

# British Powerlifting 2025 AGM Motion Comments by Registered Members

Voting on motions opens Sunday 27<sup>th</sup> April 2025

Should anyone wish to amend their motion before voting opens, please email  
[ben.davis@britishpowerlifting.org](mailto:ben.davis@britishpowerlifting.org) by 17:00hrs on Sunday 27<sup>th</sup> April 2025

Full details of the motions can be found [HERE](#)

Here are the comments submitted regarding the proposed motions for British Powerlifting 2025,  
Comments are now closed. All comments are presented anonymously.

This document includes only substantive comments. Simple responses such as "yes," "no," "agree," "abstain," "not applicable," and similar have been excluded from the detailed comments reported, as they do not provide any reasoning. For transparency, we will still report the number of non-substantive responses (e.g., "For," "Against," "No Comment," "Abstain," or simple statements of agreement) as a simple count. However, please note that comments will not be counted towards the final vote counts on motions. To formally register a vote, you must complete the subsequent voting form.

Motions that have subsequently become invalid, or that concern matters no longer subject to a vote owing to circumstances, were also omitted from the comments process.

## **Motions and Comments**

### **Motion 13.1: Yaron Bernstein and Amina Bux**

**Referees should be compensated at least in line with other volunteers at national-level competitions.**

#### **Motion Comments:**

|   |
|---|
| No figures or data is provided for volunteer numbers and referee numbers to indicate the basis of this financial assumption. The required volunteer number can vary based on the competition, as well as number of referees (e.g. a jury can be formed of 3 or 5 people).   |
| <p>I agree in principle. Though a tiny amount, it seems an illogical disparity.</p> <p>I suggest the following tweak: That British Powerlifting adopt a single volunteer compensation framework for national-level competitions as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A flat allowance of £75 per full day for all volunteers, inclusive of travel and subsistence.</li> <li>2. A 50 % membership rebate for any approved volunteer who contributes a minimum of two full days in a calendar year.</li> <li>3. The Board will review and report annually on total volunteer-days, costs, and referee recruitment/retention, with authority to recommend rate adjustments to future AGMs.</li> </ol> |
| The principle is valid, everyone should be treated equally, but why are we reducing expenses vs bringing everyone up to the same?   |
| Agree to compensate expenses at the same rate as a minimum, although feel the referees will see the removal of the free membership as a step backwards and this should be used as an incentive to encourage more referees for the future.   |
| Yes, all volunteers claim £60 per day   |
| Disagree with removing membership refund. Referees should then be compensated same as other volunteers now.   |

#### **Summary of Yes/No/Abstain/NA comments not listed above:**

| <b>Yes/Agree</b> | <b>No/Against</b> | <b>Abstain/NA/No Comment</b> |
|------------------|-------------------|------------------------------|
| 8                | 4                 | 6                            |

## Motion 13.2: Tarrin Wilson & Owen Leggett

British Powerlifting will develop and provide a template sign-up sheet for Meet Directors that includes an optional field for lifters to indicate the phonetic pronunciation of their name. Meet Directors will be encouraged to collect these pronunciation guides, print them, and share them with MCs and commentators ahead of the event. MCs and commentators will be encouraged to familiarise themselves with these guides and refer to them during the competition to ensure names are pronounced as accurately as possible.

### Motion Comments:

|   |
|---|
| This could be expanded to included preferred name to enable lifters to be referenced by their preferred name as opposed to given name.  |
| <p>I support the aim of helping MCs and commentators pronounce every lifter's name correctly – it's a simple mark of respect and strengthens the spectator experience.</p> <p>However, to avoid unnecessary bureaucracy, I propose that British Powerlifting:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Add an optional phonetic-pronunciation field to each member's online profile (perhaps on member registration). This value is then auto-pulled into competition start lists and commentator running orders, so Meet Directors have no extra data-entry burden.</li> <li>2. Provide a one-page guide for MCs highlighting free AI/name-pronunciation tools and encouraging them to rehearse unfamiliar names. This could be at the request of meet organisers.</li> <li>3. Pilot the system at one national event in 2025 and report back to the 2026 AGM on uptake, cost and athlete feedback before making it compulsory.</li> </ol> <p>This keeps the motion's inclusivity goal while ensuring the solution is scalable and low-overhead for our volunteer organisers.</p> <p>Longer term it might be possible to integrate AI with open lifter to do this automatically and display on screen with zero admin and deliver a global impact. But would require a volunteer with development experience and free time to commit the change as a pull request to the project.</p> |
| Yes include a pronunciation field on entry forms  |

### Summary of Yes/No/Abstain/NA comments not listed above:

| Yes/Agree | No/Against | Abstain/NA/No Comment |
|-----------|------------|-----------------------|
| 15        | 0          | 4                     |

### Motion 13.3: Richard Parker & Joy Nnamani

**That an independent Appeal Panel is set up comprising of members who shall be and shall remain independent of the parties at all times and shall immediately disclose any circumstance which may affect his or her independence during the appeals process in writing to the parties.**

#### Motion Comments:

|   |
|---|
| Can this be incorporated into the current disciplinary committee as part of a two-tier structure?   |
| <p>I support the principle of an arms-length appeal stage. Independence is now common practice across UK NGBs (e.g. British Weight Lifting, British Fencing) and is encouraged by Sport England's Governance Code. It strengthens transparency and protects the Board from accusations of marking its own homework.</p> <p>However, the mechanism must be proportionate for a small but growing sport. I propose that British Powerlifting:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Adopts a policy that any appeal concerning Board actions, selection decisions or disciplinary sanctions is heard by a three-person panel with an independent chair and a majority of independent members.</li> <li>2. Potentially utilises the Sport Resolutions panel-support scheme (no cost for the panellists, only case-admin fees) or, failing that, maintains a small volunteer pool drawn from outside the federation.</li> <li>3. Retains the right for the Board (via an Appeals Secretary) to reject vexatious or out-of-time appeals to avoid unnecessary process.</li> <li>4. Commits to an annual report to the AGM on the number, nature and cost of appeals so members can monitor impact.</li> </ol> <p>This approach secures independence without creating a standing committee that would add permanent cost or bureaucracy.</p> |
| I agree that the panel should be an independent panel of members. Also, I agree that there should be a separate complaints procedure.   |
| In the first line of the motion "compromising" should read "comprising" as was submitted in the original motion.  |
| The independent appeal panel should never have been removed in the first instance and therefore it is correct that one is reinstated.   |
| This is unclear to me sorry. I'm not understanding the practical application of choosing different appeal members for appeals. Can this be explained further. Perhaps an example can be used.   |
| Also how is the chair appointed? By the board?  |

#### Summary of Yes/No/Abstain/NA comments not listed above:

| Yes/Agree | No/Against | Abstain/NA/No Comment |
|-----------|------------|-----------------------|
| 12        | 0          | 2                     |

**Motion 13.4: Miriam Weber and Amy Sanders**

**To reset all Equipped British Records currently held by Classic lifters to the standard, ensuring fair competition and alignment with IPF regulations.**

**Motion Comments:**

Resetting these records back to a standard would mean that any equipped lifters that had records prior to classic lifters being awarded the records would also then lose their records.

It would also mean that anyone who has now moved class, eg, record as a Junior that is now Open, would lose their records if they were reset to a standard and not be able to try and set them again. This would be unfair to equipped lifters who hold records in classes that they no longer are eligible to compete in.

Whilst I agree in principle, it would be an onerous task to identify all equipped records made by classic lifters.

**Summary of Yes/No/Abstain/NA comments not listed above:**

| Yes/Agree | No/Against | Abstain/NA/No Comment |
|-----------|------------|-----------------------|
| 9         | 4          | 5                     |

### **Motion 13.5: Hannah Matson and Charlie Marillier**

**To undertake a complete Safeguarding and safety review for British Powerlifting.**

#### **Motion Comments:**

I'm in favour of reviewing or refreshing our safeguarding policy, particularly around online coaching and social media.

Though British Powerlifting already has a 2022 safeguarding policy and the new Coaching Licence requires UK Coaching safeguarding certification, so probably best to focus efforts on where there might be gaps.

I propose a light-touch update: commission a quick external check (e.g. UK Coaching) and let the current Safeguarding Officer lead any amendments, reporting back to the Board and AGM.

- No new standing committee unless the audit shows a genuine gap.
- Publish a short annual safeguarding summary so members can see progress.

This keeps us aligned with best practice without adding unnecessary bureaucracy.

This is an extremely important motion given the current climate of the coaching landscape within British Powerlifting. Far too many lifters consider themselves "coaches" and engage in poor coaching practices due to lack of education, consideration, and regulation, which ultimately impacts health and safety of the lifter, as well as presents a huge safeguarding risk. In no other sport would one be permitted to coach without adequate qualification or regulation. In addition to the fantastic points raised in this motion, I would make the suggestion to consider the impact of non-professional, unqualified persons who engage in coaching practices upon the safeguarding risk commonly seen within the coaching landscape, and how this can be included within a safeguarding review.

#### **Summary of Yes/No/Abstain/NA comments not listed above:**

| <b>Yes/Agree</b> | <b>No/Against</b> | <b>Abstain/NA/No Comment</b> |
|------------------|-------------------|------------------------------|
| 13               | 1                 | 5                            |

### Motion 13.6: Kim Cowell and James Taylor

**In circumstances where a decision made by the board materially impacts the membership, there must be a mandatory period of consultation with the relevant commission(s) and / or key members who reasonably represent the group or class of people affected by the decision (whether positively or negatively).**

#### Motion Comments:

I agree members should be heard on changes that significantly affect fees, licensing or competition rules.

However, a blanket obligation to consult before every such decision risks paralysing the Board when rapid action is required. The main hazards are:

- Loss of agility in an emergency (venue, safeguarding, anti-doping).
- Missed commercial opportunities through delay.
- Administrative drain on a volunteer-led organisation.
- Greater legal attack surface if any step is inadvertently skipped.

Proposed compromise:

1. Define “material impact” precisely (e.g. fee changes > 10 %, rules that affect an entire age/weight category, etc).
2. Set a default 21-day consultation window, but allow the Board to bypass it when delay would expose the federation to substantial financial, legal or safety risk. Reasons must be published within 7 days and a retrospective 60-day consultation run.
3. Publish a short annual log of consultations and outcomes so members can see transparency without hamstringing day-to-day governance.

This mirrors practice in cycling and football: members get a voice, yet the directors we elect retain the agility—and clear accountability—to protect and progress British Powerlifting.

This approach is not about requiring consultation for every routine or operational decision—that would be unworkable and burdensome. Instead, it’s about drawing a clear line for exceptional cases where decisions have a broad or material impact on the membership.

The policy should also include an emergency exemption, allowing the Board to bypass consultation where a delay would risk financial loss, legal exposure, or safeguarding failures. In such cases, the Board must publish its reasons and consult retrospectively within 60 days.

Agree - policy to include definition and timeframe for clarity

I would like to see a definition of materially? A significant financial cost or additional time required (e.g courses to be completed).

Summary of Yes/No/Abstain/NA comments not listed above:

| Yes/Agree | No/Against | Abstain/NA/No Comment |
|-----------|------------|-----------------------|
| 12        | 0          | 5                     |



**Motion 13.7: James Taylor and Lottie Hall (Special resolution - 75% vote - Change to articles)****To amend Articles 38****Motion Comments:**

I'm fully in favour of transparent, reasonable reimbursement for volunteer directors. However, requiring an AGM vote every year to set allowances risks politicising a routine policy and could leave directors out-of-pocket if costs rise mid-season.

Alternative proposal:

1. Adopt a published expenses policy tied to HMRC mileage rates and government subsistence tables. Any change above CPI + 5% must be reported to members but does not need a separate vote.
2. Require dual approval (Chair + Finance Director) for each claim and include expense totals for each director in the annual accounts.
3. Independent audit review of the policy's application, reported to the AGM.

This keeps expenses transparent and properly controlled — in line with wider UK-sport practice — without adding an annual voting cycle that could hamper agility or discourage future volunteers.

**Summary of Yes/No/Abstain/NA comments not listed above:**

| Yes/Agree | No/Against | Abstain/NA/No Comment |
|-----------|------------|-----------------------|
| 14        | 0          | 6                     |

# **Motion 13.8: James Taylor and Lottie Hall (Special resolution - 75% vote - Change to articles)**

**To amend Article 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, and 81**

## **Motion Comments**

I support extending conflict-of-interest rules to all Board committees and introducing annual declarations; that is now standard good practice across UK sport and the charity sector. But I think the following safeguards are critical.

1. Limit automatic invalidation to deliberate or reckless non-declaration. Otherwise a harmless oversight discovered months later could retroactively void meet results, coach selections or sponsorship contracts, exposing the federation to legal challenge and reputational damage.
2. Provide a way to keep quorum when recusals occur (e.g. allowing an independent reserve member to step in). Without this, small committees could be paralysed mid-meeting, delaying urgent decisions on selections, safeguarding, or event approvals.
3. A decision shall not be invalidated for non-declaration of a conflict unless the potential conflict is brought to the Board's attention within 60 days of the meeting at which the decision was taken (or, if later, within 30 days of the minutes being published). After this period the Board may still review the matter, but the original decision shall remain valid unless set aside by a fresh resolution.

With these clarifications the amendment delivers transparency and trust without risking operational breakdown or legal jeopardy.

In the past I struggled to get the Board to issue a conflict of interest register. Even then the published register omits any details of the precise conflict.

## **Summary of Yes/No/Abstain/NA comments not listed above:**

| Yes/Agree | No/Against | Abstain/NA/No Comment |
|-----------|------------|-----------------------|
| 14        | 0          | 5                     |

## Motion 13.9: James Taylor and Kim Cowell (Special resolution - 75% vote - Change to articles)

### Amend Article 86

#### Motion Comments:

Transparent minutes are the right direction and meet Code Requirement 5. However, the 21-day rule and mandatory vote on every redaction could make it unworkable for a volunteer Board and may inhibit frank discussion.

Suggested amendments:

1. Publish redacted minutes within 30 days or at the next scheduled Board meeting, whichever is later.
2. Approve a standing redaction policy (data-protected personal info, commercially sensitive bids, legal privilege). Chair + Company Secretary apply the policy; Board reviews annually.
3. Issue a short "Board communiqué" summary alongside the redacted minutes for clarity.

This keeps British Powerlifting fully compliant with the Code and in line with peers like British Cycling, while avoiding unintended administrative burden or chilled debate.

P.S A Board communiqué is a short, plain-English summary of what happened in a Board meeting — written for stakeholders (like members, staff, or partners) who don't need the full minutes. Given how well AI can now summarise meeting minutes, this should be able to be generated in an unbiased way that should not take a lot of time.

Perhaps we could encourage use of AI digital meeting minuting tools like Otter.ai, Google meet transcribe and others across BP to help with compliance whilst reducing the administration. Though minutes would still need to be checked for accuracy by a human as the AI can hallucinate.

#### Summary of Yes/No/Abstain/NA comments not listed above:

| Yes/Agree | No/Against | Abstain/NA/No Comment |
|-----------|------------|-----------------------|
| 13        | 0          | 7                     |

**Motion 13.10: James Taylor and Kim Cowell (Special resolution - 75% vote - Change to articles)**

**To amend Article 85**

**Motion Comments:**

I support publishing draft AGM/EGM minutes quickly, so members aren't in the dark for a year. To keep the admin light and align with Motion 13.9, I propose two small tweaks:

1. Approval: Draft minutes are prepared by the Company Secretary and approved by the Chair (with all directors given seven days to raise corrections) rather than requiring unanimous email sign-off. Members need to be made aware what it means for minutes to be in draft status, perhaps with a disclaimer at the top.

2. Timeline: Publish within 21 days rather than 14, matching the Board-minute timeline — one clear deadline for staff and volunteers.

All other points stand: the draft goes on the website with any redactions applied under the same policy as Article 86, and the final text is ratified by members at the next GM. This balances transparency with realistic workload and avoids duplicating bureaucracy.

The minutes of last year's AGM were only issued after I made a formal request to see them 24/3/25! This was after my complaint to the DC on this matter was rejected!

**Summary of Yes/No/Abstain/NA comments not listed above:**

| Yes/Agree | No/Against | Abstain/NA/No Comment |
|-----------|------------|-----------------------|
| 13        | 0          | 6                     |

## Motion 13.11: James Taylor and Kim Cowell (Special resolution - 75% vote - Change to articles

### To amend Article 83

#### Motion Comments:

I support this motion. Clear, standardised minutes that record who was present, what was decided, and the outcome of any vote (including those made outside formal meetings) are crucial for transparency and good governance.

To keep this lightweight in practice, I suggest adding a clarification: "Only material comments and actions relevant to the decision should be recorded." This ensures minutes remain useful and efficient, not overly verbose.

This approach supports British Powerlifting's credibility and future growth without adding unnecessary process.

Again, perhaps encouraging and/or paying for the adoption of AI meeting minute taking tools would aid compliance with this and make it a lot easier to create minutes rapidly post meeting rather than requiring a lot of manual work. At the moment BP emails are driven through an rudimentary service. I propose switching to Google Workplace which comes with better email management tools (like Gmail) and AI tools for online Google meet meetings.

Strongly agree. The published 2024 AGM Minutes do not list all those who voted, only those who actually participated in the AGM. Plus the voting should be in the body of the minutes not just a link. Does this mean that those voting aren't participants in the actual AGM, ,in which case how can the voting be valid? Of course, a number would have done both.

Agree - review number reference from 82.3.4 should be 83.3.4 etc.

#### Summary of Yes/No/Abstain/NA comments not listed above:

| Yes/Agree | No/Against | Abstain/NA/No Comment |
|-----------|------------|-----------------------|
| 11        | 0          | 6                     |

**Motion 13.12: James Taylor and Kim Cowell (Special resolution - 75% vote - Change to articles****To amend Article 84****Motion Comments:**

I welcome a defined timeline for approving Board and committee minutes — that safeguards accuracy and transparency.

To keep the process workable for a volunteer Board, I suggest aligning with Chartered Governance Institute guidance: circulate minutes within 10 working days, give directors 7 days to comment, deem them approved if no objections are raised, and formally ratify at the next meeting. This avoids delays caused by seeking unanimous email sign-off while still ensuring every director has the opportunity to correct the record.

**Summary of Yes/No/Abstain/NA comments not listed above:**

| Yes/Agree | No/Against | Abstain/NA/No Comment |
|-----------|------------|-----------------------|
| 13        | 0          | 7                     |

**Motion 13.13: Kim Cowell and Paul Marsh (Special resolution - 75% vote - Change to articles)**

**This motion has two parts:**

**Part a) To amend Article 40**

**Part b) To create a new bylaw to address the purpose of the DEI Commission**

**Motion Comments:**

I support establishing a Board-level DEIB Commission to address real diversity and inclusion gaps in British Powerlifting, with a clear focus on equality of opportunity—not enforced outcomes.

What the DEIB Commission should do:

1. Map the landscape. Collect and publish anonymous data (gender, ethnicity, disability, socio-economic background) across roles to monitor diversity annually.
2. Identify barriers. Use surveys, interviews, or workshops to uncover genuine obstacles (e.g. cost, accessibility, caring duties, bias), and act based on evidence.
3. Propose lawful, merit-based actions  
Recommend outreach, mentoring, blind recruitment, and support (e.g. childcare, travel)—while ensuring final decisions remain merit-based.
4. Provide constructive training. Offer voluntary, relevant training (e.g. Equality Act) in a supportive, non-punitive way that respects free speech and avoids reverse discrimination.
5. Ensure transparency. Publish an annual report on actions and outcomes for Board and AGM scrutiny.

What the DEIB Commission must avoid:

1. No quotas or reserved seats. These are unlawful under the Equality Act and undermine meritocracy.
2. No demographic exclusions  
All adverts and shortlists must remain inclusive and non-discriminatory.
3. No ideological tests or speech restrictions  
Respect lawful free expression and follow existing codes of conduct.
4. No punitive or compulsory training  
Keep development supportive, voluntary, and constructive—never shaming.
5. No unrecorded decisions  
All recommendations and votes must be transparent and minuted.

Reasoning: A data-driven, opportunity-focused approach meets governance needs and widens access, while avoiding legal risks and division. Promoting fairness, free speech, and evidence-based inclusion benefits all.

There is no DEI Commission shown on the website, chairperson announcement made nor any nomination for this position on the agenda.

**Summary of Yes/No/Abstain/NA comments not listed above:**

| Yes/Agree | No/Against | Abstain/NA/No Comment |
|-----------|------------|-----------------------|
| 11        | 1          | 7                     |



# **Motion 13.14: Paul Marsh and James Taylor (Special resolution - 75% vote - Change to articles)**

## **To amend Articles 46, 47 and 49**

### **Motion Comments:**

I support tightening director term limits. The current 20-year cap is out of step with Sport England’s Tier 1 Code, which recommends a nine-year maximum.

Practical proposal for a volunteer-led sport:

1. Set a nine-year cap (three terms).
2. Allow one exceptional two-year extension (up to 11 years) by super-majority vote, published in the minutes.
3. Cap Home Countries directors at 12 years to respect external election cycles.
4. Clarify Article 47’s one-year rollover counts toward the cap and is non-repeatable.
5. Phase in over two AGMs to retain key experience.

This balances compliance with best practice, fresh thinking, and continuity—essential for a growing, volunteer-dependent federation.

It aligns with Tier 1 Code Requirement 4: People, which promotes renewal, diversity, and succession planning through time-limited Board service.

### **Summary of Yes/No/Abstain/NA comments not listed above:**

| Yes/Agree | No/Against | Abstain/NA/No Comment |
|-----------|------------|-----------------------|
| 14        | 0          | 6                     |