

**GB Powerlifting Federation Ltd ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING**

**Sunday 20th July 2025 10.30hrs**

**ALL REGISTERED MEMBERS ARE INVITED TO ATTEND, THIS WILL BE AN ONLINE HOSTED AGM.**

**ONLINE LINK WILL BE DISTRIBUTED 12 HOURS PRIOR TO THE MEETING**

**AGENDA**

1. Register of all members present (electronically recorded).

2. Minutes of the 2024 AGM.

3. Matters arising.

4. Finance Report.

5. Agreement of budget for 2025.

6. Remuneration of accountants.

7. Chairman’s Report.

8. Chief Executive Officer’s Report.

9. Performance Director Report.

10. Committee Reports:

 10.1. England
 10.2. Scotland
 10.3. Wales
 10.4. Northern Ireland
 10.5. Disciplinary Committee
 10.6. Athlete’s Commission
 10.7. Law and Legislation Committee
 10.8. Medical Committee

11. Elections – none this year (no applications received for election for chairperson of Athletes’ Commission – See EGM election section).

12. Notices of motion from the Board – none.

13. Notice of Motions from Members:

13.1) **𝗬𝗮𝗿𝗼𝗻 𝗕𝗲𝗿𝗻𝘀𝘁𝗲𝗶𝗻 𝗮𝗻𝗱 𝗔𝗺𝗶𝗻𝗮 𝗕𝘂𝘅

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

Prior to 2024, referees were the only volunteers at national-level events eligible for compensation, in the form of a contribution towards travel expenses and free membership for the following year for attending two days at national-level competitions in a given year. Compensating referees makes sense as refereeing is the only voluntary role that requires significant financial investment to qualify for.

When compensation for volunteers was introduced, suddenly non-referee volunteers were being compensated more generously than referees. Volunteers at national-level competitions can now claim up to £75 a day. Travel expenses for referees were slightly uplifted, yet the maximum possible overall compensation (travel + membership value) is still only £74.50 per day, although most referees are typically eligible for far less.

This has led many referees to question why they are being undervalued. In addition to the investment required to qualify in the first instance, refereeing is far from the easiest voluntary role, and referees are regularly denigrated by the wider powerlifting community when performing their role enforcing the rules that keep our federation prestigious. The powerlifting community already undervalues referees: British Powerlifting’s volunteer compensation framework only perpetuates and exacerbates this.

Considering 50% of competitive powerlifters are under the age of 25 (source: powerliftingindata), this imbalance in compensation incentivises younger volunteers to avoid refereeing, which could lead to demand for referees begin to outstrip supply as the sport continues to rapidly grow. Current referees are already starting to favour other voluntary roles.

Therefore, we propose referees should be compensated at least in line with other volunteers in the interest of fairness and securing the future of the sport. This can be achieved at no additional cost to British Powerlifting by offering volunteers and referees £60 per day instead of £75 and removing the offer of free membership for referees.

This has been calculated to match BP's current referee and volunteer budget with figures and assumptions identical to those used by BP for their budget calculations to ensure minimal financial strain on BP finances, allowing for rapid implementation.

(Regular Motion only needs a majority vote to pass)

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.**

This motion was brought to my attention by a friend who has regularly attended and commentated at powerlifting meets. One thing he highlighted was the frequency with which lifters' names are mispronounced, particularly those from ethnic or linguistic backgrounds that may be less familiar to MCs, commentators, and spectators.

Names are a core part of the powerlifting experience - they're spoken throughout the day by officials, shouted by the crowd, and often chanted as lifters take the platform. Mispronunciation, especially when repeated, can feel dismissive and alienating, even when entirely unintentional.

Including a pronunciation field on entry forms is a small, simple step that allows those running competitions to show consideration and respect to every lifter. This isn't about creating a burden for volunteers or staff - it's about fostering a more inclusive environment by encouraging Meet Directors, MCs, and commentators to make the effort to get names right.

(Regular Motion only needs a majority vote to pass)

13.3) **𝟏𝟑.𝟑) 𝗥𝗶𝗰𝗵𝗮𝗿𝗱 𝗣𝗮𝗿𝗸𝗲𝗿 & 𝗝𝗼𝘆 𝗡𝗻𝗮𝗺𝗮𝗻𝗶

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

A member is not independent where, by reason of the facts or by circumstances, a reasonable-minded person may consider the he or she would show bias.

A Chair shall be appointed, and all appeals shall be addressed to them in the first instance, copying the CEO. Only the Chair shall have the power to refuse and appeal. The composition of the Panel may be varies depending on what skills are required to hear an appeal; the appeals Chair shall use reasonable endeavors to ensure the appointed members have the appropriate expertise, including legal expertise. The minimum number to hear an appeal shall be three. Members of the panel shall be appointed by the Board, but shall not include company directors if the complaint concerns the Board, any director or any decision made by the Board.

The Current practice of appeals being heard by the Board is open to the accusation of bias, particularly in the case of complaints against Board members or action.

The following clauses in the By Laws and Complaints and Disciplinary Policy & Procedure to be amended as follows:

By Laws: ADD after clause 48. Disciplinary Committee Appeal Panel details as above. Clauses 52 and 53 detailing the actions available for an unsuccessful appeal remain as is.

Complaints and Disciplinary Procedure: Amend all references to the Appeal Panel comprising Board Members to include non-conflicted independent members as above.
REASON:
Othe NGBs like British Weightlifting (BWL), British Fencing and the IPF have completely independent disciplinary procedures. BWL use true independent directors, i.e. no weightlifting involvement at all and the IPF have a dedicated Appeals Commission.

(Regular Motion only needs a majority vote to pass)

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.**

This proposal calls for resetting all Equipped British Records currently held by lifters who claimed them competing in the Classic category. Classic and Equipped Powerlifting are fundamentally different, with distinct technical demands and training requirements. Equipped lifters experience unique challenges, particularly in the deadlift, where the limited support from the deadlift suits along with significantly increased demands on the lifters central nervous system when performance an equipped squat and bench press results in lower relative deadlift numbers despite higher sub-totals in squat and bench. At present, 87.5% of all Open Equipped deadlift records are held by Classic lifters, who typically have little engagement with the Equipped discipline. This skews the representation of what Equipped lifters can achieve. Moreover, 10% of British deadlift records are higher than the corresponding World Records due to British Powerlifting allowing Classic lifters to hold Equipped records, a practice not mirrored by the IPF. This creates an inconsistency between national and international standards, disproportionally affecting women, with 37.5% of Women’s British Open Equipped deadlift records exceeding the World Records. Resetting these records to the standard would align British Powerlifting with the IPF, ensuring the records are set by athletes.

(Regular Motion only needs a majority vote to pass)

13.5) **𝟏𝟑.𝟓) 𝗛𝗮𝗻𝗻𝗮𝗵 𝗠𝗮𝘁𝘀𝗼𝗻 𝗮𝗻𝗱 𝗖𝗵𝗮𝗿𝗹𝗶𝗲 𝗠𝗮𝗿𝗶𝗹𝗹𝗶𝗲𝗿

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

This should include the Safeguarding policy and how it is implemented in all areas of British Powerlifting such as safe practices for children online and at powerlifting events, education and publication of safe practices for coaches and participants involved in powerlifting and continual review and amendments of the policy in line with legislation, regulation and best practice.

To adopt UK Coaching’s guidance on Safeguarding, online safety, safe recruitment and retention of powerlifting staff, safe practices in events and supporting Elite athletes.

To also recruit a safeguarding committee, much as the Coaching committee has expanded, to delegate this huge task under the Safeguarding Lead.

Powerlifting is dominated by the online space.  It is an effective way to promote the sport and an individual’s career. It is also a common method used by coaches to provide their services, rather than face-to-face. However, the digital space comes with the risk of misuse. I believe that adopting these suggestions put forward by UK Coaching on good practice in the digital space will help promote the safety of our members, particularly vulnerable groups, and remind members of the federation to use social platforms responsibly. A draft Safeguarding policy has been submitted which is a full and extensive policy adapted from the guidance from UK Sport and the NSPCC. However, there is still much work to be done on the policy and it’s effective implementation.

(Regular Motion only needs a majority vote to pass)