledged but might prove problematic in upcoming future due to coronavirus measures.

### b. BACL Handbook for 2020-21

BJ queried whether a handbook for any 2020-21 competition would be required. Amidst much praise for BJ's efforts producing the Handbook each year, the meeting agreed that no printed version would be necessary for 2020-21, but depending on how much of a 2020-21 season takes place a PDF version would be welcome. CR suggested that in any event a cut down version to maintain continuity of records might be worth producing.

**Close of meeting: 9:44pm**

## **BURY AREA CHESS LEAGUE**

### **Treasurer's Report, 2020/21**

With the League having been in abeyance throughout the 2020/21 season there is little to report so I will forego the pro-forma accounts this year.

The League's accumulated balance at 30 April 2020 was £1678.48. No income has been received in the past year and just two items of expenditure incurred. Website costs amounted to £76.80, and £120 was paid in Game-of-the-Season prizes from 2019/20. Congratulations to the three divisional winners, Aarnavh Trivedi, Giulio Sahinoz and William Gu who have each received £40. The League's year-end balance stands at £1481.68.

The Bury St Edmunds Congress was not held in 2020. The Congress has separate accounts and their balance has increased from £1345 in April 2020 to £1534.53 at the end of April 2021. This is because of sponsorship and donations received in anticipation of a Congress in 2020 (which the donors were happy to see carried forward to this year), partially offset by website costs. It is currently hoped that it will be possible to hold the 2021 Congress in late October.

For the forthcoming season I propose to waive entry fees for the League and Roger Goldsmith competitions. The League can afford to forego the £400 or so that they normally raise, and clubs' finances are likely to be under pressure as they endeavour to restore membership levels to pre-pandemic levels. However any fines from the ECF in respect of non-members competing in League events would be passed on, and if hard copies of handbooks are produced I propose that the costs are recovered by charging clubs based on the number ordered.

PAUL KEMP

Treasurer



## INTRODUCTION OF A MONTHLY RATING SYSTEM

As of August 2020, the ECF has moved on to a monthly rating system to replace twice-yearly grading.

The new ratings are based on the final grading list (August 2020), using a conversion: **Rating = 7.5\*August grade + 700**. So if someone was graded 150 in the August 2020 list, their new rating would be 1825. A few other examples:

100 grade = 1450

125 grade = 1638

175 grade = 2013

200 grade = 2200

New ratings can be viewed in the Ratings Database at [https://www.ecfrating.org.uk/v2/new/list\\_players.php](https://www.ecfrating.org.uk/v2/new/list_players.php)

Each player has up to five ratings: Standard play, Rapid, Online (Standard, Rapid, Blitz). If you have been playing online, your ratings may have been updated since August 2020, but OTB grades will be unchanged as no events have taken place during Covid.

In the BAFL the only competition where grades have been used in the past is the Roger Goldsmith Memorial Trophy (see below). However, grades are important when deciding board order:

**BAFL Rule 5** covers grades:

5.1 (for board order) “ ... a **permitted tolerance** of 10 grading points”

The rest of Rule 5 is concerned with estimated grades and the mid-season update, neither of which are relevant in the new rating system.

We need to agree what the ‘permitted tolerance’ should be. Strictly speaking, it is  $10 \times 7.5 = 75$  rating points. This may be considered a little too complicated, so perhaps 70 or 80 rating points might be a simpler calculation. Alternatively, an even simpler system would be to permit a 100 rating point difference, which is equivalent to about  $13\frac{1}{2}$  grading points. Bear in mind that we have allowed a 15-point tolerance at some point in the past.

### **Roger Goldsmith**

We also need to agree the aggregate rating limits for the two Roger Goldsmith competitions. They are currently 580 and 500 (grades). The direct equivalents are 7150 and 6550. These are calculated by taking the average grade per player (145 and 125 respectively), multiplying each by 7.5 and adding 700. Finally, multiplying the result by 4.

We can either accept the direct correlation, or make them slightly simpler, say 7200 and 6600 (equivalent to 587 and 507 grades).

Finally, we need to agree the relevant rating list for calculation purposes. It is suggested that the September 2021 list should be used throughout the coming season. This is preferable to using the current (monthly) list, which might involve players being unable to represent a team for which they have played, earlier in the season (or vice versa).

## PROPOSED RULE CHANGES FOR BACL AGM

Players will be aware that the ECF has moved to a monthly rating system (instead of a twice-yearly grading system). This has necessitated changes to a number of League rules (especially Rule 5) as well as the Roger Goldsmith Trophy rules. The current BACL post of 'Grader' should be renamed 'Ratings Officer'.

Current	Proposed
<p><b>3.1</b> Teams will consist of four nominated players who should play in grading order (subject to rule 5.1). Any substitute must be graded not more than ten points higher than the player being replaced.</p>	<p><b>3.1</b> Teams will consist of four nominated players who should play in rating order (subject to rule 5.1). Any substitute must be graded not more than 100 points higher than the player being replaced.</p>
<p><b>3.3</b> No person may be nominated for more than one team and all nominated board grades must relate to specific members of the club.</p>	<p><b>3.3</b> No person may be nominated for more than one team and all nominated board ratings must relate to specific members of the club.</p>
<p><b>4.6 (part)</b> To be eligible the player should be graded not more than 10 points above the nominated grade for that board, unless the opposing captain agrees otherwise.</p>	<p><b>4.6 (part)</b> To be eligible the player should be rated not more than 100 points above the nominated grade for that board, unless the opposing captain agrees otherwise.</p>
<p><b>5</b> Grading, board order and eligibility</p>	<p><b>5</b> Ratings, board order and eligibility</p>
<p><b>5.1</b> At the start of the season, teams should play in order of their most recently published slowplay grades, but a week after the ECF's mid-season grading list is published, the latest grades should be used. These requirements are subject to a permitted tolerance of 10 grading points. Players with a grade below 90 may play in any order among themselves.</p>	<p><b>5.1</b> Throughout the season, teams should play in order of their standard over-the board (OTB) ratings as published in the current monthly list. One week's grace will be allowed for implementation, following the publication of each monthly rating list.</p> <p><b>5.2</b> Board order is subject to a permitted tolerance of 100 rating points.</p> <p><b>5.3</b> Players with a current standard OTB rating below 1375 may play in any order among themselves.</p>
<p><b>5.2</b> For the purposes of nomination and eligibility, a player's grade will be his slowplay grade or estimated grade at the start of the season, and this continues to apply after the ECF publishes mid-season grades. However, a week</p>	<p><b>5.4</b> For the purposes of nomination and eligibility, a player's rating will either be his standard OTB rating as published in the July rating list, or an estimated rating (see 5.5).</p>

<p>after the new grading list is published the latest grade should be used to determine board order (subject to the permitted tolerances). A person without a category A to E standard play grade at the start of the season will be given an estimated grade, which will be used for nomination, eligibility and board order until either the grader revises it or the player acquires a category A to E grade in the mid-season ECF list, whereupon the new grade will be used after a week's delay.</p>	
<p><b>5.3</b> Where a player is ungraded the club secretary will provide the Match Secretary with an estimated grade, which should be used for the purposes of these rules. The estimate should be based on all known data, including old grades from a previous list and games held by the grader. Should the grader consider the estimate to be significantly different to the player's performance (either when first submitted or during the course of the season) he will notify the Match Secretary, the Internet Officer and the club secretary, and the grader's estimate should be used thereafter. The grader will treat all category F grades, which are based on fewer than nine games, as estimated grades and therefore subject to revision.</p>	<p><b>5.5</b> Where a player has no published standard OTB rating, the club secretary will provide the Match Secretary with an estimated rating, which should be used for the purposes of these rules. This estimate should be based on all known data, including old ratings or grades from previous lists, as well as current rapidplay ratings and online ratings. The estimate should be used thereafter, until the player concerned receives a current standard OTB rating in a published monthly rating list.</p>
<p><b>Roger Goldsmith</b></p> <p><b>3</b> Rule 5.3 (estimated grades)</p>	<p><b>3</b> Rule 5.5 (estimated ratings)</p>
<p><b>4</b> Teams are subject to a maximum aggregate grading limit of 580 in Division 1, or 500 in Division 2, calculated in accordance with Rule 5.2 of the League Rules.</p>	<p><b>4</b> Teams are subject to a maximum aggregate rating limit of 7200 in Division 1, or 6500 in Division 2, calculated in accordance with Rule 5.4 of the League Rules.</p>
<p><b>5</b> Any player with an actual or estimated grade of under 80 in Division 1 shall be deemed to have a grade of 80 for the purposes of calculating the team's aggregate grade. The corresponding figure in Division 2 shall be 60.</p>	<p><b>5</b> Any player with an actual or estimated rating of under 1300 in Division 1 shall be deemed to have a rating of 1300 for the purposes of calculating the team's aggregate grade. The corresponding figure in Division 2 shall be 1150.</p>
<p><b>6</b> Should a team default one or more boards the aggregate team grade will be that of the</p>	<p><b>6</b> Should a team default one or more boards the aggregate team rating will</p>

<p>players present plus a notional grade for each defaulted board. Where the bottom board is defaulted it will be 80 points in Division 1, or 60 in Division 2. If a board other than the bottom board is defaulted in either division the notional grade attaching to that board will be the grade of the player on the next lowest board. <i>(For example, if a team defaults board 2 and the player on board 3 is graded 130, then the notional grade for board 2 will be 130).</i></p>	<p><b>be that of the players present plus a notional rating for each defaulted board. Where the bottom board is defaulted it will be 1300 points in Division 1, or 1150 in Division 2. If a board other than the bottom board is defaulted in either division the notional rating attaching to that board will be the rating of the player on the next lowest board. <i>(For example, if a team defaults board 2 and the player on board 3 is rated 1700, then the notional grade for board 2 will be 1700).</i></b></p>
<p><b>7</b> A team that breaches the aggregate grading limit will normally have one game point transferred to the opposing team (subject to a maximum win of 4-0), though the game results will stand for grading purposes.</p>	<p><b>7</b> A team that breaches the aggregate rating limit will normally have one game point transferred to the opposing team (subject to a maximum win of 4-0), though the game results will stand for rating purposes.</p>
<p><b>11 (part)</b> If this fails to break the tie the team with the lower aggregate grade will qualify.</p>	<p><b>11 (part)</b> If this fails to break the tie the team with the lower aggregate rating will qualify.</p>
<p><b>13 (iv)</b> Lower aggregate grading total in the final</p>	<p><b>13 (iv)</b> Lower aggregate rating total in the final</p>

# Restarting BAFL Competitions Autumn 2021

By Alan Richardson, Chairman BAFL

## Introduction

At the time of writing (June 2021), we entered the 3<sup>rd</sup> phase of the government's road map on 17 May for lifting the coronavirus restrictions. This has coincided with significant local outbreaks most notably initially in the north west of England (around Bolton), Bedford and Glasgow associated with the Indian variant of the virus. Subsequent to these local outbreaks there has been a fast general increase in covid-19 cases including in Cambridge. However, hospitalizations and deaths remain low compared to earlier phases of the pandemic and the vaccination programme continues apace with around 84% of the adult population having had one dose of vaccine and 61% both doses. The roadmap provides for all restrictions to be lifted not before July 19 and we will not know until July 12<sup>th</sup> whether further restrictions will be eased.

As of today, any over the board chess is subject to the organisers carrying out a risk assessment and adopting appropriate covid secure measures for the scale of the event and the nature of the venue. More information on these requirements can be found at <https://www.englishchess.org.uk/covid-precautions/>.

The AGM will need to decide if the BAFL is running normal OTB competitions from Autumn 2021.

## Scenario 1: All coronavirus restrictions have been lifted in England before the AGM

In this scenario, the Executive proposes the League and the Roger Goldsmith competitions be run in the normal way for the 2021-22 season with matches starting in the week of 20 September preceded by the Jamboree at Bury on Thursday 16<sup>th</sup> September.

Can the clubs check before the AGM that their venues are available and able to re-open?

If this is endorsed by the AGM, then we ask the clubs to indicate provisionally at the AGM how many teams they wish to enter and of what strength. In order for the fixture list to be finalised in coordination with neighbouring counties, clubs must finalise these entries by August 1<sup>st</sup>.

The intention is to produce a Handbook for the current season and that it be ready before the proposed start of season.

## Scenario 2: Some Material Coronavirus Restrictions Remain

The possible scenario is that some restrictions are not lifted on July 19<sup>th</sup> and the government indicates a future date for another review, probably later in the summer. The current process seems to be to relax some requirements for about a month so that the effect of the relaxation can be seen before further review.

So at this point I guess for this scenario there would be restrictions that affect the capacity of the venue such that multiple teams could not play simultaneously or that require protective equipment such as screens or masks. There may be more clarity in announcements on or around July 12<sup>th</sup>.

I propose that if this is the position on July 19<sup>th</sup>, there should be a discussion where clubs indicate if they wish to re-start with the restrictions as they are. If the answer is no then we should further debate whether there is any appetite for re-starting competitions until restrictions are fully lifted and in particular which restrictions would have to be lifted to restart. If the clubs do wish to restart

with the restrictions in force, then the clubs will be actioned to carry out whatever processes are necessary to enable them to confirm how many teams they would wish to enter in the competitions by August 1<sup>st</sup>.

# Proposal to Amend Rules 1.5 to 1.6

By Alan Richardson, BACL Chairman

## Introduction and Current Position

The 2020 AGM agreed to modify the BACL rules to convert what was then a Core Executive and other members of the Executive to a flat structure where all members of the Executive were of equal status. The matters explicitly agreed were:

- The Officers of BACL should be a single tier (not a core and others)
- Quoracy would be defined by 2/3 being present
- The Executive should be able to invite Club Representatives of clubs that do not have an Officer on the Executive to attend even when the club doesn't have a proposal to present

After the new rules were drafted, there was a difficult discussion about matters that were not discussed, which were:

- Whether the attendance of club representatives counted towards quoracy – the rules adopted do not include club representatives in determining if the meeting is quorate – quoracy only applies to the attendance of BACL Officers
- Whether the Executive was obliged to invite a club representative from all clubs that do not have an Officer on the Executive to all Executive Meetings. The rules adopted require this because the Officers felt the lack of an explicit decision by the AGM required this.
- Whether club representatives attending the Executive have a right to vote on the matters on the agenda. This became unclear because the old rules pre-amendment allowed club representatives to attend and participate in the Executive if they brought a proposal. But these rules were unclear whether participate meant contribute to the discussion or vote on the matters discussed. Therefore because the AGM was again not explicit, the current position is club representatives are allowed to vote.

## Proposed Changes and Rationale

The rules adopted are anomalous in that

- A club that has no Executive Member will be invited to all Executive Meetings whereas a club whose member of the Executive can't make a meeting will not be represented
- The current rules are not explicit on the number of club representatives.

## Proposed Changes to Rules 1.5 to 1.6

1.5 Any club which has not provided an Officer (or if no Officer of that club is able to attend) will be invited to send a single representative to participate in meetings and decisions of the Executive.

1.6 For a meeting to be quorate, and therefore capable of making decisions binding upon the League, the proportion of the League Executive present must be at least two-thirds (rounded downward if this is not a whole number). Club representatives invited under rule 1.5 are not considered in the quoracy assessment. The Executive will normally meet in the Spring to prepare for the AGM. The Executive will also consider such matters and take such decisions as may be necessary for the running of the League between AGMs. The Executive may take any of its decisions by communicating without meeting.