

Executive Committee DRAFT MINUTES (NJ)

19 February 2007

Meeting Particulars

Date & Time	Monday 19 February 2007 19.30 hours
Venue	Burway Rowing Club (www.burwayrc.co.uk) Thameside, Laleham, Middlesex TW18 1UQ Tel: 01784 454 860

Executive Committee Members

Initials	Name	Role	Apologies Rec'd?
AE	Tony Evans	Div 13 Representative <i>and</i> Competitions Calendar	PRESENT
AR	Andrew Russell	Honorary Secretary	APOLOGIES
AW	Andy Weekes	Div 11 Representative	APOLOGIES
BC	Becky Chalk	Junior Officials Coordinator	
BM	Bill Mitchell	President <i>and</i> Chairman, Conduct Panel	PRESENT
CG	Chris George	Regional Water Safety Development Adviser	PRESENT
CS	Chris Sprague	Umpires' Commissioner <i>and</i> Vice-President	APOLOGIES
EJ	Emma James	TRC Representative	PRESENT
EW	Elizabeth Wray	PR / Marketing	APOLOGIES
JB	John Biddle	Div 14 Representative	PRESENT
JH	Jim Harlow	Downriver Representative	PRESENT
JP	Judith Packer	Upriver Representative	PRESENT
KW	Ken Williams	Div 16 Representative	APOLOGIES
LL	Laura Lion	Juniors' Commission (upriver)	PRESENT
MA	Margaret Adams	Vice-President	APOLOGIES
MBB	Mark Blandford-Baker	Div 10 Representative	APOLOGIES
MH	Martin Humphrys	Chairman	PRESENT
MJ	Michael Jones	Leander Club Representative	PRESENT
ML	Murray Litvak	Veterans' Commission	PRESENT
MW	Mike Williams	LRC Representative	APOLOGIES
NJ	Neil Jackson	Div 18 Representative <i>and</i> RWSA	PRESENT
NW	Nick Watkins	Deputy RWSA	PRESENT
PB	Paul Baldwin	Honorary Treasurer	PRESENT
PL	Paul Lorenzato	Div 19 Representative	PRESENT
PM	Peter Moore	Div 12 <i>and</i> Recreational Representative	PRESENT
PS	Phil Simmons	ARA Coaching and Development Officer	PRESENT
RH	Ruth Hatton	Juniors' Commission (downriver)	APOLOGIES
RPa	Richard Packer	Equipment Officer	PRESENT
RPh	Richard Philips	Coaching Commission	PRESENT
RW	Richard West	Div 15 Representative <i>and</i> EA Representative	PRESENT
SB	Sarah Birch	ARA Coaching and Development Officer	PRESENT
SDC	Stan Collingwood	Tideway Event Code of Conduct Coordinator	APOLOGIES
SC	Siobhan Cassidy	Div 17 Representative	APOLOGIES

Meeting Agenda

No.	Agenda Item	Action Required	Member
1	APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE Noted above.	Noted	
2	MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING Review and approval of January Meeting Minutes	Approved	
3	MATTERS ARISING		MH
4	ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION, ACTION, OR DECISION The Executive Committee is asked to consider the following:	[See minutes below]	
4.1	Regional Water Safety Adviser's Report (see RWSA's report) Molesey Veterans head Club Safety Audit status Regularising TRUC / RWSA relationship	Decided Noted Noted	NJ NW NJ/SC
4.2	Coaching Development Officers (see CDOs' report) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sport England Club and Coach Development Funding Club Support (POXtra funding) 	Decided Decided	SB/PS SB/PS
4.3	Caversham Facility (see Division 11 Representative's Report)	Discussed	AW
4.4	Equipment (see Equipment Officer's Report) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Megaphone replacement Finish horn 	Agreed Agreed	RPk RPk
4.4	Veterans' Commissioner <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Financial support of training day (£50) 	Agreed	ML
4.5	Tideway Code of Conduct Panel Terms of Reference (see Terms of Reference)	Agreed	BM
4.6	Changes to TRUC Structure and Practices	Noted with approval	BM
4.7	TRRC Dinner at Leander (Friday, 19 January)	Approved	PM
5	REPORTS TO NOTE In addition to reports explicitly referenced above, the Executive Committee is asked to note all the reports submitted as shown under "List of Reports" below.	Noted	All
6	ANY OTHER BUSINESS ARA national review of Regions' boundaries	Noted	MH

No.	Agenda Item	Action Required	Member
7	NEXT MEETING Monday 19 March at 19.30. Downriver location TBD	Action Required	JH

	MEETING ADJOURNMENT		
--	----------------------------	--	--

Agenda item	Minute	Action
4.1	<p>Regional Water Safety Adviser's Report (see RWSA's report)</p> <p>4.1.1 MH introduced the item and tabled copies of an e-mail sent by NJ that day bringing Council up-to-date on progress with granting TRRC consent on safety grounds to the holding on 24 February, of Molesey Veterans' Head, the Remenham Challenge, and the Henley Juniors head .</p> <p>4.1.2 Molesey Veterans' Head (MVH)</p> <p>4.1.2.1 MVH had submitted documentation for RWSA consent but weeks after the expiry of the one month deadline. As required by TRRC the decision had been remitted to Council. At MH's request NJ had advised MVH organizers in detail on changes needed to bring it up to the standard of being adequate for the purpose of providing a sufficient risk assessment, and a system and documentation to deal with the risks.</p> <p>4.1.2.2 MVH had then submitted amended documents. NJ had advised MH and the organizers on his view that the amended package was now adequate for the purpose and could, if Council wished, be approved, but it fell short of best practice in the field.</p> <p>4.1.3 Remenham Challenge</p> <p>4.1.3.1 NJ had informed MH and the organizers that the revised MVH documents now included at two places the words "Remenham Division" – presumably the Remenham Challenge race - without further explanation, assessment, or safety provision. The organizers had responded that it was, indeed, the re-arranged Remenham Challenge (a private match for four or more clubs previously cancelled from the Kingston reach without the submission of any documentation for approval). It was to be run as a subsequent division of MVH.</p> <p>4.1.3.2 NJ had advised MH and the organizers and now advised Council that he was not prepared to consider the Remenham rearrangement as it would mix a properly prepared public veteran event with an undocumented non-veteran private race.</p> <p>4.1.4 Henley Juniors head (HJH)</p> <p>4.1.4.1 NJ reported that he had received that morning documentation for the HJH seeking consent for it to take place in five working days' time. He advised MH and the organizers that this was a clear breach of the one month rule and, moreover, he could not clear an event from scratch in just five days.</p> <p>4.1.4.2 MH had tabled the HJH application for Council to consider. NJ repeated his advice, saying that he had not had time to review the documentation during the day.</p> <p>4.1.5 Discussion</p> <p>4.1.5.1 Council took note of NJ's advice on the three events. He also reminded Council that the 'one month rule was brought in by Council in 2006:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * to ensure that the RWSA could carry out the task on behalf of Council thoroughly and responsibly; * to consult a nominee of Thames Regional Umpires 	

	<p>Commission (TRUC) on their local knowledge and for their views on the organization, people, and delivery of the event and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * to remove from the RWSA the moral pressure to approve an ill-prepared event because, as with HJH, the event was about to happen and he did NOT want to disappoint competitors and disrupt their day on the water at zero notice. <p>4.1.5.2 In discussion Council recognized the issues raised by the three late applications, and endorsed the basis of its decision on the one month rule. It was not prepared to make the rule absolute – to instruct the RWSA to refuse consent for any late application – nor to shorten the deadline to, say, two weeks. NJ assured Council that he did allow a few days flexibility on the rule, just warning the organizers to be prompter next time. Council asked whether there were any mitigating factors, but none were put forward. HJH in particular was seen as giving Council too little time to deal appropriately with the risks and responsibilities inherent in an event for juniors in winter.</p> <p>4.1.5.3 Council also acknowledged that whilst systems and documents were important, it was the PEOPLE who ultimately mattered. It welcomed TRUC making inputs on such matters, but noted that no such input could have been made in respect of Remenham and HJH. The liability in respect of a private event being approved in a process for a public one was seen as a worry. Council had also to recognize the effect and precedent set by its decisions.</p> <p>4.1.5.4 Council decided unanimously as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * MVH: Council granted consent. * Remenham Challenge: Council did not consider the application for consent as it was inappropriate to try to do so by way of an unspecific private adjunct to the process for a public event. * HJH: Council refused consent as the organizers had allowed too little time for a satisfactory appraisal process. <p>4.1.5.5 NJ was instructed to tell the respective organizers forthwith.</p> <p>4.1.2 Club Safety Audit status</p> <p>4.1.2.1 NW gave an oral up-date on progress in the Region with submitting Club Water Safety Audits (required by the ARA by 15 February, failing which a club would be automatically suspended from affiliation until the default was made good). There was some uncertainty between ARA and TRRC over one or two clubs, notably Abingdon RC. And the RWSA would have to pursue some clubs over some details of their returns. Student and some school clubs had been especially laggardly but had responded to warnings about the safety issue he had sent via non-rowing parts of the institution!</p> <p>4.1.2.2 There were probably only some seven clubs in total default (out of RMA Sandhurst; Pangbourne College; Wraysbury; Sons of the Isis; QMC/Westfield; Univ of London WBC; Thames Valley Sculling Centre; Shiplake School; Linacre College; Dragon School). But the position did change as they responded (or not) to his pursuing them by phone or e-mail as best he could. And ARA required us to give some leeway over “technical difficulties”.</p> <p>4.1.2.3 NJ told Council that NW had been making a major effort, backed up by Div Reps, to get the Region’s clubs on-side. And that CG’s work with Vorboss in building the Region’s easily usable on-line system gave clubs minimal excuse for failures. Council acknowledged their respective contributions and noted the situation.</p> <p>4.1.3 Regularising TRUC / RWSA relationship</p> <p>4.1.3.1 The substance of this issue and the state of progress had been brought out in the discussion of the three head events. BM explained that</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>TRUC, under Stan Collingwood, had liaised with the RWSA over a number of events, especially the Quinitin head, Hammersmith heads and United Hospitals race, including meetings with the organizers and RWSA. These practical exercises brought out the different roles of TRUC and RWSA (to the satisfaction of both). SC was now working up a more coherent set of arrangements which would enable timely co-ordination and minimize the risk of any matters falling through any gap between them. Differences of view would, of course, be settled bilaterally!</p> <p>4.1.3.2 NJ said that he strongly commended the development to Council. SC had now provided NJ with a list of TRUC nominees – in practice the duty Commissioner for the event. NJ copied them in as soon as a reasonably complete package of documents reached him. He accommodated their views, without, of course, losing sight of his duty to make up his own mind on specifically safety issues. He also pressed on with his decisions on his interests, but, if necessary, reserved TRUC's position.</p> <p>4.1.3.4 Council welcomed the development and looked forward to seeing SC's framework document in due course.</p>	
4.2	<p>CDOs</p> <p>4.2.1 Sport England's Club and Coaching Development Funding scheme</p> <p>4.2.1.1. SB sought Council's approval for the approach the CODs had had to take to making the Regions number with Sport England. In other regions, the council had gone out to clubs. In effect, the Thames CDOs had just got on with it directly with clubs keeping Council informed via MH.</p> <p>4.2.1.2 MH added that the planned Junior Rowing Centre at Hammersmith had now received planning permission from Hammersmith and Fulham LBC. It would happen! He had met London Youth Rowing Trust. That would be the Region's required financial input. There might well be relevant provision for 'a coach to coach the coaches'.</p> <p>4.2.1.3 Council happily agreed that CDOs should continue with their proactive approach to a too-hurried initiative by Sport England, keeping MH informed.</p> <p>4.2..2 Workforce Development Planning</p> <p>4.2.2.1 SB had asked a number of clubs to fill in a questionnaire for Sport England via County Sports Forums. The response had been poor. Clubs which failed to make returns would be refused funding! Those present who had complied said that it was a lot of work for what it was worth!</p> <p>4.2.3 Planning controls and rowing around Kew bridge</p> <p>4.2.3.1 PS said that there was some dispute with developers as to what constituted the "water-borne activities facility". RW advised that there was a covenant in force; we must ensure that, under it, the development on the Hounslow side at Kew should preserve water sports access to the water-side.</p> <p>4.2.3.2 BM reported on the grant of planning permission by Richmond LBC for the 'replacement' of the damaged portion of the pontoon on the up-river side of the bridge despite representations from rowers and other river users on the dangers it would add to the use of the river there. NW who attended in person said that the Borough wilfully ignored our concerns.</p> <p>4.2.3.3 The owner was already advertising the space for permanent moorings on the river face of the pontoon. Even though those would appear to obstruct the in-shore zone and even extend into the fairway, the PLA denied it had any control over the matter. The Borough said it was a PLA matter, not one for planning controls.</p> <p>4.2.3.4. TRRC was to meet the PLA the following week to explore the issue. In the meantime, the PLA had indicated its disquiet if moored boats did intrude into the fairway.</p>	
4.3	Caversham facility	

	<p>4.3.1 MH said that disquiet had been expressed at national Council over the non-availability of the facility for 'off-peak' use by clubs. Covenants on the se of the facility imposed by the site owner-donor restricted it to members of BIRO, Oxford University BC and University College, Oxford, BC. David Tanner had indicated that the 'fallow period' in August could be made available.</p> <p>4.3.2 In discussion JP pointed out that usage, especially for local juniors would not only be valuable in its own right but give the facility a good local profile. PM warned, however, that the facility was in good use for a lot more of the time than people realized. Moreover, owing to the low profile of the riverside bund, it was all-too-likely to be flooded just when rowers fleeing red boards were most likely to want to use it.</p>	
4.4	<p>Equipment</p> <p>4.4.1 Council agreed the purchase of six megaphones and a finish horn.</p> <p>4.4.2 RP proposed that Council should add to its inventory a modern projector and screen. That was agreed; and JP kindly agreed to explore the scope for acquiring one second hand from disposals at her work.</p>	
4.4A	<p>Financial support for Veterans training day.</p> <p>4.4A.1 Council agreed to join with other regions in providing £50 by way of financial aid to hiring "a good coach" to stimulate attendance at an experiment in putting on a training day for Veterans on the day before the National Veteran Championships.</p>	
4.5	<p>Tideway Code of Conduct Panel: Terms of Reference</p> <p>4.5.1 BM moved the adoption of the Terms of Reference already circulated. He reported that the Panel had worked well together – to the extent that the nominated members no made the decisions and he merely had to keep good order! The membership needed, however, to be widened to cover a wider variety of type of club. Membership would be rotated, beginning in two months' time, to spread understanding of, and confidence in, the Panel's work.</p> <p>4.5.2 Council thanked BM and his Panel colleagues for their work and approved the proposed Terms of Reference.</p>	
4.6	<p>TRRC Dinner at Leander (Friday 19th January 2007)</p> <p>4.6.1 MH thanked PM for organizing such a good and worthwhile event – Council unanimously agreed (with a small caveat about the possible limitation on the food arising from the newness of the chef).</p> <p>4.6.2 MH proposed a repeat performance. PM suggested that, if so, Council should formally invite and fund official guests.</p> <p>4.6.2 Council agreed both proposals.</p>	
4.7	<p>TRUC structure</p> <p>4.7.1 BM explained that TRUC was not content with its ability to meet its operational needs. The new liaison with RWSA had been discussed earlier. The Region was required to run its own multi-lane training. And TRUC needed to fit in with FISA's cycle for renewal of appointments. JD added that there were now 12 candidates for new appointments.</p> <p>4.7.2 TRUC intended: to give its Hon Secretary a more administrative role; to appoint an events performance co-ordinator; and to change its training supervisors (as successors to BM and SC).</p> <p>4.7.3 MH added that the National Umpires Commission had decided to standardize umpires' kit. He proposed that Council should subsidize the costs by 50%, conditional on an individual completing 15 events.</p> <p>4.7.4 Council took note with approval of the TRUC changes and agreed to the proposed conditional it subsidy.</p>	
5.	<p>Reports to note</p> <p>5.1 Council took note formally of other reports listed in the agenda.</p>	
6	<p>Any Other Business</p> <p>6.1 Boundary changes for ARA Regions</p> <p>6.1.1 MH reported that a 3-member sib-committee of the ARA National Development Committee had been tasked with looking at changing the regional boundaries and structure. He was inviting Council to express views for him to take away to the sub-committee.</p>	

	<p>6.1.2 One factor driving the case for change was to fit more easily with the regions used by funding bodies. But Sport England's "London and the South-East" was too big for our purposes – it would take in our Thames (up-river and Tideway), South East, and Southern Coastal. But separating out "London" would simply not work in rowing terms</p> <p>6.1.3 MH added that they were trying to find out the numbers of rowers in the affected areas within Regions. For his part he thought we ought to be ready to take in extra areas to which our clubs frequently travelled or whose clubs often came into our patch. That pointed to areas such as Hampshire East and the Isle of White!</p> <p>6.1.4 KH invited Council's views. In discussion: JH pointed out that concentrating London's resources concentrated on its clubs would make them better off! CG and MH said that reverting to the old separation of up- and down-river was not on the agenda. Keeping the united bidding power of the existing Region and the strength of its voice at national ARA level would be important. But growth would strengthen further the case for paid administrative support.</p> <p>6.1.5 MH closed the discussion, but invited further view and representations as people thought of them</p>	
	<p>The meeting closed at about 10p.m with thanks to John Biddle and his Burway colleagues for hosting the meeting.</p>	

List of Reports

Report	Status	Member
Chairman	Nothing to report	MH
Honorary Secretary	Nothing to report	AR
Honorary Treasurer	Nothing to report	PB
Upriver Representative	To note	JP
Downriver Representative	Nothing to report	JH
Division 10 (Oxford University) Representative	Nothing to report	MBB
Division 11 (Upper Thames) Representative	For Discussion	AW
Division 12 (Reading) Representative	Nothing to report	PM
Division 13 (Middle Thames) Representative	To note	AE
Division 14 (Staines & Molesey) Representative	Nothing to report	JB
Division 15 (Kingston & Twickenham) Representative	<i>Not available</i>	RW
Division 16 (Chiswick & Mortlake) Representative	NO REPORT	KW
Division 17 (University of London) Representative	NO REPORT	SC
Division 18 (Barnes & Hammersmith) Representative	Nothing to report	NJ
Division 19 (Putney) Representative	NO REPORT	PL
London Rowing Club Representative	Nothing to report	MW
Thames Rowing Club Representative	NO REPORT	EJ
Leander Club Representative	Nothing to report	MJ
ARA Coaching and Development Officers	For Discussion	PS & SB
Coaching Commissioner	Nothing to report	RPh
Competitions Calendar ("Events") Coordinator	To note	AE
Environment Agency Representative	For Discussion*	RW
Equipment Officer	For Discussion	RPa
Junior Officials Coordinator (<i>combined in Upriver Rep's Report</i>)	- see upriver rep-	JP/BC
Juniors' Commissioner (upriver)	Nothing to report	LL
Juniors' Commissioner (downriver)	Nothing to report	RH
PR & Marketing Officer	NO REPORT	EW
Recreational Representative	To note	PM
Regional Water Safety Adviser (RWSA)	To note	NJ
Regional Water Safety Development Adviser (RWSDA)	To note	CG
Tideway Code of Conduct Panel Chairman	For Discussion	BM
Tideway Event Code of Conduct Coordinator	Nothing to report	SDC
Umpires' Commissioner	For Discussion	CS
Veterans' Commissioner	For Discussion	ML

List of Related Materials

Funding Guide (from 2005)	To note	MA
Coaching Awards (by Club and Total)	To note	RPh
Report of attendance by Paul Baldwin (Hon Treasurer) at the Pro-active South London 'Meet the Partners' event at the Stoop, Twickenham on 6 February 2007	To note	PB

* The relevant report was available in advance of the meeting, but not in electronic format. It is expected that the report may be available in hardcopy at the meeting.