

## Appendix D – Proposals for Discussion & Voting

The following items are to be discussed and voted upon to determine how the League proceeds on those matters.

a. **2018-19 Club Affiliation/Membership Fees**

*In the light of the information and statistics provided in the accompanying **Appendix C** should the member club affiliation fees be changed?*

**Yes / No**

*If yes, which of the following options is preferred?*

**Option A / Option B / Option C / Option D / Option E / Option F**

b. **New Member Clubs Proposals**

*The following clubs have successfully completed the initial trial period over the past season and have proved their commitment to the OXL with consistent athlete turnout as well as offering support at the Round 2 fixture:*

- Harwell Harriers
- Oxford Tri Club

*The proposal is therefore to invite both clubs to join up as full members of the League.*

*Proposed by **Dene Stringfellow** (OXL League Manager)*

**Yes / No**

c. **GDPR Compliance Proposals**

*Following the review of the GDPR and its impact on the OXL the following proposals are put forward in an effort to ensure the OXL meets its compliance obligations ( – please refer to **Appendix A** for full details):*

- i. *Are member clubs in agreement with the proposals presented in the **GDPR Overview & Compliance** document to meet general GDPR compliance?*

**Yes / No\***

- ii. *Are there any objections to the proposed OXL **Privacy Policy**?*

**Yes / No\***

- iii. *Are there any objections to the proposed OXL **Cookies Policy**?*

**Yes / No\***

- iv. Are there any objections to the proposed OXL **Online Entry System** and, if not, are there any volunteers that may be able to assist?

**Yes / No\***

- v. Are there any objections to the proposed OXL **Athlete Photography Consent** process?

**Yes / No\***

\* If the decision is No, what alternative solution is proposed? **Note:** The policies need to be in place on the League website by Wednesday, 25<sup>th</sup> May 2018 at the latest.

**d. League Constitution Amendments**

As part of the ongoing process of the review of the League Constitution and as agreed at the past three AGMs further amendments based upon those initially set out for the 2015 AGM are proposed.  
Please refer to **Appendix E** for full details.

**e. Category Prizes for V65+ Women and V70+ Men**

The question was raised during the course for the past season as to why veteran prizes are only available for Women age 55+ and Men age 60+. The correspondent felt there are sufficient veteran athletes aged 65+ and 70+ respectively to justify the addition of these categories. It was also felt the introduction of the 65+ and 70+ would increase competition among those qualifying athletes. Proposed by **Thornton Greenland** (Abingdon AC)  
Should additional 65+ Women and 70+ Men categories be created and, if so, should prizes be awarded for 1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> places or 1<sup>st</sup> place only?

**Yes / No     1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> prizes / 1<sup>st</sup> prizes only**

**f. Senior Divisional Promotions & Structure**

A concern has been raised as to the validity of the existing senior divisional and promotional structure owing to an instance of a team in the 3<sup>rd</sup> Division (Women) outperforming all but one of the other teams in all the divisions. Although the 2017-18 champion team won by a significant margin in this instance, it does not preclude the situation where a team in a lower division could outperform all other teams and yet not be crowned OXL champions. Proposed by **Simon Leech** (White Horse Harriers AC)  
Should anything be done to address this issue?

i. Option 1:

1. Division 1 - A teams only
2. Division 2 - B teams only
3. Division 3 - Remaining teams

ii. Option 2:

1. Allow a team to be promoted to a division on the basis of the points achieved, not position.
  - a. **Note:** The decision was taken at an earlier AGM to remove the possibility to gain promotion based upon the points total achieved at the end of the season. Any

*decision to approve Option 2 would mean back-tracking on that earlier decision.*

iii. Option 3:

1. *Leave things as they currently stand (2 up/2 down)*

**Yes / No      Option 1 / Option 2 / Option 3**

**g. Chip Timing Survey Results & Review**

*A survey has been conducted as requested at the 2017 AGM as to whether or not member clubs would be in favour, in principal, of the League introducing chip timing. That survey was completed and the results indicate there is an even split between those member clubs in favour and those not. Please refer to **Appendix D** for an overview of the results.*

*The survey did not ask member clubs to consider any issues currently impacting the League. It is now pertinent to do so. They are:*

- i. *Issues arising from athletes racing wearing the wrong number.*
- ii. *The dwindling number of available officials to record the finishers.*
- iii. *The workload placed upon the current League Manager.*

*The overriding concerns of clubs related to the cost and how race numbers will be managed. Some suggestions are put forward below as to how these issues may be addressed in an effort to allow the introduction of chip timing and help resolve the issues currently being faced.*

i. Option 1:

- a) *Set the League affiliation fee to a flat fee for all member clubs.*
- b) *Sponsorship for the individual races for the season – i.e. One sponsor for all 2018-19 U9 Girls and Boys races, one sponsor for all U11 Girls races, etc.*

ii. Option 2:

- a) *Keep the League affiliation structure as it is for all member clubs.*
- b) *Move to a wholly online entry system where all athletes pay their own entry fees, complete their entry form individually and receive their own race number incorporating their timing chip.*

**Note:** *A requirement for this option to be viable would be that an individual would have to manage his/her own EA affiliation record, ensure that his/her EA record is correct and the EA affiliation fees have been paid and processed.*

iii. Option 3:

- a) *Do not introduce chip timing and keep system as it currently stands.*

**Option 1 / Option 2 / Option 3**

**h. Fixture Costs & Cancellation Insurance**

*Some concerns have been raised in the aftermath of this season's Round 2 fixture that was scheduled at very short notice and the decision taken not to collect car parking fees on the day at a remote location potentially putting marshals at risk. The decision was taken by the League Committee to subsequently cover the cost of the fixture by requesting that clubs collect and submit an apportioned contribution from their club members that attended the fixture. While some clubs may have done so, others may have taken the decision for the club to cover the cost itself. Where the latter has been the case*

*the concern has been raised as to whether or not the League Committee should be able to make a request at such short notice without any forewarning.*

*Proposed by **The Club Committee** (Abingdon AC)*

- i. Is it within the remit of the League Committee to make such requests to cover costs?*

**Yes / No**

*Additionally, in the light of the cancellation of the final fixture of the season the following proposal has been put forward in an effort to alleviate the burden on clubs hosting fixtures.*

*Proposed by **Hugh Morris** (Eynsham RR)*

- ii. A review of the OXL entry system suggested to change to either a club or individual entry system (mirroring that of the Mota-vation series) with this pot (of income) meeting the set up costs of all events and retaining the funds as a cushion for future years. That would allow clubs to still help set up events but without the financial risk. The League could then cover all the events financial risks with cancellation insurance. It would also remove the need to collect car park fees would release more volunteers to marshal elsewhere.*

**Yes / No**