



GB Powerlifting Federation Ltd ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING

Motion Comments registered by members.

Voting on motions open Saturday 6th April.

Should anyone wish to amend their motion before voting opens please email tom.morgan@britishpowerlifting.org with your amendment by 1700hrs Friday 5th April 2024.

15.1) Amendment to article 104#

Number of comments – 22

Number of void comments – 2 (submitted as Proxy without proxy authority submitted)

Comments in agreeance – 15

No comment – 2

Further Comments -

Whilst this is in principle a good idea, it is being voted on AFTER an on-line AGM has been convened. This is contrary to the existing Articles, which only allow in person or by proxy voting and still apply. Changes to the Articles have to be submitted to Companies House and published on the website before they become effective. Thus all decisions made at this meeting are open to challenge and potentially risk our NGB status. This is because all our policies and procedures were submitted and approved by Sport England as part of the NGB application process. Thus we are expected to operate in accordance with the Articles as per Company Law.

An AGM in accordance with the existing Articles should be held to amend the Articles. An on-line meeting would then, and only then, be legitimate.

The wording in the rationale doesn't make sense.

This is not recorded as having been approved by the Board in meeting minutes.

This is a great start to making meetings accessible to all of the members of British Powerlifting. It has been the only AGM that I have had to attend in several years in person and I am pleased we are moving with the times. More members of all ages have the opportunity to engage with the process making for a more inclusive organisation.

Response -

1 Whilst currently the articles do not explicitly allow an online AGM, neither do they state that it is not permissible., BP sought legal advice and advice from an Olympic NGB as to how they set precedent by following the format the board have chosen to run this years AGM. Said NGB were backed by their sporting governing body and made article changes to that effect.. wording clearly states a Quorum must be made of 20 people in attendance, it does not however state in one single location.

The wording of the rationale in this regard makes perfect sense as the membership have repeatedly requested a more accessible format, and the previous executive has allowed these motions to go through as Ordinary motions, not special resolutions thus making them Void at the point of voting.

2 Was discussed at board level and agreed. From time to time and for the furtherment of the organisation decisions are made outside of board meetings as a collective via email chains etc.

Motion result – To carry with the motion in its original format.

15.2) Amendment to Article 110

Number of comments – 22

Number of void comments – 2 (submitted as Proxy without proxy authority submitted)

Comments in agreeance – 14

No comment – 2

Further Comments

Voting 14 days in advance defeats the object of having the AGM itself, which is then just a rubber stamping exercise. It also denies members the opportunity to question candidates standing for election. Furthermore it will stifle any interactive discussion on notices of motion. It also conflicts with the 21 day notice period for issuing the agenda and other AGM deadlines.

The wording in the rationale doesn't make sense.

This is not recorded as having been approved by the Board in meeting minutes.

Fantastic, easy to read and in my own time.

Response As above reply.

Result Motion stands in its original format.

16.1) International Athlete Badges

Number of comments – 22

Number of void comments – 2 (submitted as Proxy without proxy authority submitted)

Comments for – 9

Comments against – 7

Further Comments –

No issue per se but Athletes do receive certificates that can be downloaded following international events.

There are participation medals at internationals though no?

I don't think the addition of a badge is needed. I'd personally throw mine away.

Decline - I feel there are better uses of the federations money

participation medals exist. This seems like another thing that gets added to the mountain of medals that people already have. Waste of money and not very environmentally friendly to create something for the sake of it.

Declined (participation medals)

Disagree, don't feel it's a valid use of funds

Agree to have them represented at EPA board level rather than BP

This is a really good idea

It is a nice idea just not sure where it comes in a list of priorities, I would pay for such a badge but expecting the federation to cover the costs seems like one more benefit for the few rather than reinvesting for the many

16.2) Isle of Man

Number of comments – 22

Number of void comments – 2 (submitted as Proxy without proxy authority submitted)

Comments for – 14

Further Comments

The Isle of Man is not part of the UK; it is a Crown Protectorate. It is disproportionate and unfair to other Home Nations to have Board Director representing such a very small number of members ~50.

Not justified bearing in mind the small number of Manx members.

I don't care if they're recognised as a home nation but they do not have the capacity and it would be a logistical nightmare for them to host. We would also need to account for each of the channel islands.

Agree to have them represented at EPA board level rather than BP

Agree to have them represented at EPA board level rather than BP

Agree but it seems to benefit a relatively small number of lifters with a great cost both in finances, participation and decision making representation

Result

Motion to be amended to include IOM in the Articles but to have them represented at board level by the EPA

Amendment to be voted on. TBA

17) Amendment to article 18

Number of comments – 22

Number of void comments – 2 (submitted as Proxy without proxy authority submitted)

Comments for - 13

No opinion - 1

Further comment

This is just making everything unnecessarily complex. The current system works very well.

Too complicated

Which rate of inflation. CPI or RPI. And recorded as of when relatively. Maybe inflation + 2% would also be more prudent?

We may struggle to make up the current deficit from inflation by only increasing it by that capped amount. But it's better than almost never increasing it.

Of course it should be under the boards purview to make decisions about membership costs... they are best poised to know the needs of the federation and can make best decisions where small and restricted increases are concerned on behalf of all the lifters.

Result

Motion to be amended to

18. The Board may set a membership subscription fee (the "Membership Fee") for each class of membership relating to the relevant membership period at their discretion, and all members of that class of membership shall pay to British Powerlifting that subscription as a condition of membership.

Any change in membership fee may be made on an annual basis at the discretion of the Board of Directors. Under the proviso of:

18.1 The increase is no more than 2% above the CPI rate of inflation set by the OBR at the 1st July of that year.

18.2 The increase is discussed at the board level and minuted for publication.

18.3 That members are notified of the increase by no less than 60 days prior to the following years' membership being available for purchase.

For avoidance of doubt, the Membership Fee paid by a Member shall not be refunded under any circumstances and this is not a payment for goods or services, but for the right to be recognised as a Member of British Powerlifting.

18) Amendment to bylaw 25.3

Number of comments – 21

Number of void comments – 2 (submitted as Proxy without proxy authority submitted)

Comments for – 13

Further Comments

This makes sense, unfair for juniors to be able to chip the junior record to beat an open who has to go up by 2.5. I'm in favour of people paying 2 entry fees and competing twice though.

would prefer 8for the purposes of classic bench press only

Agree. We should probably adhere to the IPF technical rules rather than oppose them directly. Especially when it is at the cost of other lifters

This seems appropriate

19) Article Amendment

Number of comments – 22

Number of void comments – 2 (submitted as Proxy without proxy authority submitted)

All comments agreed with the motion in its current form with one abstain -

Abstain - Abstain, understand the reasons but seems to add a lot of additional work to volunteers

Further comment –

This is necessary to ensure sound governance.

The new additions to the board have been thoughtfully considered and are professionals adding great value to the skill sets represented on the current board. This motion feels like nonsense and feels as though it maligns those who have volunteered their time and capabilities to better our federation. The idea we should not add high value board members feels like the antithesis of progress and the values we espouse of being an inclusive organisation. Our recent additions have brought new energy, creativity professional experience and a vision which had been lacking for so long. Any responsible board looks at themselves and seeks to add persons who will allow for a broader capacity to meet goals and move the organisation forward. The idea this has not been done and will not continue to be done is baseless and needlessly inflammatory.