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KINDLY SPONSORED BY ‘THE NORTHERN SNOOKER CENTRE’

  

**\*\*ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING\*\***

**2016-2017**

**MONDAY 4th SEPTEMBER 2017 – 7-45pm**

**HOLBECK WMC**

**(Arranged in accordance with current Rules 22)**

**\*\* AGENDA (IN PART) \*\***

* **A MAJOR PROPOSAL:**

1. **To reduce Delegate Meetings to a minimum, &**
2. **Combine league & competition fees as a result of (a)!**

*One of the items on the agenda for the 2016-17 AGM, was the above two part proposal, which is here described in much greater detail as a separate addendum to the full minutes of the AGM, which merely give it a mention in comparison.*

*In brief, the final outcome was this two part proposal was approved by delegates / team captains at the AGM.*

1. *The first part - (a) - was approved without a vote, given it could not be and was not disputed in any way.*
2. *The second part - (b) - was approved by delegates / team captains at the AGM, and by a show of hands which went 2 to 1 in favour!*

*The full details of the whole proposal and as they actually unfolded, prior to and as part of the AGM, are now described below as follows-*

*----------------------------------------------------------------------*

Next on the agenda and starting at around 2030, was the proposal for a major and radical overhaul of some key LBSO functions.

Principally proposed by Bob Patterson (BP), but with the full support and approval of the other members of the Management Committee after discussion with them, this dual proposal had been methodically thought through, and already broadcast to delegates / captains for the 2017-18 season, in a number of formats and on various occasions prior to this AGM.

In more detail-:

1. 17/07/17 - A notice was first posted on the website to coincide with promoting the Presentation Night on the 19th July – **see ‘A’ below**,
2. 19/07/17 – the same notice was handed out at the Presentation Night – **see ‘A’ below**,
3. 23/07/17 – the same notice was circulated by email attachment, but also with the full text of the notice copied into the email, to all delegates / captains for the forthcoming 2017-18 season – **see ‘A’ below**,
4. 13/08/17 – a much more detailed version of the original notice was then circulated to all delegates / captains for the forthcoming 2017-18 season, in exactly the same way as at point 3, as well as being posted on the website – **see ‘B’ below**,
5. 21/08/17 - a further reminder was sent as above with the AGM agenda, and also promising a ‘final summary’ of this proposal, before the AGM on the 4th September - **see ‘C’ below** - and
6. 03/09/17 – that ‘final summary’ to be used at the AGM, was circulated exactly as above once again, as well as being posted on the website – **see ‘C’ below**.
7. AGM - 04/09/17 - The same ‘final summary’ now copied below, was also handed out to the delegates at the AGM, and was then used by BP at the meeting, as the basis to elaborate on the main points of the summary - **see ‘C’ below**.

**‘FINAL SUMMARY’ – MAIN POINTS:**

The main points of the summary of the dual proposal speak for themselves, but principally it had all come down to the following **three** basic points of **fact**-

1. It is a **fact**, that delegate meetings are no longer required like they used to be, and nobody has been able to argue against that, so that losing them would not have any adverse effect on the future running of the LBSO.
2. It is also a **fact** though, that the combined receipts from league and competition fees, have been in the past and will continue to be in the future, vital for the LBSO to survive, and, further over the last few years especially, the collecting of these fees has become the main activity at delegate meetings.
3. ***Therefore, if delegate meetings are to be disposed of, it is also clearly a fact then, that other ways of collecting league and competition fees will have to be found in the future, and the best way of achieving this goal for everybody concerned, was the main preoccupation at this point in time.***

**VOTE ON THE PROPOSAL’s - SECOND PART ONLY:**

It was made clear by BP from the outset, that the first part of the proposal was not up for negotiation, but the second part was, on the basis that the first part had not and could not be argued against, whilst the second part clearly could!

Consequently, BP further clarified, that a determination at this meeting, would only be made on the second part of the proposal and not the first, and that determination on the second part, would be by a vote and the show of hands.

**‘FINAL SUMMARY’ – POINT BY POINT - see ‘C’ below:**

BP went through each point of the ‘final summary’ handout one by one, expanding on most points with additional information but to varying degrees.

For example-:

**1st PART:**

* Very little was added with regards to the **first part of the proposal**, given there was very little if anything to dispute!

Assurances were given however-:

* that a delegates meeting could still be called at any time (now as per the change of rules earlier at this AGM),
* delegates would be kept fully informed about the 2018 meetings in March & April, and
* the AGM, which is NOT a delegates meeting, would remain unaffected, by reducing / eliminating delegate meetings.

**2nd PART:**

* With regards to the **second part of the proposal**, much greater expansion of the main points was required to ‘sell it’, particularly to those team captains more sceptical.

But judging by the final outcome, this approach whilst questionably as to the level it was persuasive, was certainly very worthwhile-:

* The vital importance of **combined league and competition fees** was evidenced by another handout given at the meeting, which was not only to prove this basic point, but also show historically, in which direction the fees have gone individually over the past 8 years.
* **Combined fees** were now nearer 80% of total income from around the 75% mark, whereas individually, league fees were on the decline with receipts for competitions on the increase, which was slightly worryingly as the latter would be the most affected by the accepted proposal to reduce delegate meetings.
* **Other** **alternatives** had been given serious thought, before deciding to make this proposal, and explanations were given and figures provided to show why other alternatives had then been rejected.
* The old methods of payment by cash / cheque were considered largely obsolete, due in the main to meetings now being cancelled, and an ‘invoice type system’ was also contemplated, but from experience predicted to be piecemeal for a number of reasons given, and was therefore considered to be inadequate and unsuitable also.
* The **best alternative** considered by far was **‘bank transfer’** (or something similar). Figures were given by BP at the meeting, to show that this method had significantly improved this last season compared to the previous one, but still not enough to surpass payment by cash / cheque, which was still at a 2/3 ratio – (66% cash / cheque – 33% bank transfer). The point was also made though, that even at this 1/3 ratio, the amount of texts and emails needed to achieve this significantly below average portion is already disproportionate and completely unwieldy, which then makes this solution to retrieve the remaining 2/3rd majority unimaginable! Therefore, mainly for this reason, this option was also rejected for what was now proposed.
* This left the actual **proposed fee** itself to discuss, and how its basis had been considered and construed from **two separate angles**, in anticipation that some captains would regard the fee from one of those angles, and other captains from the alternative position – the two angles being –

1) from a **single figure** perspective and

2) from another angle as a **combination of figures**.

Explanation on the night, therefore dealt with each point in turn.

**1) Single Figure:**

* It was first acknowledged that some captains would understandably look at the new proposed fee, simply as a single figure increase of last season’s league entry fee alone.
* However, BP attempted by examples and with figures, to persuade these captains that the increase was not unreasonable, even in this single context and despite personally take the view, that this stance was not the most representative or illustrative one anyway.
* According to BP, alternatively and more helpful, was a system which took into consideration, the **combination** of separate league and competition fees.

**2) Combination of Figures:**

* The **new proposed fee** would be a **one-off payment** which would allow club teams to enter the **league**, but then **also** allow **any** of its registered players to enter **any** other LBSO **competition**, so it seemed only logical for the purpose of this exercise, to compare the most recent figures for club teams total contributions, made up of separate league and competition receipts.
* Therefore BP had at the meeting, figures from the 2016/17 season just gone, which could show the separate and then combined totals paid by all club teams in terms of league and competition entries.
* The object of this exercise being –
  + to compare what was actually received from all club teams last season,
  + against how all club teams would then fare, if the entry numbers for both league and competition elements, were to be same for this 2017/18 season,
  + even though the new proposed fee would not be implemented until the 2018/19 season.

**EXEMPTIONS TO THIS CALCULATION:**

* It was acknowledged by BP straight away though, that-

1. The figures from last season were not detailed enough to actually identify the separate / total amounts paid by each team from the same club, only those amounts of each club,
2. A small number of clubs (3), could not be realistically considered for the sake of this comparison, due to them entering more or fewer teams in the league this season, and
3. Equally another small number of clubs (8), could also not be realistically considered for the sake of this comparison, due to them not entering any competitions at all during the 2016/17 season.

* Notwithstanding the points made directly above, the comparison still served to produce a more balanced and accurate account of the situation, and therefore a better representative view with which to convince particularly sceptical captains, that accepting the proposal was still the right forward move.

**MORE ACCURATE ACCOUNT:**

* The resulting comparison therefore, notwithstanding the acknowledged **exemptions** above, still revealed a more balanced situation which it set out to do.
* With 20% of clubs exempt (11 of 53 as mentioned above), 80% of clubs ‘qualified’ for the comparison – (42 of 53).
* Of those 42 clubs ‘qualifying’ for the comparison, it was shown that 40% of those clubs (17 in total), would actually benefit from the proposal by paying less, to varying degrees but some considerably. Individual teams from those clubs would then benefit accordingly depending on how many there are, and how much each contributed last season.
* Conversely, it was also shown that the other 60% of clubs ‘qualifying’ for the comparison (25 in total), would be worse off from the proposal by paying more, again to varying degrees. Similarly, individual teams would be affected accordingly as above, but to their detriment.
* Interestingly, the point was made that most of the clubs worst off by the proposal, was because of a below average contribution towards competition entries by those clubs during the 2016/17 season.
* But, whilst it was then also further pointed out, that there is and never has been an automatic obligation on any club / team to enter any LBSO competitions, conversely it is also relevant to take this into consideration, especially if the deficit of the figures for these clubs would narrow, by those clubs entering more competitions.
* Another point was also then made out of the previous one, that with a possible switch of opinion by some teams / captains, it will also be interesting to see in the future, if competition entries actually increase as a result of this proposal?
* As the current finances dealt with earlier at the meeting would suggest, there is no necessity for a boost in income from competition fees, and this was certainly never the intention with this proposal.
* But if some teams / captains alter their original attitude to this new proposed fee in the future, and, because of their changed stance, see this as a means for their players to effectively enter competitions for ‘free’, then it may well be that unintentionally, competition numbers will actually increase as a result of this proposal?
* Time will tell with this but by contrast, it would be very surprising if competition numbers decline, unless there is a considerable numbers of teams who do not register next season?

In addition and to support the individual points of this ‘final summary’ made above, BP as the main proposer, also then made the following general observations in concluding his address on this proposal.

In more detail they were-

1. That delegates would probably gather, the Committee through BP really wanted the delegates to approve this proposal,
2. As the main proposer, a lot of thought had been given to this process, and the conclusion had been reached, that this was the best option moving forward, but only after considering other alternatives,
3. In trying to point to a favourable outcome, it was highlighted from the figures as presented, that a considerable number of club teams would actually benefit from the proposal financially, and that these club teams in the main would presumably have no issues?
4. Conversely however, it was also acknowledged from the figures as presented, that a considerable number of club teams would equally not benefit financially, and it was expected the most resistance would come from these club teams?
5. ***But, it was to these latter club teams particularly that the final appeal was made by BP, that even though voting yes might end up costing them more, they should still do so, as this was the best option available in the circumstances and decided by the person in the best position to do so, after 8 years of being general secretary and writing up minutes from meetings, and also treasurer and collecting the relevant fees at the same meetings!***

**HEALTHY DEBATE:**

Not surprisingly, the proposal attracted an above average contribution from the delegates, both during BP’s address and after it, so that this particular part of the agenda lasted about an hour (a little longer than expected),

Some delegates were positive about the proposal from the outset, and some were less so.

But, it became obvious it was mainly those who were outright against or unsure about the proposal, who voiced their opinions on the night, which actually gave a wrong impression that the proposal was not being well received at the time, judging by the final outcome!

A few who were unsure to start with became persuaded after clarifying certain relevant points.

Others more sceptical still remained doubtful after making their views known.

But what did become apparent in the end, was those mainly in favour or more sure from the outset, made little or no contribution at all during the debate, which resulted in a somewhat surprising 2 to 1 final vote in favour!

Some of the points raised by the delegates were justifiable reasons for concern, whilst others were clearly not relevant, and some delegates appeared to be using other broader unrelated reasons for opposing this proposal!

For instance, the attitude of any club committee towards paying their team’s fees, or the current overall state of any club, could not be considered as being pertinent to this particular proposal, just as much as how a team was going to raise the proposed combined fee of £104 in the future!

In more detail-:

**RELEVANT FACTORS:**

Clearly relevant factors such as-

* what the proposed combined fee was and why it had come about,
* how and why the figure had been calculated as it had, and what is represented as a merged fee for the future, and
* how this would affect club teams financially, when compared to the most recent split structure to be replaced,

then, these were all things covered in the summary and addressed at the AGM as being **highly relevant**.

**IRRELEVANT FACTORS:**

However, some matters put forward such as-

* how would club teams raise the proposed new combined fee,
* how would a situation be resolved, where different teams from the same club had different views, and could not therefore agree terms about how to raise the new fee, and
* what if the club committee would not agree to pay the new fee, in whole or in part, and especially when citing the overall current state of the club or its finances,

then, these could **not** be considered as relevant factors at all.

By way of further explanation as to why they couldn’t -

How teams have raised their fees in the past has never been the business of the LBSO before (or the L.&D.B.&S.L previously), so why should things be any different in the future, just because the fee is different – more or less?

Equally, those club committees who usually pay for their snooker teams may indeed object to paying the new fee in full or in part, but again there has never been an expectancy on clubs to pay for teams as far as the LBSO are concerned (or the L.&D.B.&S.L previously), only for team fees to be paid somehow.

**This has always been and will continue to be a private arrangement between each club and their snooker teams**, and if that agreement is altered for any reason including because of this proposal, this has still nothing to do with the running of the LBSO, or its rules in relation to league teams and any subscriptions due from them.

Even less of an argument, is any implication that a particular clubs finances will become even more precarious, so as to put the clubs future in further jeopardy, due to club committees being asked to make further contributions to their snooker teams LBSO entry fees, which is totally ridiculous to consider here, apart from being completely irrelevant, but was clearly the thought process of the odd delegate or two on the night!

--------------------------------------------------

***Despite their insignificance, mention here of these irrelevant points is important, since this was clearly the mind-set of certain delegates at the meeting, and is likely to remain their mind-set when the proposal is due to be implemented next season, when the written record of these minutes now, may be needed to serve as a reminder for some in the future?***

***-----------------------------------------------------------------------***

**VOTING PROCEDURE:**

After nearly an hours input and debate, the delegates were then asked to vote by a show of hands, but reminded that this would only be on the second part of proposal.

As had been made clear prior to the meeting (with circulation to club delegates / captains on the 3rd September), and was repeated again to those present at the meeting, as this was not a delegates meeting but an annual general meeting, the power of voting by the ‘2 delegate rule’ was not applicable on this occasion – (and was no longer relevant at all strictly speaking, as that particular rule had actually been repealed earlier during this AGM).

**The intention all along with this proposal, was to given maximum opportunity to as many team captains as possible, given the radical nature of it, and its effect on all teams involved with the LBSO!**

Equally however, it was also made clear, that whilst each club could have more than two representatives to vote where this was applicable, a club could only have as many votes as teams it had registered in the league, and no more!

Consequently, two clubs which had only one team registered in the league but had two representatives present at the meeting, were both told only one of them could vote.

**THE VOTE – VOTE 1 & VOTE 2!**

BP asked captains present to vote ‘for’ and then ‘against’ the proposal, and AT counted the show of hands, which went 44 ‘for’ and 21 ‘against’, for what was intended to be the only vote!

However at this point, one suspecting captain suggested that it had not been made clear by BP, which vote was ‘for’ and which was ‘against’ the proposal, inferring that the result of the vote should be the opposite way round.

Therefore to appease this captain in question, but also to make absolutely sure of the outcome for everybody concerned, the vote was done again in the same order, but this time it was made unequivocally clear by BP, what each show of hands was for.

So once again, BP asked captains present to first vote ‘for’ and then ‘against’ the proposal, and AT once again counted the show of hands, which this time went 44 ‘for’ and 22 ‘against’.

***A very slight discrepancy on the second occasion compared with the first, but not sufficient to invalidate the first show of hands, or the vote on the proposal overall, which was approved 2 to 1 on both occasions, to leave the decision in NO doubt!***

|  |
| --- |
| **CONCLUSION:**  **Therefore, the second part of the proposal was passed by a 2/3 majority.**  **However, it was also made clear again, that the combined new fee of £104 per team, would not become due until the start of the 2018/19 season.**  **For the forthcoming 2017/18 season, it would be business as usual!**   * **League Fees - had already been collected earlier in the year as usual of course. &** * **Competition Fees – would be collected as normal, BUT with NO delegate meetings at which to pay the fees!**   BP, on behalf of the Management Committee, was clearly more than satisfied with the overall outcome, but was also content that the process adopted from start to finish, had been accurate in presentation and representative to all concerned.  Further, all captains had been furnished with more than sufficient information, upon which to make a fully informed decision.  In fact, it would appear that the information provided was not only worthwhile, but was also instrumental in influencing the overall outcome, given that the majority of captains who became involved in the debate at the meeting, were either sceptical or totally against the proposal, but then the final vote still went 2 to 1 in favour! |

\*\*\*\*\*\*

--NOTICE ‘A’--

\*\*\*\*\*\*

****

KINDLY SPONSORED BY ‘THE NORTHERN SNOOKER CENTRE’

 **IMPORTANT NOTICE** 

**ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING (AGM)**

**MON. – 04/09/17 – HOLBECK WMC**

|  |
| --- |
| **ALL CLUBS SHOULD ATTEND!**  **TO VOTE ON A VERY IMPORTANT PROPOSAL-**   * To reduce delegate meetings to a minimum, which will have a significant effect on league & competition fees! |

Behind the proposal are the following observations about delegate meetings and fees, all of which will be very hard for anybody to argue against-

* **MEETINGS**: There is no longer a need for delegate meetings like there used to be!
* Now, with the advent of the website, which is pretty much fully functional, delegate meetings have outlived their main purpose!
* Paper handouts of current league tables, sheets of handicap changes, competition entry forms and next-round draws, and up to date league and competition secretary reports, are things of the past and directly because of the way the website now functions!
* **FEES**: In the last few years particularly, delegate meetings have become nothing more than a collecting point for delegates to pay league and competition fees, which recorded minutes of meetings clearly show!
* ***BUT***, these **FEES** have been in the past, and will continue to be in the future, crucial for the LBSO to continue to function as it always has,
* **Therefore, as the income from league and competition fees will continue to be just as important, but if they are no longer going to be paid at delegate meetings, other ways of collecting them will have to be found, which is what will be proposed at the AGM, &**

* **WHICH IS WHY ALL CLUB TEAMS SHOULD ATTEND**!

|  |
| --- |
| **THIS IS JUST TO PUT YOU ALL ON NOTICE TO ATTEND!**  **Between now and the AGM, much more detail will be given about this proposal, to next season’s club delegates and team captains, via the website and by personal emails as provided on the most recent league registration forms, to discuss with ALL your players, prior to the AGM.**  **KEEP A LOOK OUT ON THE WEBSITE & IN YOUR ‘INBOX’!!** |

On behalf of the LBSO Management Committee

Bob Patterson – LBSO General Secretary / Treasurer

19th July 2017

\*\*\*\*\*\*

--NOTICE ‘B’--

\*\*\*\*\*\*

****

KINDLY SPONSORED BY ‘THE NORTHERN SNOOKER CENTRE’

 **IMPORTANT NOTICE** 

**ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING (AGM)**

**MONDAY – 4th SEPTEMBER 2017 – HOLBECK WMC – 7-45pm**

|  |
| --- |
| **ALL CLUBS SHOULD ATTEND!**  **TO VOTE ON A VERY IMPORTANT PROPOSAL-**   * To reduce delegate meetings to a minimum, * Which will affect league & competition fees significantly!   **PLEASE READ ON!** |

Delegates / Captains / Players - for the 2017/2018 season:

**RULE CHANGES:** Firstly, can I remind all Delegates / Captains / Players, that any proposed **rule changes**, should be sent to myself by email via the website, and with specific future wording, to reach me no later than **Sunday 20th August 2017** – this is in accordance with current league rule 22(b).

|  |
| --- |
| *This year, in addition to normal rule changes, a* ***very radical proposal*** *will be presented by Bob Patterson on behalf of the LBSO Management Committee-*   1. ***to reduce delegate meetings to a minimum,*** 2. ***which will affect league & competition fees significantly!***   ***SO FAR TO DATE!*** *A notice was handed out at the Presentation Evening on the 19th July, and an email was sent on the 23rd July to all Delegates and Captains for the 2017-18 season, with the same notice attached, and with the text of the notice copied into the email.*  *The notice & email-*   1. *Basically gave reasons why Delegate Meetings are no longer required as they used to be, as can easily be proved from recorded minutes of this year’s meetings which can still be viewed on the website,* 2. *Which then explained how over the past few years particularly, they have become nothing more than a reason for delegates to meet and pay league and competition fees, and* 3. *Then concluded, if Delegate Meetings are to be reduced, and therefore league & competition fees cannot be collected in the same way, then other ways will have to be found, because these fees are crucial to keep the LBSO going,!*   ***NOW, & AS THE PREVIOUS NOTICE & EMAIL PROMISED-***  ***THIS NOTICE / EMAIL WILL GIVE GREATER DETAIL OF THE PROPOSAL & HOW IT HAS BEEN THOUGHT THROUGH, SO THAT ALL TEAM CAPTAINS HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO DISCUSS THE CHANGES WITH ALL THEIR PLAYERS PRIOR TO THE AGM, WHICH ALL CLUBS ARE ADVISED TO ATTEND!*** |

**THE PROPOSAL!**

A number of ideas have been very carefully considered before putting this proposal forward. They are-

1. **MEETINGS:**

* Delegate Meetings have already been reduced since 2011/12 when there were 7, so that over the past 2 seasons, there have been 5 Delegate Meetings in total – in the months of November, December, February, March & April;
* **At present**, we still need to maintain 1) the March meeting for the circulation of league registration forms, and 2) the April meeting for the submission of the completed forms and the collection of league fees. *(However, enquiries have already been made with Michael Woodward the website designer, as to the possibility of submitting league registration forms on line, but no reply has to date been forthcoming as Michael is currently unavailable. Nevertheless, should this proves to be possible, then the March meeting could be dispensed with in due course for sure, as could possibly the April meeting also, if alternative methods of paying fees, other than attending the meeting can be found?);*
* But to repeat, **at present** the proposal is to maintain 2 Delegate Meetings – in the months of March & April!
* **AGM:** The Annual General Meeting (AGM) – which is **NOT** a Delegates Meeting – would be **unaffected** by this proposal!

Therefore, the AGM will continue to be held at the same time as it has last year and this, to conclude one season and also double-up as the date to collect scorebooks for the forthcoming league season!

* I, personally and on behalf of the Management Committee, do not know of any reasons why we should retain Delegate Meetings, but if anybody has different views, I would be interested in your thoughts as to why we should retain them?

Therefore-

|  |
| --- |
| *1.)*  *IT IS PROPOSED & WITH* ***IMMEDIATE EFFECT****,*   * *DELEGATE MEETINGS WILL BE REDUCED TO TWO PER SEASON IN MARCH & APRIL (AT PRESENT),* * *THE AGM WILL BE UNAFFECTED BY THIS PROPOSAL,*   *\*\*[THE SITUATION WITH REGARDS TO THE MARCH & APRIL MEETINGS WILL BE REVIEWED IN THE FUTURE, AND DELEGATES / CAPTAINS WILL BE KEPT INFORMED ABOUT ANY DEVELOPMENTS].\*\** |

1. **FEES – COMBINED – LBSO LEAGUE & COMPETITIONS:**

* **Combined Fees**, from **League & all Competition** entries, continue to be the ‘life blood’ of the LBSO;
* Quite simply, without them the LBSO could not exist. This has always been the case in the past, and will continue to be so in the future well beyond the outcome of this proposal;
* At present the **combined fees** are doing extremely well, in fact for the first time in my 8 years as Treasurer, **combined fees** have exceeded £9,500 this season, so that they are now moving more towards 80% of the LBSO’s total income, from an average of just over 75% for the last 7 seasons;
* It is **NOT** essential though, that the collection of this **combined** total figure is spread out over the season, as we have been doing for a long time now, **just so long as the combined figure is received in total**;
* *In other words, if fees are not going to be collected at the Delegate Meetings as they used to be (which are all competition fees in fact), then other measures to collect those competition fees will have to be put in place straight away, in order that this* ***combined*** *total figure continues to be received, which the LBSO is so heavily dependant on;*
* **Different options** other than this proposal, have been considered before choosing this particular proposition!
* For instance, whilst the rate of teams choosing **bank transfers**, to make payment of competition fees particularly, has increased without doubt this season (34% as opposed to 18.5% the previous one), **the rate of increase is not sufficient enough to overtake delegates, still preferring this season to pay at meetings by cash / cheque –** (66% as opposed to 81.5% the previous one)!
* Also from another angle, despite this increase in **bank transfers** and the fact this may increase further, the amount of texts and emails needed to retrieve what is still currently a below average percentage, is completely disproportionate, inconvenient and totally inefficient;
* *Therefore, it is proposed that* ***each TEAM*** *pays a* ***combined one-off fee*** *in* ***full*** *annually in April for the forthcoming season which starts in September, for participation in* ***both*** *1) the* ***league*** *and 2)* ***all other LBSO competitions****!*
* *Regards the league, nothing changes at all at the moment! Regards all the other LBSO competitions, nothing changes either really, in that players will still be able to enter any of the individual, pairs or team events on offer, just as before,*
* ***The only difference there will be, is that NO separate fees will be payable for any competitions, as was the case before!***

**FIGURES TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT FOR THIS COMBINED ONE-OFF FEE!**

* The actual **combined one-off fee** is based from the outset, on 98 registered teams for the 2017/2018 season, playing in 7 equal divisions of 14 teams in each division, and then each of the 4 players in each of the 98 teams, contributing £1 each week of the season which will last 26 weeks in total;
* *This is perceived by myself and the Management Committee,* ***not to be unreasonable at all!***
* In addition to this being seen as totally reasonable, this will bring in a **combined** total income figure for league and all other competitions, which has never been reached before, so the LBSO will NOT be losing out with this proposal. On the contrary in fact, the proposal will give the LBSO additional income, which will allow it to spend even more on prizes than the record amount it has done this year!
* However, another set of figures have also been taken into consideration in setting this future **combined one-off fee**, by taking into account **combined league & competition fees** for 2016/17, and calculated in the following way-

(In brackets is the example of my club / team Crossgates Recreation Hall using this same calculation)-

1. Starting with the **total league entry fees** paid by **each club** for the 2016/17 season just gone, at £45 per team – (2 teams x £45 = £90),
2. Plus, the **total amount for all other competitions** received from **each club** for the same 2016/17 season, and still using the same fees for each competition during the season just gone – (£245),
3. Gives an **overall total figure for all league and all competition fees** received from **each club** for the 2016/17 season – (£90 + £245 = £335),
4. Then by deducting what **each club** will spend in total under the new proposals, **but** based on the same number of teams as they entered in 2016/17 – (2 teams x £104 = £208),
5. This leaves a further figure for **each club** - (£335 - £208 = + £127),
6. Which if divided by the **number of TEAMS** entered by **each club** - (2),
7. Then gives a **final figure** which represents what **each TEAM** will either benefit from, or lose out by, with this proposal – (+ £127 / 2 = + £63.5).

In summary therefore, by way of a genuine example of this calculation-:

* Crossgates Recreation Hall, by entering the **same 2 teams**,
* will benefit by + £127 **as a club**, or
* + £63.50 **per team** by this proposal,
* based on the **total combined amount** actually received from the club, **for ALL league and ALL competition fees**, during the 2016/2017 season,
* **compared** to what the club will have to pay under this new proposal!

|  |
| --- |
| ***If any other delegates or captains from any other clubs / teams would like their respective figures for this particular calculation, especially-***     * ***if there is a difference of opinion between captains from different teams but from the same club, or*** * ***anybody in your team is doubtful or uncertain, but would otherwise make a positive judgment of this proposal, if their understanding of this aspect was not inaccurate,***   ***then please do not hesitate to contact me by email, and I will gladly supply your clubs figures, as I have done for my club / teams here as an example.*** |

* *Still commenting on these same figures and using this same calculation, the following relevant points are also made, which should be considered by* ***everybody*** *before making a judgement on this proposal, especially if* ***anybody*** *has any doubt or uncertainty about it* –

1. The first point to **repeat**, is that the calculation is based on **clubs** entering the **same number of teams** for the forthcoming 2017/18 season as they did for the 2016/17 season just gone,
2. *Obviously therefore, clubs who have entered more or less teams for the forthcoming 2017/2018 season, means they will either lose out or benefit financially by the proposal, –* ***however, this applies to only 3 clubs in fact -*** *(2 of which with 1 less team each next season will both benefit, whilst the other with 1 extra team will lose out),*
3. On the other hand, for clubs which **have** entered the **same number of teams** for this coming 2017/18 season as they did for the last one just gone, but where then, these clubs for whatever reason, have **NOT** entered **any competitions AT ALL**, **of which there are 8 in total**, they will obviously find the biggest negative difference by this proposal!
4. *Clubs who do not enter any competitions may have reasons which is none of anybody’s business, and this remains the case! But clearly this is the main reason for this deficit at this time, and if these clubs were to reverse this situation even to a small degree, then they would add to the significant number of clubs / teams which will benefit already from this proposal!*
5. Purely on the basis of this calculation of comparative figures for the two seasons in question, and for **NO** other reason, the **11 clubs** mentioned to date, are to be **disregarded** from the following points, which are-
6. In fact 17 **clubs** (40%) out of the 42 remaining, which do not come into either the paragraph b) or c) category, will actually **benefit** by this proposal, *in that* ***each team*** *will pay* ***less*** *by the proposed* ***combined one off figure****, than they did last year by paying* ***separate*** *league and competition fees – benefitting by various amounts ranging from 50p a* ***team*** *to £137 a* ***team****, with 12 clubs by £25 and more* ***per team****!*
7. This then means, that 25 of the remaining 42 **clubs** (60%), will lose out per team, by having to pay more by the new proposal for exactly the same reasons!
8. However, just over half of these **clubs** (13 – 52%), will lose out by less than £30 **per team**, and 8 of these 13 by less than £20 **per team**,
9. Meaning of course, that the remaining 12 **clubs** (48%) of the 25 clubs to lose out, will do so by more than £30 **per team** (6 between £30 & £40 **per team** & 6 also between £40 & £50 **per team**),
10. *Significantly however,* ***10 of these 12 clubs*** *which will lose out the most, contributed* ***less*** *than* ***£60 per club*** *for 9 paying competitions last season, when the* ***average club contribution*** *for competitions last year was £93, and further, the* ***other 2 clubs of these 12****, whilst both* ***over average*** *on competition entries,* ***both*** *have registered 4 teams each season, which is the reason in this both cases why they are in the red, but only to the tune of £31 per team in both cases,*
11. ***Again as above, the remarks here about low / below average competition entries, are the same as those clubs who do not contribute at all in this respect.*** *There is NO automatic obligation on any club / team to enter any of the LBSO competitions, and NOBODY has any right AT ALL to question why this is! But equally, where this is the main reason why clubs / teams fall into deficit by this calculation, then this should also be taken into consideration, and especially where this shortfall would significantly narrow, if these clubs in question reversed this current practice, by entering more competitions, even to a small degree!*

Therefore-

|  |
| --- |
| *2.)*  *IT IS PROPOSED* ***(TO TAKE EFFECT FROM APRIL 2018 FOR THE 2018/2019 SEASON)****,*   * *EACH TEAM REGISTERED WITH THE LBSO PAYS ANNUALLY A COMBINED ONE-OFF FEE OF £104 TO COVER LEAGUE & ALL COMPETITIONS FOR EACH SEASON, TO BE PAID IN FULL [AT THE APRIL DELEGATES MEETING /ON A DATE TO BE CONFIRMED BY THE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE]* |

**Therefore for NEXT SEASON – 2017/2018- from September 2017-**

* **League fees** for the coming season have already been dealt with in April,
* So **separate** fees for **all other LBSO competitions** will still apply next season, and will have to paid separately as before,
* ***Therefore, if you could please take particular note, that payment by bank transfer will be encouraged in ALL cases for payment of ALL competition fees this coming season,***
* There will be **NO** Delegate Meetings as such as identified previously, but if (& only if) necessary, corresponding dates will be set at Holbeck WMC, purely for any outstanding competition fees to be paid there and then,
* Any fees not paid on these occasions, will engage the relevant competition rule which currently reads-:

*“Fees must be paid in full by all competitors entered in competitions, by a deadline date to be specified by the Competition Secretary and agreed by the LBSO Management Committee, otherwise all players / pairs / teams who owe fees will be withdrawn, and irrespective of any previous rounds already played”.*

**On behalf of the LBSO Management Committee**

**Bob Patterson – LBSO General Secretary / Treasurer - 11th August 2017**

\*\*\*\*\*\*

--NOTICE ‘C’--

\*\*\*\*\*\*

 **\*\*A DUAL PROPOSAL\*\*** 

**AGM – 4th SEPTEMBER 2017**

**(HOLBECK WMC – 7-45pm)**

|  |
| --- |
| 1. To reduce **delegate meetings** to a minimum:   ***PROPOSAL 1.)***  *IT IS PROPOSED & WITH* ***IMMEDIATE EFFECT****,*   * ***DELEGATE MEETINGS*** *WILL BE REDUCED TO* ***TWO*** *PER SEASON IN MARCH & APRIL (AT PRESENT),* * *THE* ***AGM*** *WILL BE* ***UNAFFECTED*** *BY THIS PROPOSAL,*   *\*\*[THE SITUATION WITH REGARDS TO THE 2018 MARCH & APRIL MEETINGS WILL BE REVIEWED IN THE NEAR FUTURE, AND DELEGATES / CAPTAINS WILL BE KEPT INFORMED ABOUT ANY DEVELOPMENTS].\*\** |

**SUMMARY - MAIN POINTS TO DATE TO SUPPORT THE PROPOSAL:**

* **DELEGATE MEETINGS – IN THE MAIN - ARE HISTORY WITH IMMEDIATE EFFECT – MANY REASONS OUTWEIGH VERY FEW (IF ANY) TO KEEP!**
* **TWO WILL BE RETAINED - MARCH & APRIL 2018 - (PRESENTLY!)**
* **THE AGM WILL REMAIN UNAFFECTED – (To be held late August / Sept).**

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Which will affect **league & competition fees** significantly!   ***PROPOSAL 2.)***  *IT IS PROPOSED* ***(TO TAKE EFFECT FROM APRIL 2018 FOR THE 2018/2019 SEASON)****,*   * ***EACH TEAM*** *REGISTERED WITH THE LBSO PAYS ANNUALLY A* ***COMBINED ONE-OFF FEE*** *OF* ***£104*** *TO COVER* ***LEAGUE & ALL OTHER COMPETITIONS ENTRIES*** *FOR EACH SEASON, TO BE PAID IN* ***FULL*** *[AT THE APRIL DELEGATES MEETING IN 2018 /ON A DATE TO BE CONFIRMED BY THE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE].* |

**SUMMARY - MAIN POINTS TO DATE TO SUPPORT THE PROPOSAL:**

**See over the page!**

**SUMMARY - MAIN POINTS TO DATE TO SUPPORT THE PROPOSAL:**

* **NOTHING TO HAVE EFFECT UNTIL NEXT SEASON 2018/19 - (from Apr. 2018)!**
* **COMBINED FEES – LEAGUE & COMPETITIONS – LBSO’s ‘LIFE BLOOD’!**
* **LEAGUE FEES ALREADY ‘ONE-OFF’ PAYMENT – UNAFFECTED!**
* **COMPETITION FEES –**

1. **ON THE INCREASE YEAR ON YEAR, UP TO NOW FEES ‘SPREAD-OUT’ – & SIGNIFICANTLY AFFECTED BY DECISION TO CANCEL DELEGATE MEETINGS!**
2. **REVIEW HOW & WHEN TO BE PAID – ALSO AS A ‘ONE-OFF’ PAYMENT – WITH LEAGUE FEES IN APRIL – COMBINED!**

* **OTHER METHODS & OPTIONS CONSIDERED – BUT UNSUITABLE!**
* **A ‘ONE-OFF’ COMBINED PAYMENT - NOT UNREASONABLE - MOST EFFICIENT & PRACTICABLE & FAR LESS PROBLEMATIC & INCOVENIENT!**
* **ALSO A BONUS - FOR DELEGATES / CAPTAINS – NO LONGER THE NEED TO ROUND UP FEES FOR MONTHLY MEETINGS!**

|  |
| --- |
| * **ACTUAL COMBINED FEE OF £104 – CONSIDERED FROM 2 ANGLES!**   **1)**  **AS A STRAIGHT INCREASE FROM THE PREVIOUS SEASON -**   * **98 TEAMS FOR 2017/18 – WOULD HAVE TO PAY £99 ANYWAY!** * **£104 – ROUNDED UP FIGURE = TO £1 PER PLAYER PER WEEK!** * **£59 INCREASE ON LEAGUE FEES ALONE – (£45 - £104) = OR 57p PER PLAYER PER WEEK EXTRA!**   **2)**  **TOTAL OF COMBINED LEAGUE & COMPETITION FEES ACTUALLY PAID BY CLUBS IN 2016/17 - COMPARED TO THE PROPOSED COMBINED FEE OF £104 PER TEAM – BASED ON SAME NUMBER OF TEAMS ENTERED BY EACH CLUB FOR 2017/18 -**   * **53 DIFFERENT CLUBS HAVE ENTERED THE 98 TEAMS FOR 2017/18** * **3 – DIFFERANT NUMBER OF TEAMS ENTERED – SO N/A** * **8 – NO COMPETITION ENTRIES AT ALL IN 2016/17 – SO N/A** * **42 (80%) – REMAINING – FOR THE PURPOSE OF THIS EXERCISE** * **17 OF THOSE 42 CLUBS (40%) - WOULD BE BETTER OFF!**  1. By over £100 in the case of 6 of those clubs!   **&**   * **25 OF THOSE 42 CLUBS (60%) – WOULD BE WORSE OFF!**  1. 13 by less than £30 per team (29p per player / week), & 2. 12 by between £30 and £50 (29p - 48p per player / week), 3. Although 10 of 12 clubs – below average comp. entries!  * **LAST REMINDER TO CLUBS FOR THEIR COMPARATIVE FIGURES!** * **PLEASE ALSO TAKE NOTE-**  1. This comparison does not take into account different teams from the same club with different opinions, or, any imbalance of the same for competition entries! 2. Also, how clubs collect the fees, in the past or in the future, is not for consideration here either! |