Minutes of the 122\textsuperscript{nd} Annual General Meeting of Athletics New Zealand Incorporated.

Held at the Holiday Inn, 75 Featherston Street, Wellington at 2:00 pm on Friday 24 July 2009.

Chairman: Murray McKinnon (President of Athletics New Zealand)

1. Roll Call and Welcome: The President welcomed all attendees and acknowledged the attendance of Life Members.

Murray ran through the protocols for the meeting also verbalising the voting calculation.

Special mention and best wishes were offered to Trevor Wright and his family, who is currently battling illness.

Councillors: Murray McKinnon (President), John Smart (Vice President & Life Member), Annette Purvis (Board), Trevor Spittle (Board & NZ Children’s), Dave Harkness (Board & Auckland), Leon Blanchet (Board), Alan McCauley (Board), Gary Clareburt (Board), Jim Hogg (Auckland), Henry Tudor (Southland), Lance Smith (Southland), Brett Halley (Otago), Rob Urquhart (Otago), Brian Taylor (Canterbury), Craig Brown (Canterbury), Andrew Barker (Tasman), Richard Harvey (Tasman), Stephen Underwood (Wellington), Sylvia Maunder (Wellington), Ed Fern (Taranaki), Dennis Jordan (Taranaki), John Tylden (NZ Secondary Schools), Alec McNab (NZ Secondary Schools), Jim Blair (NZ Masters), Bob Carter (NZ Masters), Andrew Finn (NZ Children’s), Allan Potts (Hawke’s Bay Gisborne), Murray Andersen (Hawke’s Bay Gisborne), George McConachy (Manawatu Wanganui), Fred Holmes (Manawatu Wanganui), David Olson (Waikato Bay of Plenty), Malcolm Taylor (Waikato Bay of Plenty), Morris Gray (Northland), Eileen Parsons (Northland).

Also in attendance: Arthur Eustace (Patron & Life Member), Don Chadderton (Past President), Colin Maclachlan (Past President), Rod Syme (Life Member), Dave Norris (Life Member), Don Mackenzie (Life Member), Alan Stevens (Life Member), Scott Newman (CEO), Leanne Asher (Staff), Alastair Dunn (Staff), Brett Addison (Staff), Rosie Graham (Staff), Nadine Fromont (Staff), Kevin Ankrom (Staff), Michael Sharapoff (Staff), Craig Purdy (Ombudsman), Steve Hollings (Statistician), Paul Coughlan, Craig Motley, Barry Ellis, Graham O’Brien, Ian Priest, Hamish Carson, Arch Jelley, Sir John Walker, Todd Stevens, Michael Dwyer, David Lonsdale, Tony Rogers, Chris Williams, Ian Boyd, Louise McDonald, Ray Marten, Dan Powell.


   Moved: Ed Fern, Seconded: Jim Blair

3. Proxies: The following proxies were advised
   Board: Annette Purvis for Patrick Meffan

   Moved: Richard Harvey, Seconded: John Smart
4. **Valedictions:** The meeting honoured the following by observing a moment’s silence.
   
   June Clare (nee Schoch)
   Colin Kay
   John Eccles
   Peter V O’Brien

   Roy Daines was acknowledged as the meeting was unsure if he had been acknowledged the previous year.

5. **Minutes of Previous AGM:** Subject to the following correction the minutes were confirmed as a true and correct record of the meeting held on 25 July 2008.

   Change: Addition of Peter Richards to the apologies of the 2008 AGM

   Moved Sylvia Maunder, Seconded Jim Hogg. CARRIED

6. **Matters Arising:** Nil

7. **Annual Report:** Chairman – Annette Purvis

   The Chairman presented the 122nd Annual Report for Athletics New Zealand and highlighted that although there was a good result in the financials that the surplus was primarily as a result of SPARCs unbudgeted investment in Sport Development. Our funding is prominently from funding agencies which is not sustainable. We were affected by the collapse of Lane Walker Rudkin (LWR).

   The Board have tried to maintain the status quo with a main focus on improving governance. Thanks must go to SPARC for assisting with the governance improvements through the available courses and risk management assessment work that is being carried out.

   The highlight of the year was the Olympics in Beijing and the medals that Valerie Vili and Nick Willis attained and the effort that all of the athletes put in.

   Acknowledgement was given to the volunteers, coaches, officials and administrators involved in our sport and to those who are actively involved on our committees.

   A special thanks to our key stakeholders SPARC, the New Zealand Academy of Sport, New Zealand Community Trust, Lion Foundation, The Perry Foundation, Colgate and ASICS

   The Chairman then opened the meeting to questions from the floor.

   Jim Hogg (AKL) - There is a loss shown in three events, at a previous AGM the floor was told this would never happen again and it has.

   Annette Purvis (Chair) – Agreed that this was the intent, events can be a struggle and it is our endeavour to do our best to operate on a minimum of break even basis.

8. **Statement of Financial Performance:** CEO - Scott Newman

   Scott Newman gave an overview of the Financial Reports. It was pleasing to be advising a surplus, although it is a nervous position to be in. Put in perspective we are still on a knife edge with finance. The key message is not to get carried away. We need to be retaining surplus of $35,000.00 on an ongoing basis.

   We are thankful to SPARCs confidence in reinvesting in us. Essentially the unbudgeted $62,000.00 investment from SPARC is the profit less the LWR loss of $25,000.00. There has been a greater level of budgeted funding. The monies we receive from SPARC is often received in advance which is of great help and support to us.
Currently there is $112,000.00 equity which is far from secure on a 3 Million dollar turnover annually
Aim to always increase equity
The need for money in the bank so that we can take progressive risks
RME By-Law change had significant impacts on Centres. Acknowledgement that the calls of concern have been heard and the question of member value is relevant
Generally sheltered from the recession as we are in multi-year agreements. We have been challenged by LWR and this will be ongoing as we try to put a apparel deal in place

Looking ahead we are aware that Gaming Trust Funding is down in its availability. There is more opportunity if there is a focus around health initiatives.

We have under taken a review with KPMG which we were able to do with the help of SPARC funding. This is a 12 month review and will help us put in place sound financial systems.

Our finances are back in house. The function was with Stuarts of Palmerston North for 4-5 years. It is with thanks to both the team at Stuarts and Rosie Graham that we have now got this back in house. Craig Purdy of Stuarts still provides financial overview as required.

The CEO opened the meeting to questions from the floor.

Morris Gray (NTH) - Asked if the budget figures for Club Affiliations and Centre fees includes GST as last year they took it to be including GST which it wasn’t.

Scott (CEO) - All finance figures including the budget that will be discussed further on do not include GST.

David Olson (WBOP) - PM Scholarships have increased from 2008-09, what is the reason for this?

Scott (CEO) - PM Scholarships vary from year to year. It is completely out of our control as it is a SPARC programme.

Brent Halley (OTG) - The LWR loss is mentioned at $25,000.00 yet there is $11,000.00 bad debts in the accounts, is this from the previous year?

Scott (CEO) Yes

Arthur Eustace (Patron) - Commented on the quality of the annual report and that is fantastic and a very professional document.

Moved that the 2008-09 Annual Report & Statement of Financial Performance be adopted": Moved: Stephen Underwood, Seconded: Craig Brown CARRIED

9. Awards

Long Service: The following received awards in recognition of their long service to the sport:

Rodger Brickland Auckland
Philip Bastion Canterbury
John Christie Canterbury
Eric Cox Canterbury
James McGregor Hawkes Bay Gisborne
Noo Samuel Manawatu Wanganui
Janice Vipond Manawatu Wanganui
Phil Coakes Otago
Carol Foote Otago
Peter Hague Tasman
Stuart Hague Tasman
Grant Hunt Tasman
Ian Morrison Tasman
Eric Verstappen Tasman
Sue Addison WBOP
Henry Beex WBOP
Michelle Curnow WBOP
Loloma Foster WBOP
Gary Henley-Smith WBOP
Jack Hewitt WBOP
Alister Hobday WBOP
Dot King WBOP
Paul Luckie WBOP
Brian Smith WBOP
Criss Strange WBOP
Wayne Strong WBOP
Bruce Wallace WBOP
Colin Watson WBOP
Neal Webb WBOP

The President congratulated the recipients of the long service awards.

**Merit Awards:**
Alan Stevens on behalf of the Awards Committee reminded us of the importance of recognising volunteers and officials in our sport. A number of people make a substantial contribution to our sport and we all need to be proactive in nominating these people.

**Colin Maclachlan**
Athletics Wellington

Alan Stevens had pleasure in presenting an overview of Colin’s contribution to Athletics as not only an athlete but as an administrator within our sport. Colin was a leading middle distance runner in the UK before migrating to New Zealand and joining the Wellington Scottish Club. Colin filled a number of roles in the Wellington Centre being president of the Centre for 3 years. Colin is a Life Member of Athletics New Zealand and was President of Athletics New Zealand 2005/06.

*Murray McKinnon presented Colin with the merit award pin.*

Colin passed on his thanks to all and was blown away by the awarding of this distinction.

**Barry Magee**

Murray McKinnon had pleasure in presenting an overview on Barry’s contribution to athletics. Barry had a highly respected career as an athlete with 7 national titles. He went on to coach in 1965 and took a number of athletes on to Olympic and Commonwealth level. Barry is committed to helping people reach their goals.

*Barry was unable to be present at the AGM and will be awarded his Merit Pin at another occasion.*

**Arch Jelly**

Alan Stevens had pleasure in presenting an overview of Arch’s distinguished career. Arch was one of the of the leading Wellington runners from the Olympic Harrier club before moving north to Auckland. Arch moved into coaching and has done so for 30 years. Arch has coached athletes throughout the world. He has managed teams from Olympics to World Championships.
He was a well respected National Cross Country & Road Selector who had all the facts. He was President of Athletics New Zealand from 1996 to 1997 and held the role of Ombudsman for Athletics New Zealand until 2007. Arch holds and IAAF International Diploma and has been inducted to the New Zealand Sports Hall of Fame and was awarded an OBE for Services to Sport.

Murray McKinnon presented Arch with his Merit Award pin.

Arch was pleased to receive this award although mentioned that he had been brought down to Wellington under false pretences. In response to the comment of his passion for bridge is that he is now in the position of coaching 1 athlete and 20 bridge players!

Life Member: Arch Jelly presented the meeting with extensive history of Sir John Walker's distinguished career in Athletics.

Arch first met Sir John in Hobsonville when he had just been defeated for the first time and asked Arch for some coaching help. This is when Arch found out that Sir John only ran on Saturdays and didn’t have a training plan. It wasn’t until 1971 that he asked to train with Arch and that he was committed to using his talent. This talent was evident when he raced against Dick Quax and beat him convincingly. Sir John trained hard and went overseas at his own expense. It was at Gothenburg where he was the first to run a sub 3:50 mile. Sir John had the important factors – determination, grit and the ability to focus and had the mental toughness to fight back from injuries.

Moved “that Sir John Walker be awarded Life Membership of Athletics New Zealand”:

CARRIED by Acclaim

Sir John addressed the audience and said that it was a great honour to be recognised in front of his peers. There is no greater accolade.

Sir John gave a moving talk on the need to focus on the grass roots for kids. It is our responsibility to help these kids become the next Olympians. The world is different and kids don’t have the fun that we had, the comradeship that we had is missing. Sir John paid tribute to Arch Jelly in that he couldn’t have done it without him. Arch did his coaching via letters which always showed that he believed in Sir John.

The sport is in good strength, it is a great sport. Through Sir John’s programme Field of Dreams he is able to get kids off the street and involved in sports that they would be able to otherwise do through afterschool programmes. In closing Sir John reflected on a great honour, a great year and what better than three Knights in our sport.

10. Election of Officers

Patron:

The Board nominated Arthur Eustace as Patron to Athletics New Zealand

Nominated by: Board of Athletics New Zealand, Seconded: Annette Purvis (Chair)

DECLARED

President:

John Smart

Moved by: Murray McKinnon, Seconded: Leon Blanchet (Board)

DECLARED

Murray McKinnon presented John with the President’s badge.
John addressed the AGM and thanked them for the great honour. Today being 50 years since he started his first administration role through University Club. John is looking forward to visiting as many centres as he can in his term.

**Vice President:**
Jim Blair (NZ Masters)

_Moved: Murray McKinnon, Seconded: Stephen Underwood DECLARED_

**Board:**
There were five nominations for three positions:
- Dave Harkness
- Philip Kearney
- Patrick Meffan
- Trevor Spittle
- Murray Taylor

There was a call for the nomination of two scrutineers. Dr Rod Syme and Alan Stevens were nominated by Murray McKinnon and seconded by John Smart.

After the counting of voting papers Dave Harkness, Trevor Spittle and Patrick Meffan were declared.

**Cross Country & Road Selectors:**
There were three nominations for three positions.

Under By-Law Rule 16 at least one selector must be from the South Island & one selector from the North Island. This being the case, all nominees were appointed.
- John Bowden
- Barry Ellis
- Craig Motley

**National Technical Officials Committee:**
There were two nominations for one position.
- Trevor Spittle
- Heather O’Hagan

Trevor Spittle withdrew his nomination due to his reappointment to the Board of Athletics New Zealand therefore Heather O’Hagan was appointed to the National Technical Officials Committee.

_Murray McKinnon moved that all Voting papers be destroyed. Seconded: Leon Blanchet CARRIED_

Scott Newman presented a two year budget which he undertook to do at the previous AGM. Scott made brief comments on the budget
- Decrease in competition is due to more being out in the regions
- High Performance operates on a zero basis – what comes in must go out
- Athlete Development is new money targeted for 2016. This is money which has been made available from SPARC
- 2010/2011 may well be impacted by the transformation project so is likely to change things.
- Inflationary increases are included

The budgets need to be flexible as the transformation project unfolds.

_The CEO opened the meeting to questions from the floor._

There were no questions.
12. Remits

REMIT A – Athletics Tasman

Proposed Amendment to Rule 10 - Council Voting Strength

Supporting Data

Last year saw the introduction of the Registered Member Equivalent (RME) method for setting Centre Levies as per By-Law A6.1 that was amended in October 2008. By-Law A6.1 refers to Rule 10.6

The Tasman Centre believes that this new method put too much weighting on Registered grades G19 and above, relative to G7-G14 and Member (Social) grades. Seniors are paying too much relative to junior grades and member (Social) grades.

Although ANZ increased their budget by a modest 3% last year, the effect of the RME changes has resulted in a 19.4% increase in the Tasman Centre levy.

Marlborough Harriers have disaffiliated from the Tasman Centre and ANZ as a result of the huge increase in registration fees brought about by the change to the RME model. They are a club made up predominantly of registered Adult members. Another Tasman Centre Harrier club is also struggling with a huge increase in fees of 24%.

The Tasman Centre passes the levies on the Clubs using the same RME formula. It has been suggested to us that we set our own registration fees for each grade. We believe that this just distorts the figures even more.

The proposed rule change seeks to address this imbalance by increasing the weighting for grades G7-G14 and Social from 0.2 to 0.3.

This proposed rule change will mean a change in voting strength for Centres as well. However, the Tasman Centre believes that voting strength should be proportional to the levies paid to ANZ.

The attached spread sheet, based on the 09-10 national figures, show what the effect is on each Centre with this change. Remember though, this change rebalances in a small way, the excessive changes already brought about with the introduction of the RME method.
Andrew Barker (TAS) - The purpose of this proposed remit is seeking to rebalance the levy calculation. The change saw increases to levels around 20% and in some clubs 90% while membership dropped. This is unsustainable.

Marlborough Harrier Club disaffiliated this year which means a loss to both the Centre and Athletics New Zealand. Tasman is still liable for the total levy. Clubs with higher children’s numbers are better off.

The remit was opened for discussion

Andrew Finn (NZ Children’s) - spoke against the remit. Senior athletes are likely to compete over a year where as children only compete 16-18 weeks per year. Some parts of the sport don’t pay membership fees – social members etc. Andrew believes that if you lower the price to meet the market the numbers will increase.

Far more other sports are more expensive. We need more people involved in the running of our sport – 40 to 50 for an athletic meet vs. 1 or 2 for cricket.

Current Rule reads:

10.6. Council Voting Strength for Centres be determined by:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Registered Member Equivalents</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Over 2000</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1501 – 2000</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1001 – 1500</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 -1000</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The registered member equivalents for the Annual Meeting shall be based on the figures at the thirty-first (31) day of March of the year in which the Annual Meeting is held. Registered Member Equivalents refers to the formula whereby age group members equal some portion of a full adult membership, the formula being determined by Council from time to time.

The formula is:- Registered member [Masters Men, Masters Women, Men, Women, Men 19 (M19) & Women 19 (W19)] = 1; Registered member [Men 16 (M16), Women 16 (W16)] = 0.5; Registered member [Boys 14 (B14) & Girls 14 (G14)] = 0.2; Member = 0.2

Amended Rule to read:

10.6. Council Voting Strength for Centres be determined by:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Registered Member Equivalents</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Over 2000</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1501 – 2000</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1001 – 1500</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 -1000</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The registered member equivalents for the Annual Meeting shall be based on the figures at the thirty-first (31) day of March of the year in which the Annual Meeting is held. Registered Member Equivalents refers to the formula whereby age group members equal some portion of a full adult membership, the formula being determined by Council from time to time.

The formula is:- Registered member [Masters Men, Masters Women, Men, Women, Men 19 (M19) & Women 19 (W19)] = 1; Registered member [Men 16 (M16), Women 16 (W16)] = 0.5; Registered member [Boys 14 (B14) & Girls 14 (G14)] = 0.3; Member = 0.3

Andrew Barker (TAS) - The purpose of this proposed remit is seeking to rebalance the levy calculation. The change saw increases to levels around 20% and in some clubs 90% while membership dropped. This is unsustainable.

Marlborough Harrier Club disaffiliated this year which means a loss to both the Centre and Athletics New Zealand. Tasman is still liable for the total levy. Clubs with higher children’s numbers are better off.
Andrew questioned if any discussion had taken place within the Children’s section in Tasman as he didn’t believe this to be the case.

In response Richard advised the REM has been the tip of the iceberg for Tasman. They are faced with $7000.00 missing from the budget and a centre struggling for members. Clubs are bound round fun runners and associate members and it is likely that other clubs may disaffiliate.

Craig Brown (CAN) - They moved registration to the REM basis. Applying a 0.2 vs. 0.3 he found that clubs strong in social members had a big increase but those strong in seniors saw a decrease. By going to 0.3 you are effectively raising the cost for the club which ends up driving away the social members.

Andrew Barker advised that Tasman Children’s were consulted and although they didn’t attend meetings they were kept informed. This amendment is not about increasing the cost to children’s but about how the Centre calculates the fees.

The motion was put to the vote

\textit{In favour 2, Against 12} \quad \textit{Motion Lost}

\textbf{REMIT B – Athletics Canterbury}

\textbf{REMIT TO ATHLETICS NEW ZEALAND AGM ON THE APPOINTMENT POLICY OF THE NZ SELECTORS}

\textbf{NOTES IN SUPPORT OF THE REMIT}

1. This remit is designed to eliminate potential conflict of interest situations. Rules to govern potential conflict of interest situations where selectors who are coaching athletes that are in line for possible selection to IAAF World Championships teams are vague at best. There is clear evidence that the process for overcoming a conflict of interest does not adequately cover this situation. Simply stepping out of the selection room when the selector’s athlete is being considered is not adequate and certainly not demonstrating transparency.

2. In some quarters there has been concern expressed that there are not enough people who would be available to fill these positions. It is our belief that this would open up opportunities for new people to be brought into these positions. Bringing in new people to important positions such as these outweighs the disadvantages of a potential conflict of interest that currently exists when a selector is also a coach at national level. There is deep concern that the appointments to positions like these are a closed shop and that the same people who are coaches will invariably be elected. The two activities must be kept separate and the only truly honest way of making this happen is to legislate for it. \textit{People who have a strong interest in athletic performance and statistics could be the ideal person to be a selector.}

3. We are into a more professional environment now. Selectors need to be specialists not generalists. This means they should have a strong selection role rather than an all rounder role that a selector/coach would have. Being a coach as well as a selector compromises their selection role. It is a very difficult and compromising situation when the coach of an athlete has to deal with a selector who is also a coach, ESPECIALLY, when the selector is a coach in the same area in the sport. The selection role must be totally transparent and not have the capacity of compromising the selector role through coaching responsibilities. On the other hand the coach should be a total advocate for the
athlete not the selector with a coach’s hat on. That situation cannot be transparent as everyone knows from past experiences.

4. It has been questioned that if this applies at national level, should it be applied to Centres as well. Our view is that selecting at regional level it is totally the responsibility of individual centres

5. If a person who is a selector has to step down for any reason then a replacement selector could be appointed by the board, (following the same criteria indentified above), until nominations are due for the next round of appropriate elections.

New Clause

RULE 16.1(f)
"Any person actively coaching carded athletes or (athletes of International quality) who are able to compete at any IAAF sanctioned championships shall not be permitted to hold a position as an Athletics New Zealand Selector. (If a selector is already appointed and an athlete that the selector is coaching reaches the category identified above, then that selector shall resign their position as a selector.)

Note: This rule shall apply to both the track and field and cross country and road selectors."

Brian Taylor (CAN) - This proposal is about transparency and the protection of athletes, coaches and the sport.

The remit was put to the floor for discussion

Dave Harkness (AKL/BOARD) - This is a debate between what is ideal and practical. Is the country big enough to have selectors that are not coaches? Selectors are currently those that put themselves forward or not if they feel they may be compromised.

Jim Hogg (AKL) - Asked if it would be possible to gain opinion from the selectors present.

Dave Norris (Life Member) - There are two points to consider. A selector may be the coach of a marginal High Performance athlete they have to consider if they should speak about the athlete but not vote or the selector would have to choose not to speak out about the athlete and not vote – this is not a good position to be in.

Secondly there is the perception that the athlete got in the team because their coach is a selector. It is a difficult decision as to where you draw the line.

George McConachy (MWA) - The merits of this remit can be seen, however we need to appoint the best people to do this role.

David Olsen (WBOP) - Is of the view that it should do no harm, but the coach of an athlete should withdraw from the panel.

Tony Rogers (Observer/Selector) - There is a perception out in the sport, but the reality is that there are no coaches on the selection panel that currently have carded athletes.

Brian Taylor (CAN) moved that in light off continued discussion on the matter a procedural motion was put that the motion not be put to the vote

Seconded Craig Brown (CAN) CARRIED
PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO RULE 16 - SELECTORS

Background
Team selections are a critical point for our sport, and very important for our credibility and profile. There is a requirement for strong checks and balances in the selection process. It is also vital that there is robust risk mitigation built into the selection procedure to reduce the chances of challenges to team selection.

The board wishes to identify special skills that may be required to complement those that the elected selectors bring to the selection panel, and to ensure that process and policy is adhered to, and that there is a level of consistency and moderation to match the current environment.

The board considers it appropriate to have an appointee on both Selection Panels with full speaking and voting rights.

As such a change would result with only two elected members on each panel it would seem appropriate to delete the residential requirement for the elected selectors. This residential requirement was appropriate before the days of fast electronic communication and fast and regular air travel, but in this modern era it could be classed as an anachronism.

Present Rule

RULE 16. - SELECTORS-N.Z. TEAMS - INSURANCE - FITNESS

1. (a) All New Zealand Teams shall be selected by three (3) elected selectors and there shall be separate panels of selectors for Track and Field teams and for Cross Country and Road teams. The panels of selectors shall be elected by the Council at an Annual Meeting of the Association in accordance with Rule 8 (f), and hold office for two (2) years. The panel for Track and Field teams shall be elected in even numbered years and the panel for Cross Country and Road teams in odd numbered years. In each panel at least one (1) selector shall be resident in the North Island and at least one (1) in the South Island. The Board of Directors may fill any vacancy caused by the resignation or death of a selector.

(b) & (c) .................

(d) In addition to the selectors as set out above the Board of Directors may appoint a member of staff to each of the two panels. Such appointments shall be for a one-year term, and shall be reviewed annually by the Board of Directors, or earlier if considered necessary. In all deliberations the person so appointed shall have full speaking rights but no voting rights other than for EAD/AWD selections. During the term of such appointment the person so appointed shall not be eligible to offer themselves as a candidate for an elected position on either panel of selectors.

Note: Normally the member of staff so appointed shall be the person carrying out the function of High Performance Manager.
Proposed Rule

RULE 16. - SELECTORS-N.Z. TEAMS -INSURANCE -FITNESS

1. (a) All New Zealand Teams shall be selected by three (3) selectors and there shall be separate panels of selectors for Track and Field teams and for Cross Country and Road teams. Two (2) members of each panel of selectors shall be elected by the Council at an Annual Meeting of the Association in accordance with Rule 8(f), and one (1) member of each panel shall be appointed by the Board of Directors, and all shall hold office for two (2) years. The panel for Track and Field teams shall be elected in even numbered years and the panel for Cross Country and Road teams in odd numbered years. The Board of Directors may fill any vacancy caused by the resignation or death of a selector.

(b) & (c) (Remains as at present)

(d) In addition to the selectors as set out above the Board of Directors may also appoint a member of staff to each of the two panels. Such appointments shall be for a one-year term, and shall be reviewed annually by the Board of Directors, or earlier if considered necessary. In all deliberations the person so appointed shall have full speaking rights but no voting rights other than for EAD/AWD selections. During the term of such appointment the person so appointed shall not be eligible to offer themselves as a candidate for an elected position on either panel of selectors.

Note: Normally the member of staff so appointed shall be the person carrying out the function of High Performance Manager.

Annette Purvis (Chair) - Acknowledged the intent of Canterbury’s remit but the essence of this proposal was to address the matter in a different manner. There is the perception about potential conflicts about transparency. The ability to elect some members of the panel and have a transparent appointment process for one member did address transparency similar to what occurs in a board appointment outside Athletics. This appointment process also ensured that the best person for the role was secured.

The motion was put to the floor for discussion.

There was no discussion so the motion was put to the vote.

The motion went through the voting process on three occasions to confirm the correctness of the count and the applicability of abstinence votes. After discussion by the Rules Committee it was agreed that abstentions did not alter the voting strength that had been declared at the beginning of the meeting.

In favour 23: Against 11: Abstained 4

Motion Lost

Remit D

CLARIFICATION OF RULE 33.1 – ALTERATION TO RULES

Background

As a result of a motion to the 2007 AGM which would have aligned the proposer and seconder requirements of Rule 33.1 with Rule 8.1(g) being defeated there appears to be a good deal of confusion on who may second a proposed rule change to get it on the order paper of a meeting of Council. The present Rule 8.1(g) is quite clear
on who is required to second such a rule change to get it to discussion status at such a meeting, but the question is – do the requirements of Rule 8.1(g) apply to Rule 33.1? The proposed Note to this Rule below sets out to clarify this, by taking the liberal view, which was implied by the defeat of the 2007 motion, in that the seconder need not comply with Rule 8.1(g) to get a proposed Rule change on the agenda. Thus a proposed rule change may have different seconders at these two stages. The only requirement for the proposer and seconder in the note to Rule 33.1 is that they both be members of Council or authorised officials of Centres or groups represented on Council.

**Present Rules**

**RULE 33. - ALTERATION TO RULES**

1. These rules may be added to, amended or repealed by resolution at any annual meeting of the Council or at any special meeting called for the purpose, provided that notice of such proposed addition, amendment or alteration, together with the names of the proposer and seconder thereof, shall be given to the Association at least forty-five (45) days before the date fixed for such annual or special meeting and by the Association to each member of the Council and each Centre at least twenty-eight (28) days before the date of the meeting.

**RULE 8.1 - ANNUAL MEETING**

(g) Remits and notices of motion may be proposed only by members of the Board of Directors, or Centres, or organisations represented on Council [refer Rule 7.1.1]. To gain discussion status at a General Meeting such remit or notice of motion must be seconded by a member of the Board of Directors or Centre or group represented on Council [refer Rule 7.1.1] not being the proposer of the remit or notice of motion.

**Proposed addition of a Note of Clarification**

**RULE 33. - ALTERATION TO RULES**

1. These rules may be added to, amended or repealed by resolution at any annual meeting of the Council or at any special meeting called for the purpose, provided that notice of such proposed addition, amendment or alteration, together with the names of the proposer and seconder thereof, shall be given to the Association at least forty-five (45) days before the date fixed for such annual or special meeting and by the Association to each member of the Council and each Centre at least twenty-eight (28) days before the date of the meeting.

**NOTE:** Notwithstanding Rule 8.1(g), to have a proposed motion to add to, amend or repeal a Rule placed on the agenda of a meeting of Council the proposer and seconder may belong to the same Centre or group represented on Council so long as they are both authorised officials of that Centre or group represented on Council. Notwithstanding this Note, for such a motion to reach discussion status at a meeting of Council Rule 8.1(g) shall be complied with.

John Smart motioned that this remit should be withdrawn as it was inappropriate with the upcoming constitutional changes as a result of the proposed transformation work.

Moved: John Smart, Seconded: George McConachy

CARRIED

**REMIT E – Athletics New Zealand Board**
COPY OF THE LETTER RECEIVED

International Association of Athletics Federations

Mr Scott NEWMANN
General Secretary
Athletics New Zealand

Monaco, 16 February 2009

Dear General Secretary,

Sub: Member Federations Constitutions
Thank you for submitting a copy of the Constitution of your Federation. We have noted that the mandatory articles as required by the IAAF have been included. However, as you may already know, the Rule numbers may change from time to time depending on amendments made during the IAAF Congress. Thus, I would be grateful if you could, at the next opportunity, make arrangements to include the following paragraph in the Constitution of your Federation as suggested by the IAAF Advisory Board.

**International Relationships**
The Athletics New Zealand is affiliated to the IAAF (and through the IAAF to the Oceania Athletics Association). The Athletics New Zealand recognises, accepts, applies, observes and abides by the current Constitution, Rules and Regulations of the IAAF and the Oceania Athletics Association, as well as any future amendments. This applies especially to the Anti-Doping rules, the handling of disputes, and relations with Athletes’ Representatives.

Any citizen of New Zealand elected to the IAAF Council is *de jure* a member of the Council and/or Executive Body of the Athletics New Zealand with full voting rights.

I would be grateful if you could acknowledge receipt of this communication and to inform us when you plan to include this paragraph in the Constitution of your Federation. This should be done preferably before 30 June 2009.

Yours sincerely,

Jee Isram
Senior Manager
Federations Assistance Unit

PROPOSED RULE CHANGES

1. **RULE 32**
The section of the letter this proposed change refers to:

*International Relationships*
*The Athletics New Zealand is affiliated to the IAAF (and through the IAAF to the Oceania Athletics Association). The Athletics New Zealand recognises, accepts,*
applies, observes and abides by the current Constitution, Rules and Regulations of the IAAF and the Oceania Athletics Association, as well as any future amendments. This applies especially to the Anti-Doping rules, the handling of disputes, and relations with Athletes’ Representatives

Present Rule
– IAAF Rules
Where not inconsistent with these rules and on any matter not provided for herein, the rules of the International Association of Athletics Federations shall apply.

Proposed New Rule and Heading Name
– International Relationships
On any matter not provided for herein, the rules of the International Association of Athletics Federations shall apply. Athletics New Zealand is affiliated to the IAAF (and through the IAAF to the Oceania Athletics Association). Athletics New Zealand recognises, accepts, applies, observes and abides by the current Constitution, Rules and Regulations of the IAAF and the Oceania Athletics Association, as well as any future amendments. This applies especially to the Anti-Doping rules, the handling of disputes, and relations with Athletes’ Representatives.

2. RULE 18. - BOARD OF DIRECTORS - GENERAL

The section of the letter this proposed change refers to:
- Any citizen of New Zealand elected to the IAAF Council is de jure a member of the Council and/or Executive Body of the Athletics New Zealand with full voting rights.

Note there has been a change from New Zealand resident in the present rule to NZ citizen in the proposed rule.

Present Rule
1. The Board of Directors shall consist of seven (7) elected members and any New Zealand resident who is member of the IAAF Council.
2 – 3 ............
4. Any New Zealand resident who is member of the IAAF Council and is not an elected member of the Board of Directors, shall not be entitled to vote on any matter at meetings of the Board of Directors. The member shall not be counted for the purposes of Rules 10 and 11.

Proposed New Rule
1. The Board of Directors shall consist of seven (7) elected members and de jure, with full voting rights, any New Zealand citizen who is an elected member of the IAAF Council.
2 – 3 ............
4. This sub-clause be deleted and subsequent clauses renumbered.

CONSEQUENTIAL CHANGE

RULE 7. - COUNCIL

RULE 7.1. - CONSTITUTION OF COUNCIL
1. The governing body of the Association shall be a Council consisting of the following:

**Present Rule**
(e) Any New Zealand **resident** who is a member of the IAAF Council.

**Proposed New Rule**
(e) Any New Zealand **citizen** who is a member of the IAAF Council.

Annette Purvis (Chair) - The purpose of this remit is simply to be in accordance with our governing body the IAAF.

*The motion was put to the floor for discussion.*

George McConachy (MWA) - It would be foolish not to follow the IAAF.

*The motion was put to the vote* CARRIED

**13. Appointment of Auditor**

Murray McKinnon moved that Martin Jarvie PKF be reappointed as the Association’s auditors. CARRIED

**14. Date for 2009 AGM**

This will be held on Friday 23 July 2010 in Wellington.

It was asked that consideration be given to the holding of a possible Special AGM if and as required by the transformation work be held at the same time as the National Track & Field Championships.

**15. Closure/Acknowledgments**

Murray McKinnon thanked those present for according him for his term as President and acknowledged John Smart for stepping in for him at the Mountain Running and M19 3,000m championships. He enjoyed visiting the Centres and thanked them for looking after him.

John Smart thanked Murray McKinnon for the tremendous job he has done as President and awarded him with his Past President’s badge.

John also acknowledged the retirement of Dr Rod Syme from the National Technical Officials Committee. Rod is well recognised overseas and has given great service to our sport.

John thanked all present and closed the meeting.

**Meeting Closed: 4:07pm**