British Powerlifting

**EGM Motions Proposed for comment from the British Powerlifting Membership for the upcoming EGM on 20th July 2025.**

**Motion 1 - Kimberley Cowell, James Taylor & Lottie Hall**

**A Committee, appointed by the Board, shall immediately commence a wholesale review of the current British Powerlifting Articles of Association and Bylaws to include, but is not limited to, the following: -**

1. Structure of the current Executive Board and its sub-committees, to include the length of terms;
2. Governance, policies and procedures;
3. Financial controls and expenses policies and procedures;
4. Conflict of interest measures, policies and procedures;
5. Processes and procedures pertaining to record keeping, the accuracy of the same and timescales for publication and availability for inspection of such records, and;
6. The implementation of decisions made by the Board and / or its sub-committees that have a material impact on the membership.

It is clear there are material gaps and issues to be addressed in order to bring British Powerlifting’s governance and policy documents in line with the expectations of a National Governing Body.

This motion acknowledges the need to carry out that review, and for updates to be made as part of that process rather than piecemeal to minimise confusion and disruption.

The above points are deliberately broad to enable full flexibility of the Committee’s review and recommendations, whilst ensuring the issues previously raised through the AGM motion mechanism are noted.

The membership shall be kept updated and input invited at the relevant junctures, with the final project to be delivered by no later than Q2 2026.

Accordingly, the following motions submitted and accepted ahead of the 2025 AGM (and stood for the adjourned 2025 AGM) are hereby withdrawn: -

* 13.6
* 13.7
* 13.8
* 13.9
* 13.10
* 13.11
* 13.12
* 13.13
* 13.14

**British Powerlifting board comments:**

* Strongly supported. Must be board-led with a committee of skilled volunteers and guided by expert legal counsel with NGB experience. Likely external spend required, seen as strategic investment.

**Members comments:**

1. This is very much needed. I would also suggest considering having instead of an Executive Board, a more traditional Board structure, with an Executive Team which report into a wider Board, made up of both the Exec and Non Exec. This will give the Exec team greater control of day to day decisions and then seeking approval from the Board or the relevant sub committee for key changes. This will also give greater challenge/better governance to the Exec Team for decisions made.
2. The current Articles and By-Laws were approved by Sport England when we gained NGB recognition so there can't be much wrong with them. This is a major exercise requiring legal input; so I would question whether we have the resources to do this. Especially bearing in mind the number of vacancies.
3. Yes
4. The existing Articles were approved by Sport England as part of the NGHB recognition process. As such they should be consulted before embarking on such an exercise. Furthermore, we can't fill all the board vacancies let alone form a committee to carry out such a far reaching task.
5. Fully support this and recent events requiring AGM Adjournment clearly highlight the weakness in the current articles. Here are my reasons:
   1. Importance of Democratic Process:

Being able to raise amendments is a critical part of a democratic voting process, however the current articles only allow this in person, which also simultaneously not allowing for amendments due to the changes to facilitate online voting. There is also no mechanism for handling if several members each submit amends to a single motion, an eventuality more and more likely to happen as membership grows. Clearly this is a significant governance issue that needs to be corrected. Without a functioning amendment process, we lose an important mechanism to make revisions to amendments that might be good for the membership. Having a one-stage process for amendments also has issues; though easier to facilitate online, it limits proper debate we risk passing policy that has unintended consequences or errors. I would personally like to see a motion amendment process that is more akin to parliamentary process, but without so much overhead to be impossible to manage. Here is an example as a starter for ten: 1. Members submit motions which are published. 2) A chat or similar for visible online two-way debate 3. Amendments can be submitted (and seconded) 4. Amendments get voted on first (one by one if several) 5. Carried amendments get folded into the motion, and the amended motion gets voted on. (note this is just one idea, and it doesn't necessarily have to function exactly like this)

2. Governance complexity Issues -------------------------- Articles are supposed to be the constitution of the company and reserved for certain matters. Currently they are big and encompass thing that probably really should be in bylaws. This adds governance complexity and makes it harder to conduct certain operational functions. I'd like to see the committee consider a review of this to ensure the scope of the articles follow best practice of other companies and sporting orgs.

3. Additional Sport England Considerations: ---------------------------------------------------------------- Though the articles were reviewed as part of NGB recognition, this doesn't mean that they are flawless, only that they passed the basic bar. I would note that British Powerlifting does not currently fully meet Sport England Tier 1, 2 or 3 standards, all of which have elevated requirements for governance processes beyond basic NGB recognition. Having a committee put this together ensures it's done in a controlled way, rather than members feeling they need to force the changes through themselves at a pace that may be unsustainable for a volunteer board. For example it may look great on paper to aim straight for tier 3 compliance on a given topic, but practically some of these requirements may be impractical for the size of British powerlifting currently. This is reasoning behind the tiered system, to act as a gradual goal for sports organizations, not for them to race to full compliance before they are ready.

4. Benefits of referring to committee vs. member submission -------------------------------------------- Governance is a complex task to get right, and evidence shows that people make better decisions as a group than on their own. By forming this committee having people on it with different vested interested, will help to ensure edge cases that cause issues are rectified so that this can be changed once, and hopefully stand the federation in good stead into the future. This committee will then be able to decide what it wants to optimise for (e.g. board transparency, respecting board capacity, Sports England best practice, etc). This means the governance changes have the best chance of being robust, fit for purpose, and also in the interest of the membership. 5. Ensuring we empowering effective leadership ---------------------------------------

----- My biggest worry is that we make British Powerlifting such a challenge to run that nobody wants to do it, we lose further leadership roles, and the fed falls into decay. In contrast, setting up this committee is an exciting opportunity to do this correctly first time. Enabling the fed to find balance and ensure a motivated and performing leadership team that attracts good people to want to be a part of. Because great functioning leadership is what is necessary to ensure British Powerlifting continues to grow and have a bright future.