

## **ENGLISH CHESS FEDERATION**

### **FINANCE COUNCIL MEETING 18<sup>TH</sup> APRIL 2015 at the Ibis Hotel, Birmingham**

The following list of attendees gives names only. The full attendance document recording the capacities in which people attended, including apologies for absence, is held at the ECF Office with the official copy of these minutes.

#### **Present:**

W Armstrong (WA), N Belinfante (NB), G Christie (GC), J Denning (JD), N Dennis (ND), B Edgell (BE), P Ehr (PE), D Eustace (DE), A Farthing (AFa), C Fegan (CF), M Flatt (MF), A French (AFr), J Foley (JF), S Gilmore (SG), RJ Haddrell (RH), R Hardy (RH), A Holowczak (AH), G Horne (GH), K Johnson (KJ), R Kane (RK), A Leadbetter (AL), A Leary (Aly), C Majer (CM), M Misson (MM), D Openshaw (DO), J Philpott (JP), S Reuben (SR), J Reyes (JR), D Smith (DS), DR Thomas (DT), M Truran (MT), B Valentine (BV), J Wickham (JW), T Whitfield (TW).

#### **Apologies:**

Verbal apologies were also received from Julian Clissold and Alex McFarlane, who both had clashes with other chess appointments.

#### **In Attendance:**

G Pearce (GP), G Willson

The meeting was called to order at 1.30pm

#### **1 Appointment of Chairman**

The Board recommended John Foley take the role of Chairman for the meeting. This was agreed.

#### **2 Notices**

- 2.1 Location of printed lists of apologies for absence, members voting by individual proxy and members voting by proxy: the chairman and company secretary had copies of lists on file for inspection if necessary.
- 2.2 Announcement of others in attendance: the Chairman gave permission to announce that Gareth Pearce and Gary Willson were in attendance.
- 2.3 Appointment of tellers: Andrew Leadbetter and Chris Majer were appointed by affirmation.
- 2.4 Voting Register: Council noted the voting register, which would be updated and accessible via the ECF website

#### **3 Approval of Minutes of the AGM held on 11<sup>th</sup> October 2014**

The proposed minutes as previously published on the ECF website, were accepted as an accurate record of the meeting.

#### **4 Matters Arising**

DE informed the meeting that the Chess Trust was registered with the Charity Commission in March 2015, and had just held its first meeting of trustees. SR asked if there was any impact on this financial year, DE stated there was not. However, the Trustees had agreed to put a proposed financial model to Council in the Autumn.

#### **5 Approval of Accounts**

DE thanked JP for his hard work on getting the accounts into an ordered state, and invited JP to talk Council through the accounts.

JP stated the 2013/14 accounts were currently with the auditors. This year was the first time the accounting year had fully corresponded to the membership year. A relatively challenging year was originally envisaged because of the uncertainty of the take up of the new membership scheme, along with having the European Team Championships and the Olympiad in the same year. However, a surplus of nearly £24K was made because the Office Manager had not been immediately replaced (JP had done the task on a voluntary basis), so a salary was not drawn; the membership was well supported; the International budget was not fully utilised. Council should see the first of these as a windfall and not as an ongoing saving.

As a result, the general fund is now in a better surplus, and the situation was positive for 2014/15.

JF thanked JP for his help, and commented that he had single-handedly saved the ECF, in more ways than one. His thanks were seconded by acclamation.

The accounts were approved (subject to audit) *nem con*.

#### **6 Report of the Chairman of the Finance Committee**

MT invited questions from the floor on his report.

BE wished to raise some questions concerning communications within the ECF. JF stated that time had been allowed to discuss this issued under AOB, and asked if it would be OK to discuss this then. BE agreed.

No further questions were forthcoming. Council noted the report.

#### **7 Strategy Statement**

PE stated that the Board drew up the document after many discussions that included a dedicated strategy weekend. It is constantly under review, and sets out a series of goals, themes and initiatives. It is not quite a strategic plan, but a work in progress towards that. It contains a vision of what we ought to be doing in 3 to 5 years, focusing on membership (including women and juniors), and examining how we do business. The initiatives include integrating the Commercial Director's contributions, the inclusion of training within the Junior Directorate, building the strongest international teams, communications, and increasing the reserves to provide a larger buffer and take advantage of future opportunities. The Strategy Statement is closely linked to the budget.

SR stated the ECF "leading the development ..." is a break from tradition, as the BCF only organised events. The question is whether this is desirable. PE stated that the verb 'lead' was deliberate and

coupled with the commitment to work co-operatively with 3<sup>rd</sup> parties. We are the *de facto* governing body in common with other sports, and we ought to recognise the responsibility to lead. Leadership exists in clubs, counties and regional unions across England and does not necessarily mean control.

JD asked if it risked blurring strategy and tactics? PE replied that we have a mixture of scaled projects. The Board believes the items in the Strategy Statement rise to the level of strategic significance and accurately convey the Board's intent.

AFa believed the document to be "painfully thin". It is still not a business plan which is troubling. He asked why the Board had chosen to "do less better"; based on communications received activity has dropped below an acceptable level. He asked why the Board wanted to publish grades more frequently when every 6 months is fine. He asked why the Board had decided to create a gross surplus, and why the arbitrary figure of £100K, the Federation has a lot of money in reserve.

PE thanked AFa for his analysis.

CF stated that the phrase "do less better" was his, but that it referred to how the Board operates. We will be successful if the Board succeeds, as it will be more efficient.

AF stated that this did not answer his question to his satisfaction.

AH stated that the proposal was based on the model of the Yorkshire grading lists.

DE stated some time ago Council set a target of £50K. Taking in account inflation, he took a judgement as Finance Director that a surplus of £100K was suitable. The PIF is supporting the British Championships and in order to move forward a reserve was needed, a surplus to improve chess. Council should then challenge the Board with what you want us to do.

DE noticed that a lot of activities in chess have no ECF involvement. We seem to be behind the times. We *can* use the reserve, but we would then be relying on the generosity of past generations.

GC asked what was wrong with relying on the past, why do we ask again? The money could be spent in a fruitful way to show we can use it.

DE stated the PIF is used to support the British (£5K every year). Aside from this, he would be reluctant to use the reserve unless it was on very good ideas.

AFr stated he would have liked to have seen a plan (where we are, where would we like to be and how do we get there).

PE replied that the Board thought Council was best served by a shorter document and not a full strategy.

DE stated that the previous strategy 4 years ago was never looked at, and the current Board did not wish a repeat of this. It is accepted that it needs fleshing out.

CF added that the document did contain some substantial issues such as a review of the British Championships.

SG agreed with SR (that the ECF administers but does not run). He is not aware of a single issue in all his time being involved with chess that would justify this amount of surplus, and he looked forward to seeing what is being planned.

DO stated that he personally pushed for a short document as it focused on a few key points, a longer document is not necessarily more effective.

JR asked if the proposed Academy had a set location.

TW explained (by way of a presentation) that the Academy would be virtual so that it could be aimed across the whole country. It would primarily be aimed at juniors of a national and international standard, to support juniors to achieve GM status by the time they are 18 years old. It is thought there is significant help already for county and league players provided by clubs and county associations.

The individual structured support programme is going to last for 3 years for each player, but after start up it may take 10 years before significant results will be seen. However, because it will address broad areas it will encourage lots of juniors to continue playing into adult hood. The programme will include 4 training weekends, a chess advisory panel, 5 training tournaments, learning resources and parental activities to support development. We will identify elite players from the programme and support them to achieve on the international scene, including attainment of titles.

JF asked what the costs were. TW stated start up costs would be £21.5K, which will come from the parents, reserves, and the John Robinson Trust. For the launch we will need £5K. Applications will be invited from September with the Academy formally beginning in January 2016.

BE asked what the situation was concerning the UKCA, as they would be our competitors.

PE replied that the ECF Academy would be a business unit within the ECF. It would form part of the range of opportunities available for all young chess players in the country. Ours would be a FIDE Academy, as would the UKCA. These and other potential FIDE academies we may compete with each other. Healthy competition would encourage higher standards. Other academies may also be granted official status by FIDE. We should welcome those which are properly established.

BE asked if we would differentiate between boys and girls, and also that he believed we need more support at lower levels. TW replied that we would make no gender specific distinction, but we acknowledge that girl's chess need more support due to comparatively low numbers. She added that we believed it was important to support and identify our more able juniors.

JF suggested we move to the vote on the strategy paper. The motion was proposed by JR, seconded by JD. The motion was carried by a show of hands (with only 5 hands against).

## **8 Independent Constitutional and Governance Review Commission**

JF invited GP to address the Council.

GP stated that they preferred to be thought of as an independent working party, reviewing the Federations Articles of Association and other areas of governance. The Commission consisted of 4 members: himself, Lara Barnes, Roger Emerson and Suzanne Wood, who have been selected to give a good balance (gender, location). Gareth has worked on similar reviews before.

So far a number of informal interviews had been conducted. A questionnaire would be going out to members within a few weeks, in line with advice from the Sports & Recreation Alliance. There would be some formal interviews in accordance with the terms of reference. The terms of reference state that the working group would reach in to 2016, but they hope to have final recommendations ready for Council in October 2015.

AL asked how many people they hoped would respond. GP replied that he did not know. They hoped to complete around a dozen formal interviews.

SR asked if they had been invited to attend the British Championships where 10% of our membership would be. GP stated no, but would be open to an invitation. SR invited GP.

SG suggested that questionnaires sent out via local organisations you would get more responses, and they would be honest.

## **9 National Chess Library**

Council had previously been informed that we had to move the library in March 2015. This had been extended so that this Council meeting could decide the library's future. The Board had identified 2 options based on the situation that existed, one of which they had recommended.

The Library Committee had recommended option A (to relocate the library to the office in Battle), but the Board believed this was too costly. They therefore recommended option B (to place the library in a storage facility, with enough space for volunteers to sort the collection). This would mean we could defer the decision on the long term future of the library until a full inventory was completed.

JF invited questions.

AFa stated that he was a member of the Library Committee. He believed that neither option is attractive or desirable, but this was not the Board's fault: the economic climate moved to such an extent that slashed budgets meant competing pressures at the University have pushed us out. We do face the challenge of dealing with duplicates and legacies. It is not a happy picture, and with no obvious palatable solution, he has to painfully accept the least expensive.

JR asked how many other institutions had been approached. RK responded that he had contacted the John Lewis Trust and the London Library. The British Library had offered to take the books, but would not accept any duplicates. From the ECF point of view this would mean breaking up legacy collections.

PE stated a number of universities had been approached, including universities of Birmingham, Aston and Oxford, and a school in North London. He acknowledged that we could have approached more. A lot of effort had been made previously to try to resolve the problem, including by Nigel Short, but no solution had been found.

MM asked what the respective costs were.

DE responded it would £2.5K to move the collection. It would cost a further £2.5K p/a to hold in boxed storage, as opposed to £8K p/a increase in rent at Battle.

BV asked if the collection goes to storage, who would be reviewing the contents.

PE stated the Board, the Library Committee, but we would need to appoint a lead.

JD asked about the location of a potential storage facility.

DE stated that he had been looking at potential sites in Eastbourne and Hastings. PE stated that it needs to be moved by a specialist company but there was scope to discuss.

AL asked the extent to which the library had been catalogued.

DT stated that a list did exist, but because of the tight deadline, it had not been possible to complete it. Some are "loan" collections, although these had not been identified or set aside. Again, time had been against us.

KJ if collections could/would be returned.

DT stated emphatically yes, but the emphasis at first needs to be on identification.

SR asked what timescales we must now work to. PE replied that we need to be out of two current locations (the university and council storage) by June 2015.

AL asked if structural changes could be made to the office in time. PE stated it was thought yes.

SG suggested a charity could be set up, to bring in some money to the Federation.

JF moved the Council to the vote, which was overwhelmingly in favour of moving the library to storage.

## **10 Report of the Finance Director and Budget 2015/16**

DE stated that 3 papers had been produced, previously circulated. By way of presentation and discussion, he gave an overview of the financial aims so that everyone could understand how we will spend our money.

The significant part of our income is from membership fees and game fees.

Expenditure is wide ranging, and includes fees incurred from membership collection (including FIDE fees).

The Junior Directorate has increased expenditure from last year to support the Academy, from £5K to £8K.

The International Directorate include cost incurred from entering our national team (Council had previously endorsed the decision to always try to field our strongest team). However sponsorship is drying up and donations are decreasing when compared to previous years.

AFr confirmed that Council had previously agreed to always field our strongest team, so that we were sending a message to sponsors of our intent. He was also concerned about the apparent split in money (£26K for the Open, £10K for the Women's), which implied a lot of money is spent on appearance fees. He questioned whether it was worth spending that money.

DO stated he had been successful in obtaining some donations, and confirmed the figures quoted. He noted that the Open is for men and women, and stated that donations are primarily for the strongest Open team. There have been situations where our strongest have not been available. If we intentionally put out a "second" team, we won't get a saving as the donations would dry up altogether. Another option is to sell places on the team.

DO compared the situation with 20 years ago, where our team is comparable in strength but there was only one Russian Team: the break up of the Soviet Union means there are more stronger teams to go up against. Realistically, we are currently as strong as we are going to get, whilst noting that Gawain Jones and David Howell are still improving.

AfR stated that he understood that, but why not develop other players? DO replied that tournaments are generally run as a Swiss system, so that strategy would not work.

In response to a question from AFa, DO confirmed that Olympiads are generally cheaper as accommodation is part of the package from the host nation.

The ECF Office incurs costs of wages for 2.4 staff, rent and service charges. Allocation has been given to salary increase and pension.

The PIF and other income sources are currently providing extra funding for the British (£5K p/a), the John Robinson awards £7K to the British to support juniors. It was noted that without the extra income, the British would perform at a significant loss.

SR stated that this did not need to be the case, as he had run the British for 3 years without extra income and it broke even. DE stated that it is run on a break-even basis.

AfR questioned whether it was worth spending £1.5K on a souvenir bulletin. AH responded that it is produced by people within the existing team so the cost is low now. SR added that it is a FIDE requirement for games to be available, so is at least in part a necessary cost.

DE compared the changes in the proposed budget to previous years: there were no international event in 2014/15; there is now a manager in the office; the FIDE delegate is now claiming expenses; the library; the contingency fund. It was also assumed that income from membership would increase as income from game fee decreased.

DE thanked the 3 trustees of the PIF for continuing to grow the fund. The Chess Trust may get some funds in time for the British (and may therefore get some tax relief).

In summary, DE concluded that the strategy statement (previously agreed) is linked to the proposed budget very closely: future proposed activity would need to be paid for.

JW asked if the PIF had produced more income than the £5K donated to the British. He stated that there is a general feeling that the ECF should be drawing on other income rather than asking members to fund international teams. DE replied that income from the PIF is used to maintain the value of the fund and provide an income. He also stated that we do not control the John Robinson Trust, the trustees do, and we cannot therefore control where the money is spent. JW commented that the presentation by DE was very good and informative, and the presentation ought to be published on the website. This was confirmed.

AL asked why the game fee was being increased. DE responded that this was in line with our policy to encourage membership. JF stated that this would be discussed under item 14.

Council noted the report.

**11 Proposal by W Armstrong and A Leadbetter: "That in fixing membership fees, the ECF should narrow the gap between Bronze and Silver so that eventually the two categories could be merged into one"**

WA stated that the main reason for the proposal was that he did not see any qualitative difference between league and congress players. The current proposal to be discussed widens the gap between the two categories. Whilst being aware that the proposal would not be popular amongst Bronze members as they would have to pay more, but we risk the gap becoming too big. It would be a move towards a single membership rate (Gold) with Platinum as an optional extra. It would be healthy for chess, particularly juniors.

RH questioned if silver members received any benefits. DT responded that silver members get all the rights of bronze members, plus the right to enter congresses.

AFr stated he had canvassed bronze members: 5 for, 29 against. It would be a simplification, but most bronze members are not interested in playing in congresses. He also believed an increased basic membership level would be a barrier to entering the world of graded chess. Silver members in general play more games per year than bronze members. A possible solution would be to introduce a new category for members who play in congresses but not in leagues.

JR concurred, stating there are more bronze members than silver, and in any event there are more FIDE players i.e. gold members than silver.

JWi stated he had asked silver members and the majority were against the proposal. He believed that when the membership scheme was introduced, the Board wanted a category for league only players.

SR stated that he believed it was easier to justify the existence of the ECF to a congress player than to a league player.

AL, as seconder of the motion, stated that when we had the previous membership scheme we essentially had free congress play. The whole idea was to have a united membership. Our current scheme has too many categories, and the motion is asking to put a marker in the ground for the future development of the membership scheme.

JF asked Council to move to the vote. By show of hands 2 voted in favour, most against. The motion therefore failed.

**12 Direct Members' Subscription.**

Council was invited to consider the proposed membership rates for the period 1<sup>st</sup> September 2015 to 31 August 2016:

Platinum: £60 (unchanged)

Gold: £32 (from £28) (Junior: £26 (from £22))



Silver: £22 (from £19) (Junior: £16 (from £13))

Bronze: £15 (from £13) (Junior: £11 (from £9))

DT outlined the specific increases as above (the first increase since the new membership scheme began), and stated these were relatively modest increases based on the budget.

BE stated that he did not believe increasing the fees for juniors was a good advert for junior chess. PE responded that we wish to access and use the untapped resource of juniors who are not members.

AFa stated that he was not in principle opposed to fee increases. However, having consulted member organisations, he has concluded that such significant increases need to be allied to a plan. The absence of a plan makes it hard to justify the increases. In addition, the proposals include the intention to ask council to further increase the fees in coming years. All we will be doing is increase the fees to increase resources. As we do not have a plan, as we do not have a contingency, I am directed to vote against the proposal.

JR asked if we can consider a smaller increase?

SR stated he was worried that increasing the fee, especially for junior, would increase the VAT we pay to government. DE responded that using that argument we should scrap membership fees altogether. SR stated that it had happened in the past.

AFr stated that he had consulted bronze members who had responded overwhelmingly against the proposal. They saw little benefit, as many only play occasional games.

JWi stated that silver members believe an increase in fees to be a barrier to encouraging new players. Would it be possible to introduce a lower entry fee for beginners? Comments to him from silver members were varied, but mainly concern about the level of increase especially for gold members. We should remember that members get a £1 discount for renewing/applying on line. Parents will not renew their children's membership if the fee increase is too high. Some members have club fees as well, and where a members is unemployed (on benefit), we should consider concessions.

KJ stated that chess is not an expensive sport, and the proposed increases are a drop in the ocean.

JD stated that most members seem to be cautious of the increase. However, if we do not pass this increase we will eat in to the reserves. The percentage increase seems significant, but in absolute terms it is minimal.

GC stated that he is concerned that the increase will have the effect of only swelling the reserves. Our members do not feel they get enough from the ECF to justify an increase.

SG stated that we are struggling to justify the increase now when also considering an increase in the coming years. The proposal is lacking a plan to justify any type of increase.

MM stated that he can agree with increasing the fees to cover office staff, International teams and juniors, but not to simply increase the reserves.

DE responded that a previous chief executive advised him do not increase fees often, but when you do make them count. He agreed that we need a plan; we now have an agreed strategy, from which we will flesh out a plan of specific activity. He agreed that the board does not communicate enough, noting that we do now have a facility to email members, and we ought to be using the forum more often. He noted that the increase is not huge in absolute terms, but in truth no-one wants to pay more. He commented that Council had agreed the strategy without asking the Board to take anything out. Perhaps we can look at helping our members who are on benefit.

AFa stated that the agreement to fund the strongest international team was not a blank cheque that could continue forever. DE responded that we had just agreed the strategy statement.

GC stated that we have other sources of income (such as sponsorship for the international teams), and that the membership should not be expected to shoulder all of the burden.

JR proposed that we consider a reduced fee increase first: bronze to £14, silver to £20, gold to £30 (with a similar increase for juniors). Council agreed to consider this proposal first. It was suggested that we could consider each individual increase in turn, but DT stated there is no provision to do so.

Following a show of hands, a card vote was requested and agreed. The result of the card vote for the amended proposal: FOR 78, AGAINST 107. The amended motion therefore failed.

AFa asked if the proposal is voted down, would the fees remain the same. JF affirmed this.

BE proposed that we move to a vote on the substantive motion, seconded by KJ, which council agreed. AL asked if we could split the vote to consider adult and junior fees separately (if the motion is passed), JF stated no as the proposal had already been seconded and agreed.

Following a close show of hands, a card vote was agreed. The result of the card vote for the proposed increase of fees: FOR 104, AGAINST 103. The motion was therefore passed.

### **13 Minimum Membership Fees for Member Organisations**

DT stated that there are only a few organisations to whom this applies. The proposal is to increase their fee to £60 from £58. The income is negligible. The fee was originally set at 100 times the game fee. JP stated that this motion is mainly a procedural matter.

It was proposed that we move to the vote. A show of hands indicated a strong affirmation of the motions with only 4 council members against.

### **14 Determination of Game Fee**

The motion proposes to increase the game fee to £2.50 (standardplay) and £1.25 (rapidplay), and to 60p (standard play) and 30p (rapidplay) for junior events.

AL stated that he though such a huge increase (25%) to be excessive.

DT stated that original fee was broadly 1/6 of the bronze membership for adults, and this increase will keep this relationship in step.

AFr stated that we should be trying to attract non-members to join. If you consider the income per individual, they are already paying 4 times the normal.

AL proposed that we move immediately to a vote. BE stated that we should consider changing the wording of the motion to replace “pay to play” with “game fee”. Council agreed to change the motion to reflect this, and moved to a vote. A show of hands indicated most members for the amended proposal with 7 members against. The motion as amended was then passed.

### **15 Introduction of Pay to Play fee for FIDE rated Events**

DT stated the current policy of delisting players who are not gold members has been inherited from a previous board. The current board consider the policy to be poor, as it creates bad feeling with FIDE and is difficult and costly to administer. In addition, should we delist a GM, we would become exposed to a potentially costly legal challenge. It is therefore proposed to introduce a “pay to play” fee, collected by tournament organisers, so that players can become gold members automatically.

NB asked what would happen if a bronze member were to enter a FIDE event, what would they pay?

RH did not like the term “pay to play”, it is in effect a game fee. He asked that the motion be reworded, this was accepted.

JP stated that he holds the proxy vote for Adam Raoof. He stated that AR believes the current policy to be draconian and urges its abandonment. JP stated that we need to consider what this proposal is trying to address. At present there is a clear policy: that you must be a gold member in order to play in FIDE rated events, but this would be watered down if the game fee option became available.

AH stated that as tournament organisers (the members who are most affected by this) are urging that it be amended, we ought to be following their wishes. JD asked if MT (who had just left the meeting) took the same position as AR. AH responded that he did.

JD asked that we consider splitting the proposal into the different elements (i.e. the game fee, and the de-listing). An amendment to delete the game element was approved, as was the revised substantive motion.

### **16 Adoption of the Budget**

DE proposed that the budget, as discussed and voted on by Council, be adopted. By show of hands, members voted overwhelmingly in favour (with one member dissenting).

### **17 Olympiad Budget**

There is a need to agree elements of next year’s budget now so that activity can begin in good time with an event (the Olympiad) due to begin in September 2016.

AFa asked what had changed from previous years, as the situation had always been like this. DO stated that he would like to have more time to organise the events, in the knowledge that Council had formally agreed his budget.

AFr asked if we could have a breakdown of the fees/costs and expenses. DO responded that £26K would be for the open team, £10K for the women’s team. .

It was proposed that we move to a vote, which was passed with an overwhelming majority.

## **18 Amendment to Procedural Bye-Laws**

JD stated she submitted minutes for the last council meeting, but they were not published promptly. A change in the bye-laws would be meaningless unless they were enforced.

CM stated that the change does give a tighter deadline. It was proposed we moved to a vote, the motion was passed nem con.

## **19 Council to Note the Amendment to Regulations.**

CM stated these changes (to Regulation No 4 (Standards of Conduct for ECF Officials) and Regulation 5 (Complaints Procedure)) were both agreed at the Council Meeting on October, which the Board voted on in February. Council duly noted the changes.

## **20 Proposal to discontinue the Yearbook and Diary after 2016**

PE stated that the proposal is essentially to save resources (financial and time).

DS stated the SCCU is against the cessation of the Yearbook as it is a good reference point for all time.

AL stated it should continue, and we should charge the going rate for non-platinum members.

AFa stated he could personally see value in having a yearbook.

JR stated that perhaps it was time to move towards a digital version. AH agreed that all the information contained in the yearbook can be accessed on the Internet. Yearbook sales have dropped to around 100-150, and anecdotally a lot of members put their yearbook in the bin.

RH disagreed and believed the yearbook should continue, although it could be better and cheaper.

AL proposed that we split the motion and consider the diary and the yearbook separately. This was agreed by general consensus without objection.

Council voted on discontinuing the yearbook, the show of hands was not conclusive. SG suggested that as the yearbook is going to be produced for 2016 in any event, Council considers the matter again in the autumn. This was agreed informally without objection.

Council voted on the discontinuation of the diary, with FOR 15 votes, AGAINST 7 votes. The diary will not be produced after 2016.

## **21 Proposal by DCCA et al, concerning the phasing out of game fee.**

DT suggested that he sets up a working party, to include BE and AFr, to take this matter forward. This was agreed informally.

**22 AOB**

22.1 JF informed Council of the sad news of the death of Colin Crouch IM. Council stood in silence for a few moments, in respect of the contribution he had made to all forms of chess over his career.

22.2 Council was informed of the intended retirement of David Anderton. He has been active in chess for over 50 years, most recently as the legal advisor (pro bono) to the Federation. PE stated that would like to receive suggestion on how members best thought we could commemorate his contribution to chess. CM stated that he would be impossible to replace, and both he and RH proposed a vote of thanks, moving that this meeting expresses its deep gratitude to David Anderton OBE for his self-less service to English Chess, British Chess, and world chess. The motion was carried by acclamation.

JF stated the meeting was closed as we had reached 6.30pm. BE and AF expressed their dismay, stating that the issue of communications had been put to AOB. JF explained that the meeting had run out of time.

DRAFT