

**ENGLISH CHESS FEDERATION**  
**ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING 12 OCTOBER 2013**  
**PROPOSAL TO AMEND THE DEFINITION OF “THE REQUISITIONISTS”**

**C19.14**

The definition of “the requisitionists” in Article 1.1 is significant because this determines:

1. The support required for business not proposed by the Board to be included on the agenda of the AGM or the finance committee
2. The support required to nominate a candidate for the elections who is not proposed by the Board and does not represent a director, chairman of a Standing Committee or the FIDE delegate standing for re-election to the same position.

Currently the definition in the Articles is as follows:

- (a) any Director; or
- (b) the FIDE Delegate; or
- (c) the Chairman of a Standing Committee; or
- (d) any two Trustees; or
- (e) any Representative Member of a Constituent Unit; or
- (f) any two Representative Members of Counties; or
- (g) any two Direct Members’ Representatives; or
- (h) any two of a Trustee, a Representative Member of a County and a Direct Members’ Representative; or
- (i) any five Full Individual or Representative Members, as defined above in this Article.

It is proposed to make two changes to this definition

**Proposal 1**

**Replace parts (a) to (h) with “any three of a Trustee, a Representative Member of a Constituent Unit or a County, a Direct Members’ Representative, the FIDE Delegate or the Chairman of a Standing Committee”, renumbering part (i) as (b).**

This seeks to address two imbalances. Firstly, it seems peculiar that a Director can unilaterally place items on the agenda, even if he is a lone voice on the Board. Secondly, it seeks to equalise the rights of voting members to place items before Council. If any representative is unable to find two like-minded organisations to support a motion or nomination, then that motion or candidate has no place being put before Council.

**Proposal 2**

**Add as a new part (c) of the definition “any number of Full Individual or Representative members who collectively exercise sufficient voting power to convene an Extraordinary General Meeting.”**

Under the Companies Act 2005, members able to exercise 5% or more of the votes are entitled to require the Board to convene an Extraordinary General Meeting within a prescribed period of time to deal with specified business. It seems illogical that there should be a combination of members able to convene an EGM which is unable to place a resolution on the AGM or Finance Council agenda.

As amendments to the Articles represent a special resolution, a 75% majority will be needed for these proposals to be passed.

Sean Hewitt  
Director