

**Outcomes of the London Regional Council Meeting
Held on Wednesday, 4th February, 2015
At Kings Cross Premier Inn, London**

Present

Peter Crawshaw (PGC) – London Council Co-Chair / Officials Portfolio
Tony Shiret (TLS) – London Council Co-Chair / England Council Chair
Geoff Morphitis (GM) – Clubs Portfolio
Steve Bosley (SB) – Schools Portfolio
Lorna Boothe (LB) – Coaching Portfolio
Tim Soutar (TJS) – Governance Portfolio
Susan Cook (SC) – Disability Portfolio
Ben Noad (BN)
Anthony Soalla-Bell (ASB)
Ellie Brown (EB)

Apologies

David Ralph – Chair, Kent County AA
Richard Pettigrew (RP)
John Gandee (JG), representing SEAA
Bob Smith (BS), EA London Area Manager

In attendance

Paul Moseley (PMo), Coach Development and Education Manager - EA
Paul Merrywest (PM), representing Chair, Essex County AA
Ivor Wiggett (IW), representing Chair, Middlesex County AA
Tom Pollak (TP), Chair, Surrey County AA
Sarah Wade (SW), EA (Minutes)

Basis of preparation:

Outcomes show the decisions made at London Regional Council Meetings but not the full debate at those meetings to reach those decisions. Publication of separate Minutes and Outcomes allows the Council to have a full debate for the record (Minutes) while keeping interested parties informed of important decisions reached (Outcomes). Minutes are not formally approved until the next Council Meeting. These Outcomes are based on the Draft Minutes of the Council meeting of 4th February, 2015 which have been circulated among those present, with amendments incorporated. The London Regional Council next meets on Wednesday, 22nd April 2015.

1. Welcome / apologies

PGC took the chair and opened the meeting. He welcomed EB to her first Council Meeting as a Co-opted member, though noting that she had already attended the London Region volunteer awards event before Christmas. He also introduced PMo who was due to present under Agenda Item 4 (a), it having been suggested by Graeme Allan that he attend.

PGC explained that BS was unable to attend, and Tim Howells unable to deputise for him, due to illness.

2. Minutes 22nd October: confirmation of accuracy

SC requested that the reference to the Surrey Championships be amplified to mention the Surrey Disability Championships on 11th / 12th April. Subject to that addition, the minutes were approved and signed by PGC as Chair.

3. Matters arising where not already on the agenda/ 'Outstandings' List

3a) Network Funding Communication:

PGC referred back to the action agreed at the previous London Council meeting, requesting timely and clear communication regarding funding plans for 2015/16, which had resulted in a letter to Networks from Chris Jones sent in mid-January. He had thereafter received a communication from the Lea Valley Athletics Network (LVAN), which he had referred to Chris Jones as the source of the decision. He asked GM and TJS if they were able to add any clarification regarding that, as he had understood that the matter had been discussed at the December meeting of the Membership Process & Consultation Advisory Group, of which they are members. They said that the Advisory Group had only been consulted regarding the form of communication (which they had asked to be made more concise), and that the decision had apparently already been made by EA Executive Management.

GM said that the North London Network (NLN) had been invited by the LVAN to join in their complaint to Chris Jones, but that they had decided not to do so. TJS said that the Kent London Network (of which Blackheath & Bromley is a member) had seen the decision to withdraw funding coming and had no plans to take further action. TJS had however been forwarded a related communication from the Sussex Network, alluding to the coincidence of timing of the Network funding communication with an announcement regarding a new Road Running event co-ordinator post.

PGC then invited the County Association representatives to comment on how these changes might affect the way in which their organisations interact with clubs, given TP's comments at the October Council meeting and recent references that had been made regarding possible developments in Middlesex. IW reminded the meeting that there are currently three Networks in Middlesex, West London Athletics Network, NLN and LVAN (the latter also including some Essex clubs): there had been a suggestion to the Middlesex Committee that they look at these Networks being merged in whole or in part and thereafter being kept going in some way under the auspices of Middlesex County AA. No decisions had yet been made, and GM urged the Middlesex Committee to progress the matter further in advance of their AGM in March.

PM said that the Essex Committee were due to meet shortly and that a similar approach regarding the Essex based clubs that currently sit within three Networks (two of which are in London). There was potential for the County Association to use any surplus arising from its County Championships to provide financial support, but all Essex clubs would need to be part of that. GM added that he sees potential for each club to pool funds, providing say £300-£400 p.a. to contribute to the costs of a paid administrator. He felt that this approach was already working well with some Networks outside London, including Herts and Notts (TLS reminded GM that the Notts administrator is a paid EA employee).

TP said that he had invited the three Surrey based Networks (two within London) to a meeting in March to discuss how the County Association could help to keep the Networks' work going, for example on coaches' and officials' development. He is also keen to look at athlete development, especially in technical events. PGC said that he was likely to attend that meeting in his capacity as Surrey County Officials Secretary, and was happy to attend any other London-related County Association meetings if that was felt helpful.

TLS said that he had an open mind regarding the model for delivering education: if the County Associations felt that they could do better than the current EA offering, then they should go for it. Such a move could

potentially be reflected in the EA medium term strategy that is currently being developed (see also Agenda Item 7b below). TLS asked that it be minuted that the Council apologises for the way in which the EA decision making process had been handled, as he felt that it should have gone through a further level of approval before being communicated. This view was endorsed by the Council.

IW / PM / TP (and DR, whom PGC will update) to come back to PGC with their respective County Associations' specific proposals regarding Networks.

3b) YDL

TLS said that the National Council had been invited by YDL management to work with them to address the key issues that had been debated before and at the 2014 YDL AGM. A teleconference had been set up with Grace Hall, Marian Williams and Roger Simons for 11th February, which would be a “scooping meeting”.

3c) Review of other outstanding actions from prior meetings

PGC had circulated a spreadsheet, providing an update on these. Most of the outstanding items were in some way covered elsewhere on the Agenda, and the following additional items were covered here:

- *Trinity training CCSO/Clubs* (Ref 17): Update required from BS.
- *Volunteer Recruitment* (Refs 18 & 20): PGC and SC seeking to meet with Tim Howells, joint Run! London project manager, before the end of February.
- *Club details to be a mandatory part of course bookings on Trinity* (Ref 13): PGC said that the current EA strategy to improve data quality in Trinity was for individual coaches and officials to be encouraged to log on to the system and ensure that their details are complete and accurate. The problem is that there is currently insufficient incentive for most to do so. This may be improved once the Disclosure & Barring Service (DBS) application and renewal process is brought online: this has been due to go live since last May, and that is now expected to happen imminently. See further discussion on this point under Agenda Item 4c below.
- *Disability athletics starting order for races/ track training discipline* (Ref 29): PGC has written to Nigel Rowe, Gavin Lightwood, Michael Hunt and Tamsin Fudge. Positive responses from NR, MH and TF. Response awaited from GL, who will need to lead decision on any changes to RunBritain guidelines re starting order issue. MH has indicated that he is sympathetic to advice being included in the next edition of the UKA H&S Code of Practice, with potential for separate guidance to be given in advance of that. PGC will be attending UKA Safety Advisory Group meeting in Birmingham on 25th February, which will provide an opportunity for these items to be further followed up and concrete action agreed.

4) Report London Manager:

4a) Presentation by Paul Moseley re Coach Development and Education

Paul Moseley (PMo) spoke to his presentation. PMo explained the matrix reporting structure, under which he reports to Chris Mallender (Head of Local Delivery) with a focus on delivery and planning – with a link across to CCSO's. He also works closely with Martin Rush (Head of Coaching & Athlete Development), who, like CM, reports directly to Chris Jones: this is more a strategic overview of coach development/ education.

TLS pointed out that none of these people have any input into content of courses, as EA delivers a syllabus that is set by UKA (Melanie Hainke and Tom Crick are the key players). TLS' view is that this aspect of the structure (split across EA and UKA) is messy and doesn't help with delivery or effecting change. Despite this, PMo and TLS consider that EA

is now in a better position to control things than previously, especially with the transfer of tutor recruitment from UKA. Overall, more responsibility for coach education is now held by EA, and the working group led by Neil Costello has made good progress in summarising issues and making recommendations.

PMo is working closely with Graeme Allan: there are now monthly meetings with Coach Ed co-ordinators. Out of original 12 (now 11) London Region tutor recruits identified in Spring 2014, 6 are still to be signed off. TLS questioned length of time and process to get tutors accredited. PMo acknowledged is an issue- he has asked UKA to put trainers on course with trainees as 12 month process is too long. PMo is in discussion with sportscoach uk on how can speed up training processes without compromising quality.

TLS asked if it is now possible to recruit 12 further tutors for this year, given especially that from 1st April tutor accreditation will be responsibility of EA. PMo said that a recent gap analysis has reconfirmed that London needs more tutors and he has asked London team to target/ headhunt potential tutors- there is not currently a deadline for this. TLS asked that any headhunting needs to be representative of those involved in the sport and to reflect the diversity of London.

GM asked if there was a list of accredited tutors available for sharing.

SC asked if there is going to any work to recruit tutor workforce with disability focus? PMo said there are tutors with disability experience: he is also keen to upskill whole workforce with disability inclusion training. Pre-requisite will soon be to include disability inclusion module before can be licensed as a tutor.

Going forward, availability of tutors shouldn't be a barrier for a course to take place as PMo will ensure courses will be covered by tutors from across the country in the interim. Also, PMo accepts the need to do all he can to make sure tutors can progress through pathway effectively. This will continue to be monitored by the London Council, via quarterly reports from Graeme Allan.

Changes to Athletics Coach/ CiRF should have an impact on numbers achieving those qualifications (power point slide 4)

GM asked if there is any guidance on who should take what level of qualification on the coaching pathway? Is it to do with athlete performance level? PM said there was no specific structure around this, but performance level / potential is an important aspect.

It was noted that the Athletics coach qualification is now very generic in terms of coaching and content. EB questioned the need for change from the modular approach used in the old Level 2 qualification. TLS added that there is a need to move back to more event specific requirements: there appears to be some movement on this, but he is not clear what will be delivered when. He believes that there is a particular gap with regard to Middle Distance coaching (representing a high percentage of existing and aspiring coaches), where CiRF does not provide a relevant product.

LB asked if there is Code of Conduct for coaches, is it linked with the licence? TLS confirmed that there is a Code of Conduct but it is not well publicised. LB believes that the Code of Conduct should include dealings with other coaches, officials, parents. TLS agreed, but said that UKA head this up and there is little appetite for change.

BN asked what provision is being made for people who have not yet completed their qualification? PM has led a recent exercise aimed at contacting / chasing up these people going back to 2010. Response has been extremely positive, but, with a need to get them completed by July, this will place a strain on the system in the meantime. EB suggested PM extend the deadline to make it easier on all parties?

SC asked what is the disability content of courses? PM said that there was an "Inclusive Ethos" being promoted within courses, but conceded that there is currently little specific content. SC requested to be sent course content with regard disability.

GM asked if coaches are struggling to make their way through the system then what support/ tools are on offer to get through. TLS said that Martin Rush is trying to get LCDP more in tune with Coach education by using mentoring and links to experienced coaches as part of process. GM also asked if we are any closer to linking coaches with clubs: Can clubs be kept informed of progress through qualification especially if they have covered costs? Can it be a pre-requisite for club/ unattached to be declared? It is currently impossible for clubs to follow progress of coaches, even if they have paid for coaches to take the qualification. While it was accepted that there would be Data Protection issues, there was a strong view that such concerns should not be used as a blanket excuse to do nothing: it should be possible to get information, possibly by asking coaches sponsored by clubs to provide some sort of disclaimer / waiver when booking the course. All agreed that we must ask the question to see what is possible.

LB said that there are still many questions over tutor recruitment. It is difficult to find able coaches with the time and desire to be tutors. TLS said that an important factor that needs urgent attention is a pay review for tutors.

PMo was thanked for his presentation, following which he left the meeting, with the following Actions having been agreed:

PMo to:

- **Circulate soft copies of his presentation slides via PGC;**
- **Investigate possibility of providing a list of accredited tutors that could be shared across the London Council;**
- **Revert to PGC / TS / BS re tutor recruitment plans for London Region in 2015;**
- **Forward to SC further detail regarding Disability content of syllabus;**
- **Investigate potential for providing to sponsoring clubs details of progression (or lack thereof) of coaches attending courses.**

4b) Run/ participation:

i) Review of recent Run! newsletters

All confirmed that they were receiving these by e mail and that they provided a useful summary of activity under the London Run! umbrella. SC asked more coverage on Disability stories. SW offered to put her in contact with Chris Minn (online content manager) so that he could be more aware of upcoming/ potential stories to be actioned.

SC and SW to liaise with Chris Minn to ensure that he is made aware of relevant stories.

ii) See <http://www.londonathletics.org/Metro>

The London Boroughs participation map is now live via the above link, as PGC's recent communications to Councillors had highlighted. There was general agreement that this is a positive step, and it was noted that no other EA Regions currently have this capability. GM and TP questioned the timing of the launch / related publicity, as they felt it might have been more effective if closer to the summer T&F season. There was some uncertainty regarding the workings of the "Free sessions" vouchers that had been in the Evening Standard: none present were aware of these having triggered any additional activities within their own organisations and expressed some concern that there might have been issues satisfying demand had that arisen, though it was noted that clubs had been consulted regarding the content being included on the site. It was agreed that clubs need to keep EA staff informed of any amendments/ additions to be actioned.

PGC quoted statistics provided by Tim Howells regarding feedback from adverts in metro/ evening standard. Positive news on figures so far:

- 30% increase in hits on London Athletics website vs busiest month thus far;
- Over 1,200 unique visits to Participation map;

- Over 70,000 people saw the advert on Facebook;
- Promotional tweet viewed almost 100,000 times.

BS / Tim Howells to provide further detail regarding voucher process

iii) 'This Girl Can' – London Impacts

PGC asked what impact clubs had seen thus far from the advertising. S said there had been positive impact on disability so far with Weir Archer Academy receiving specific enquiries from females. EB; Positive effect and may be a small increase of females so far, but there is still a need to target/ focus on schools to make sport integral part of life for girls. LB said there has been an increase in females at Sutton, but can't say if due to campaign.

PGC asked if Is there enough communication coming through for clubs in advance of the campaign? GM felt this was good example of how clubs could have done more with more notice: EA should have done more to push clubs to act. TP again suggested (while noting that this was a wider, Sport England led initiative) that campaigns should be better timed: spring / summer may have been better as better weather.

PGC / TLS to e-mail Chris Jones to give feedback.

4c) Education: coach/ official tutor recruitment/ training

PGC presented statistical report from Graeme Allan. He cautioned that the production of these figures was still very much at the prototype stage and highlighted that, following feedback at the previous Council meeting, two key changes had been made to the format of the reports:

- Comparison to prior year actual to get idea of trends (though the data is currently only available for Officials' licences issued).
- Inclusion, on the part of the report that deals with courses held (for both officials and coaches), of numbers of courses planned for the upcoming quarter.

PGC went on to explain that, although Graeme had been working with Andrew Hopkin of UKA IT to develop automated reports that Graeme can run directly from Trinity, this was still not operating as he would wish. Accordingly the figures re Officials' licences issued are still having to be produced manually: PGC thanked SW for the work that she had done to produce these. In addition, there seem to be some discrepancies in the figures for coaches' licences issued, in particular re year to date numbers for Athletics Coach and Coaching Assistant, where the figures looked implausibly high. PGC reconfirmed his determination to get robust, consistent figures available on a quarterly basis, so that there is an objective basis for judging the effectiveness of education processes and deciding on corrective action. He hopes that a successful London pilot will result in a national roll-out.

EB noted that a large number of coaches complete course but then are not licensed. It was explained that this is primarily because they do not apply for DBS. This prompted a discussion re the DBS process. SC asked why it is not possible to have candidates come prepared to complete DBS on final day of course to reduce this number? Even if the process is due to come on line, there would seem to be benefit in respect of both coaches' and officials' courses.

PGC to follow up practicalities of this approach in London Region with BS / Graeme Allan, and to raise as a matter of national policy with Neil Costello (re coaching)) and with National Portfolio Holder for Officials.

TLS pointed out that London has pushed for these figures as it is not a requirement nationally, so there will be teething problems in getting them together. He noted the improvements made compared with the previous quarter's version. TP felt that the fact that so many are not progressing through course proves that the system is not fit for purpose.

SC asked if it is possible on the online portal to have a summary/check list of what needs to be done for them to get their licence? Be good to make better use of technology to assist in process. PGC said that this is available for Officials, and he regularly refers new officials to <http://www.englandathletics.org/england-athletics-officials/gaining-your-level-2>, though he would prefer that link to be within the standard course material. He was not sure of what is provided to coaches.

PGC to raise issue of guidance to coaches with Graeme Allan.

GM repeated the need to have an option to opt out of data protection so clubs can know/assist people to get through process (see 4a above).

4d) 2015 London Consultation: agreement of date/ venue/ with outline of National proposals.

PGC had already circulated attendees re those plans, with suggestion of either 13th or 20th April and same location as last year at ULU? SC thought ULU room may not be available now due to new restructuring at ULU. Some discussion re dates: Councillors felt that April had many conflicts including London Marathon and start of Track & Field outdoor season, so preferred date is 30th March.

PGC to contact Dean Hardman to request 30th March, with 13 or 20th April as back up, and to ask Dean to double check room availability.

Proposed general theme of consultation is, 'How EA can support clubs', and there is also the desire to present and seek views on the work being done by a sub-group of the EA Board on EA Strategy for 2016-2022. TLS expressed some concern on whether this would be sufficiently progressed to present by end-March, though there is now agreement re National Council representation on the sub-group. GM stated here should only be a consultation if we are ready for it and there is a specific purpose, otherwise is a waste of time/ resources, and he cautioned against forced positivity / optimism: no shame in admitting if you have not achieved/ failed if you can demonstrate why. TLS/ PGC see it will be an opportunity to examine finances/ numbers.

TJS feels that there huge issues needing discussion with big club involvement, including, a) participation, b) relations with commercial sector/ race providers etc. c) YDL issues. We need to ask these questions and find out from clubs what they want.

GM agreed that the commercial sector encroachment in to the sport is a good example of how the sport is drifting away from club roots. Commercial companies have taken over and are clearly making good money from the sport. What can clubs do to be more involved in this?

PGC to e mail all affiliated London clubs with details of date / venue / outline agenda in support of National Communications (by Dean Hardman), as he had done re 2014 Club Conference.

SC reminded the Council that she had asked at the 2014 consultation about entries in the London marathon for wheelchair racers, whom she believes are at a disadvantage compared with able bodied runners.

PGC to follow up with Dean Hardman

5. Counties – update on competition plans and meetings / communications with England Athletics

TP sad that EA are again offering money to County Associations to enhance their meetings. The next County Chair s' meeting is scheduled on 17th February. TLS referred to there being questions raised at the National Council over apparent elitism at the County Chairs' meeting. Andy Day has been asked to come up with a more inclusive process going forward.

PGC asked for feedback on the online entry system that had been provided to Counties by EA. IW said that the system ok, but the problem was lack of support when there were problems. TP said that Surrey had similar issues with the EA-sponsored system (Surrey use the Camilla Thrush system for Disability and Masters Championships) and

also found that the technology platform used is outdated: they are piloting a new system with a local provider for their Indoor Championships.

PM said Essex have backed out of the EA-sponsored online system as there was not enough support. IMG are a commercial provider of an online system that has worked ok.

PGC concluded that the EA-sponsored system clearly hasn't worked well so need EA to come back with something that is fit for purpose. He still sees this as an area where the strategy should be for an NGB to be able to provide a properly supported system to its members, rather than having a host of different, commercially provided offerings.

PM: WGEL unable to host county multi-event so Essex doing pentathlon on 17th May.

6. SEAA: update on competition plans and meetings / communications with England Athletics

JG sent apologies for meeting.

LB questioned the timetable for hurdles at the recent SEAA Indoor championships, as she felt that there was insufficient recovery time between rounds.

7. EA matters

7a) Outcomes of National Council and Board News

TLS summarised discussions at the previous week's National Council. There will be a consultation on age group changes as well as harmonisation with IAAF technical rules. Age Group proposal is to move to U20, U18, U16 (lower age bands currently unclear). Debate is open. England Schools didn't see need to change their age group. Period of consultation will be adapted to fit competition providers' AGM's.

The first section of the current UKA Rule Book (Rules 1-24), covering such items as eligibility to compete- first claim members, as well as the important area of affiliation and registration is being considered separately. TJS is on the group dealing with this. This should help to ensure that there is proper linkage to the recommendations coming out of the Membership Process & Consultation Advisory Group.

Suggestions are open for any changes to rules, to be implemented from 2016-2018. GM thinks there should be a more transparent system to question rules coming in.

SC asked what is the process to suggest changes? The big issue for Disability is to provide a framework for disabled athletes without an IPC classification to compete. PGC had asked Chris Cohen and Roger Simons whether this would be in scope of the current IAAF harmonisation work, but had been told that UKA propose still to go with the IPC Rules. PGC said he would support with the London Council and thereafter the National Council (on which Chris Cohen now sits – albeit as the ESAA representative) whatever proposal SC may bring forward.

Competition review strategy: TJS sits on panel. Terms of reference for this have been amended- Big issue is no change has ever been implemented that has been recommended by group so what will be different this time?

TLS also reported on Board news: Commercial group has been set up to look into developing commercial income, within a properly developed framework / strategy. EA have been awarded a grant by Sport England to develop a plan. TLS will sit on group.

A Heritage Advisory Group is being set up, scope to include close liaison with the AAA.

7b) Medium Term Strategy Review

Largely covered under Consultation above. PGC reminded Councillors that he is still keen to develop an updated London Strategy document, to be linked to London 2017 in the same way as the previous document was linked to London 2012, given the special circumstances / funding opportunities potentially available.

7c) APS Survey Results

PGC summarised the position for Athletics re APS 8 Q4 (year ended October 2014). Satisfactory overall, but a mixed bag at a National level:

- Running Under 26 and Disability missed target (Other sports have also missed their disability target). Running participation dropped slightly.
- Running Over 26 and track and field (both age groups) on target. Running Over 26 participation increased slightly, as did Track & Field.

London figures still lower than in 2012, but have gone up in comparison to rest of country and compared with APS 7 (2013). London still above other Regions on a per capita basis, though the gap is narrowing.

8. London Regional Council Elections

PGC referred attendees to the detailed briefing that he had provided by e mail, and to the further details included on the EA website at <http://www.englandathletics.org/about-england-athletics/england-athletics-national-council/regional-council-elections-2015> . In summary, for London there will be four Council places due for election, as GM, PGC, LB and SB are due to retire by rotation, but are eligible to stand for re-election.

GM had confirmed that he has decided not to stand again, having completed seven years on the London Council as an elected councillor. PGC thanked GM for his valuable service throughout that period, and TLS proposed a vote of thanks to GM for his service over many years to the London Council, which was endorsed by all.

PGC, LB and SB had indicated that they will stand for re-election again, and SC confirmed that she will be standing for election. PGC welcomed SC's candidacy and said that he was hopeful that there will be other candidates in London and that a ballot is likely to be required (deadline: 3rd April). Nominations are required by 27th February, by two different clubs. All those wishing to stand for election / re-election will need to meet that deadline and should also provide a personal statement: each individual is responsible for ensuring timely and complete submission of his / her election papers.

At the first London Council meeting following the ballot (22nd April), the new cadre of Elected Councillors will need to vote on the Chair / Co-Chair going forward, and thereafter decide on Co-Opted Council members, existing Co-Opted Council members standing down but being eligible to be co-opted once again (if not elected).

9. Portfolios- Facilities:

9a) Crystal Palace/ Tooting Bec/ Walthamstow:

Crystal Palace: PGC and BS had (as already reported to Council members) met with the GLA and Sport England shortly before Christmas. PGC / BS have been gathering feedback from likely competition providers (including SEAA, Kent County AA, SLAN and Hercules Wimbledon) regarding size / frequency of potential meetings at outdoor track, in order to inform decision re stand. Overall view at the meeting is largely consistent with the consensus view, i.e. that a modern stand within acceptable changing facilities, toilets &c is wanted from a Community / grass roots athletics perspective.

The indoor area remains the main issue, as it seems certain that the existing facility will be demolished in order to restore the Paxton sight lines. Options to explore include under a stand or within proposed new school. Other nearby local developments could have an impact as Blackheath & Bromley have redevelopment plans in pipeline at Norman Park, potential development of Sutcliffe Park (Cambridge Harriers). LB stated Sutton indoor is now at capacity. Michael Hunt (UKA) is trying to find funds to employ a consultant to look at usage and demands of the indoor track, in light of the complex situation caused by the abovementioned other potential nearby development.

Tooting: SB updated. Very political situation but there is agreement in February track management will be put out to tender. HHH talking to Richard Pettigrew/ staff mutual re involvement in running the track.

SB to keep London Council up to date with progress.

Walthamstow: Development been proposed. Track to be resurfaced with a new stand. Some complaints Including appeal to TLS)) from local clubs that their requirements are not being fully met, but BS has visited the facility and concluded that clubs will see a major improvement on the status quo. TLS has accepted this position.

Southwark Park: Funding in place for redevelopment. No timescales known.

9b) Facility Assessment Process

PGC reported that the National Council has had sight of more detailed papers from Michael Hunt regarding the new, proposed scheme, following discontinuation of the previous scheme. Based on what has been proposed, this seems fit for purpose, subject to a timely and effective communication process by UKA / EA. PGC will press for detailed timescales on this at the upcoming UKA Safety Advisory Group meeting.

10. Items for noting

10a) Dates/ rolling agenda for future meetings

PGC confirmed that the version circulated with his e mail of 29th January. Next meeting: 22nd April, by which time the composition of the newly elected Council will be known.

11. AOB

GM: will EA have anything to do with U11's? Is EA missing an opportunity by ignoring this age group where other sports have high participation figures. Should there be local team competitions? PM; Essex is providing an U11 competition but with no medals.

GM: Niels De Vos and Olympic stadium statement from the Evening Standard. Should there be London involvement in this? TLS; Too late for this year but there definitely should be something pencilled in for subsequent years, needs to be investigated.

Meeting closed at 9.45pm