

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