

# ATHLETICS AUSTRALIA

Minutes of the General Meeting of Athletics Australia held at the Nurses Memorial Centre, Slater Street, Melbourne on Tuesday, 30<sup>th</sup> November, 1999 commencing at 10:15am.

## 1. ROLL CALL OF OFFICERS AND DELEGATES

### OFFICERS

President	A.Forrest
Vice President	K.Roche
Board Member	P.Kennedy
Board Member	E.Canty
Board Member	R.Scrimshaw
IAAF Representative	B.Bailey
Chief Executive Officer	S.Allatson
Board Secretary	B.Hill

### DELEGATES

Australian Capital Territory	D. Wilson	O. Henness
New South Wales	R. Doubell	J. Patchett
Northern Territory	B.Trinne	I.Fullerton
Queensland	J. Brady	K.Johnson
South Australia	T.Keynes	S.Kiel
Tasmania	T. Mahony	M.Bell
Victoria	J. Higham	D. Blyth
Western Australia	P.Bacich	C. Porter

### ALSO PRESENT

D.Carlson	Ferrier Hodgson (Consultant)
S.Rofe	Browne & Co. (Solicitors)
P.Travis	Queensland Athletics
R.Canning	Australian Little Athletics
S.Guilfoyle	Athletics Victoria
P.Sharpe	Australian Sports Commission

### STAFF PRESENT

B. Roe	Competitions Manager
C.Green	Marketing Manager

## 2. NOTICE OF GENERAL MEETING

2.1 In accordance with the Articles of Association of Athletics Australia, a General Meeting had been called on 30<sup>th</sup> November, 1999 to consider the following resolutions For adoption by the members:

- (1) The abridged period in respect of the notification of this meeting be approved;
- (2) The By-Laws of the company be revoked with immediate effect save that these By-Laws will continue to be of effect in respect of conduct occurring prior to this meeting;
- (3) Special Resolution –  
“The Constitution of the Company comprising the Memorandum of Association and Articles of Association be revoked and in lieu thereof be adopted the Constitution annexed hereto.”

### 3. SPECIAL BUSINESS

- The President, Mr.A.Forrest, opened the meeting and introduced the Board Members and the Athletics Australia CEO, Simon Allatson;
- Moved and seconded that the resolution “the abridged period in respect of the notification of this meeting be approved” be approved – **Carried.**
- The CEO spoke briefly about the remaining two special resolutions and it was agreed that both resolutions be combined in respect of ensuing discussions. Mr. Allatson explained that the process was to be discussed at todays meeting and that the delegates leave the meeting with a strong message that we are moving forward as a sport. It was moved and seconded that those present discuss the proposed changes in principal, rather than individual items in either document. - **Carried**
- A video from the Minister for Sport, Jackie Kelly, was introduced and shown to those present which outlined the Government’s support for changes outlined by the Athletics Australia Board and was followed by an outline of the Australian Sports Commission’s thoughts from Peter Sharpe who stressed that the ASC were keen to see that these proposals work philosophically.
- President, Andrew Forrest spoke in favour of the of the changes saying that it was a significant step and that he welcomed the energetic debate that had occurred to date. He stressed that the Sport needed to be restructured especially as it was considered “just in time” by Minister for Sport, Jackie Kelly and with the possible re-catagorising of Athletics to a Category 2 sport in future years. He said that the new Board, who have all had experience in “Change Management”, was committed to driving the recommendations from the PWC report and thanked the previous Board for their selfless action in appointing the new Board to carry out these recommendations.
- Andrew Forrest said he would welcome a debate around the table regarding this important proposal and duly opened discussion for debate.
- It was agreed that each State present a summary of their concerns or positives to the meeting, the main points being –

**South Australia:** President Tony Keynes presented the AA summary to the SA. Members including Life Members at a Special General Meeting who voted in favour.

**Northern Territory:**

CEO Mr. Bernie Trinne stated that NTA had reached a similar decision to ASA and their main concern was their current relationship with Little Athletics (currently under the one banner). Need more information such as changes to be made in NTA constitution re LA's, takeover of assets, ledgers – separate or not. Vice President Ian Fullerton inquired as to how the proposed new set-up compares to the AFL and ARL organisations.

**Queensland:**

President John Brady congratulated the Board on the speed in which they had endeavoured to implement the PWC recommendations, however, QAA could not support the change as he believed the Qld. Government would freeze any funding currently available. Also have a problem with the recently signed Heads of Agreement between AA and the States which assumed that State associations would be maintained v. a document now presented which promotes changing from State associations to clubs. Other concerns about the lack of detail/plans as to how the changes would be implemented. Overall, proposed change not supported, although it was recognised by the clubs that change was required.

**ACT**

President Owen Heness said his Board wished to defer making a decision as they required more details on the operational and functioning of the structure. Owen also queried where the representation would go to as he did not believe the ACT clubs would be strong enough to represent the members at meetings as typically, athletes are not interested in administration. How will the sport function in the future. Concerns were also raised about possible increases in registration fees however the AA CEO suggested that there would be no negative impact on fees but that growth would come from increased participation.

**Victoria**

President John Higham queried why structural changes were required when a Heads of Agreement had been signed recently. He suggested that the Board's proposed Corporate model was completely different to that required to run a volunteer-based sporting organisation and queried whether the Board understood the product (athletics). Andrew Forrest responded saying that whilst the Board of Management had no experience in athletics, they had experience in getting the right people to run an organisation and that tough decisions had to be made. John Higham also inquired whether Federal funding would be cut if the states do not adopt the motions. In response, it was stated that because of dissatisfaction in the way in which athletics is being managed, then funding could be reduced. It was inferred that a change to AA's organisation would be looked upon more favourably by the

Government in relation to funding. Andrew Forrest stressed that AA needs to change and change dramatically and this has been endorsed by Corporates and Government.

### **Western Australia**

President Peter Bacich's first question was why Model D (Branch Structure) was chosen by the Board. In response, the CEO stated that Model D was chosen as the most appropriate model to meet post-2000 challenges. Athletics needs to plan now for those challenges which will include changes to funding, government policy and community-based participation programs. No presentation was made to the WA Board and although they have an open mind to the change, WA would reject the current proposal. WA also has concerns regarding future Government funding if the changes were initiated. It was felt that the changes could also alienate local sponsorships. In response to this concern, three of the Board spoke on the merits of National sponsorships v. State sponsorships. Peter Bacich also queried as to how to build better relationships with LA's. WA CEO Chilla Porter expressed his concerns in relation to a number of areas including communication problems, worst option chosen, central approach, takeover bid, one way decision making process, leadership and he also referred to the Heads of Agreement signed in June 1999.

### **N.S.W.**

NSW President presented four questions on behalf of ANSW in relation to the proposal. These were:

1. Q. Is this in the best interests of athletics ?  
A. Yes;
2. Q. What are ANSW views/ alternatives ?  
A. Seems to be confusion in a number of areas including structure v. strategy; no boards; allocation of funds; the role of the Presidential Council; definition of members; Other national bodies such as LA's, Vets, Coach's, Pro's etc a possible problem; IAAF Board members. There also appears to be a few gaps in the constitution/ by-laws – eg. Loans to directors, SGM's, Insurance.
3. Q. Can AA deliver ?  
A. History suggests Yes;
4. Q. Would ANSW vote for it ?  
A. Not without consulting the NSW members;

There is also a money issue when Associations are wound-up – where do the \$'s go in this case ?

### **Tasmania**

Vice President Terry Mahoney spoke on behalf of ATAS and sighted as the main problems, the initial notice advising of the proposed change, the commitment of people in Tasmania if change occurred, the possible lack of funding

from the Government and the Model chosen. (ATAS preferred model would be the Business Unit Model which would be effective and responsive).

**Little Athletics**

Ray Canning outlined the negative relationship over the years between AA/ALA and spoke of Team sport v. individuals.

**Other**

CEO Simon Allatson in summing up reminded those present why AA were going down this path and sighted the State trends over the last three years re the number of members and the sponsorship revenue which, in most cases, showed a negative trend.

Doug Carlson, (Consultant) spoke of his experiences in 250 assignments in relation to strategic planning and restructuring. Some of his assignments have included NBA, Tennis Aust, Strategic planning for ACB, CFA and the Victorian Blood Bank. About one-third of his assignments have been involved with Not for Profit organisations.

In summing up, AA President Andrew Forrest noted, after all discussion this morning, that there had been positive support for the direction AA wished to take but that Members required additional time and more detail on implementation before fully embracing the proposed changes. Mr. Forrest proposed that the meeting be adjourned until 24<sup>th</sup> February, 2000 to allow due process to occur and to allow for further input to be received re the future structure of AA.

This was agreed to with the full support of the meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 12:50pm