



## South Midlands Powerlifting Association

### Annual General Meeting

19<sup>th</sup> November 2023 – Microsoft Teams Meeting

#### Agenda

1. Register of all voting members present
  - Kyran O'Neill – KO
  - Ashraf Alhasan – AA
  - Dave Murray – DM
  - Andrew Mcellistrim – AM
  - Lukas Amosovas – LA
  - Tzveti Tzonova – TT
  - Connie Raitt – CR
  - Kieran Perry – KP
  - Daniel Jay – DJ
  - Carly Dalton – CD
  
2. Reports to be agreed
  - a) Chairman's report (appendix 1) – Agreed
  - b) Treasurer's report (appendix 2) – Agreed
  
3. Election of Executive positions:
  - President – Dean Bowring
  - Chairman – Ashraf Alhasan
  - General Secretary – Kyran O'Neill
  - Treasurer – Carly Dalton
  - Social Media & Comms – Tzveti Tzonova
  - Competitions Officers – Kieran Perry & Mat Hallett
  - University Rep – Lukas Amosovas
  - Buckinghamshire Rep – Danny Evans
  - Berkshire Rep – Charlie Knight
  - Oxfordshire Rep – Andrew Mcellistrim/Connie Raitt – Andrew elected by 6;4
  - Hampshire Rep – Daniel Jay
  - IOW Rep – Dave Murray

AA: congratulations and welcome to all new members of Exec. Acknowledgement of Connie's experience and willingness to help the division to expand and improve operations in the Oxfordshire area. Would be a shame to lose someone so willing when they could help.

AM/CR: both agreed and happy to work together, share contacts, etc as much as possible for the benefit of Oxfordshire members. AM elected to Exec but promising future collaboration between the two.



#### 4. Motions from SMPA

Members

##### **4a. Motion from Dave Murray: “To reinstate a competition levy” (see appendix 3 for details)**

DM: Introduced rationale and content of motion. Previously had a levy in some form pre-Covid but it was scrapped when the division was running very few competitions, in the hope that it would encourage more competitions again. This has worked very well but a reintroduction of some form of levy would help to sure up finances and help us to purchase kit which can be kept in the north of the division to encourage a wider geographical spread of competitions.

CD: What was previous levy rate?

DM: Generally 10% though it was more complicated because the Exec were running most of the competitions themselves, between a small group of people. Surplus monies therefore went back to the division.

AA: Anyone want to express opinions before moving to vote?

CD: Percentage seems most fair option, as a fixed fee would cost disproportionately more for the cheaper comps.

KO: Agreed. Running a comp with £20-£30 entry fee would mean a fixed fee of say £5-£10 would be a big chunk, compared with the same levy taken from a £50 entry fee. Despite the percentage meaning a lower take for the division, DM’s financial report has shown our finances are pretty strong so without a great need to maximise the division’s income it would be better to do it in a way that causes as little as possible impact to entry fees.

KP: Agreed with CD & KO. Percentage seems the fairest and most scalable to different kinds of competitions.

AA: Moved to vote.

##### **Unanimous agreement to introduce a percentage levy.**

AA: Now to agree on what the percentage should be. Any opinions? Acknowledged that AM has proposed a motion of a 25% levy, so this can be a starting point for discussions.

AM: Pointed out that a small percentage would mean it will take a long time to raise much money, so 25% seemed reasonable, based on entry fees of around £40, so the division knows they are generally getting £10 per lifter entry.

KP: With a 25% levy, what would the competition promoters expect from the division? It is quite a large chunk so they may expect a lot from the division which may not suit the division’s model.

AM: Acknowledged new to the division as previously lifted in NW division. What does the division currently do in terms of involvement with running the divisional competitions?

KP: Very little currently – most of our competition promoters do all of the work themselves, i.e. take entries, admin, take payments, sort volunteers, referees, etc. They are very experienced so generally have their own networks of helpers, so the division does help when they are struggling for volunteers, refs, etc but mostly the promoters are self-sufficient and can be left to run their competitions without much input from the division.



AA: Agreed – the model in SM division requires very little involvement from the Exec so 25% may feel like a high cut to take and will increase expectations which many members of the Exec cannot commit the time to. Concerned that anything that increases the entry fees drastically will have the effect of pricing out the average lifter from what is supposed to be an affordable and inclusive sport.

DJ: As a gym-owner and competition promoter, a 25% cut would likely cause them not to run many competitions. They run most of their competitions with their own team as they have several qualified referees training there and many willing to help on the platform, etc so therefore need very little input from the Exec. It may be more fair to have a lower percentage as the standard but then be able to use a higher percentage if a new gym/promoter wants to run a competition and wants maximum input from the Exec, in which case this could be negotiated with them on a case-by-case basis.

CD: Going from the current position of no levy to then bring in a 25% levy will feel like a big jump and will have a big impact on lifters in terms of entry fees, as well as expectations on what support the Exec can provide.

KO: Finances are currently okay so no need to bring in a big levy, risking either fewer comps to be run, or a big increase in entry fees. Agreed with AA's earlier point about not wanting to price out the average lifter who can't afford to lift several times a year if the entry fees shoot up.

DM: Regarding the possibility of increased expectations from the Exec, DM remembers only a few years ago when the Exec used to run every competition themselves which would involve losing a weekend every month. This is not favourable and very few people can commit the time to this kind of model, so prefers the current model we have with more done by the promoters with oversight by the Exec.

AM: After hearing how the SM division works, happy to agree that a 25% levy would be too high. Happy to hear that the division is keen to prioritise keeping the sport affordable and would be happy to agree with a lower levy.

AA: Moved to vote.

**Unanimous agreement on a 10% levy to apply at all divisional competitions. Acknowledgement that once or twice a year there are competitions run by the Exec directly, whereby all surplus money will be for the division, so the strict 10% levy does not need to apply in this situation because the money coming back will exceed that amount anyway.**

Voting options:

- Fixed fee model
- Percentage model
- Blended model
- No levy

**4b. Motion from Andrew Mcellistrim:** (see detailed proposal in appendix 4)

- To increase the minimum price of competitions in the division to £40**
- To introduce a 25% franchise fee paid to the division per entrant (£10 per lifter)**



AM: Introduced motion. £40 still puts the SM as one of the cheapest divisions to lift in in the country and this will help to maintain high standards and ensure a higher return to the division based on the levy. This would only apply to 3-lift competitions as a bench-only competition could be a lot cheaper than £40.

DE: This could help us to compete with other divisions in terms of providing high standard competitions.

KP: Bear in mind the competitions run by the Exec directly will also be another big source of income so we are fairly secure financially.

DJ: Shouldn't be a minimum price. It is good to be able to run smaller competitions like bitesize comps where they can be run very cheaply as a simple competition purely for lifters to get competition experience. £40 would be too high to set as a minimum.

KO: Not keen on having a minimum. Still very possible to run competitions with £20-£30 entry, even accounting for venue hire, paying volunteers, feeding people, providing trophies/medals. Would feel very uncomfortable charging as much as £40 knowing that will cause a lot of people to decide they can't lift at that price. To address the point made by DE on competing with other divisions – if we have cheaper comps it can encourage more members meaning we get a bigger rebate from British Powerlifting based on our membership numbers. Also if our lifters are able to afford to compete more times each year then they will get more experienced and it will help us to produce more top quality lifters.

AA: Moved to vote.

**Unanimous vote against the motion to introduce a £40 minimum entry fee.**

## 5. AOB

KP: KO, please can we see the inventory on screen?

KO: Shared screen showing SMPA's inventory.

KP: We still have a rack and a bar at Elite Bodyworks in Basingstoke. They are not involved in running competitions anymore so can we move this equipment to other gyms in the north of the division where it will benefit our members?

All agreed, DJ has a contact there so they will need to be contact soon to arrange this. KP happy to drive up there to collect.

CD: DM, the finance report stated there was a discrepancy over the amount paid by British Powerlifting for our 2022 rebate. Has this now been resolved?

DM: Yes, clarified this with BP who stated that 350 members in a year doesn't necessarily translate exactly to £3,500 in rebate, because different rates are paid for juniors, sub-juniors, some members of the division are in the BP Hall of Fame so don't pay entry and unclear on whether we get a rebate from non-lifting members. May need further clarification from BP on this.