

Major Events Group

29th June 2009

Minutes of meeting



Minutes of the meeting of
Major Events Group
held on Monday 29th June 2009
at YHA St Pancras, London,
commencing at 6.30 p.m.

Present:

Mike Forrest (MF)
Sue Birkinshaw (SB)
David May (DM)
Nev Myers (NM)
David Peel (DP)

Apologies:

Scott Fraser (SF)
Steve McKinley (SM)

1. Terms of Reference

As this was the first meeting of MEG, the group agreed that it would be appropriate to review the Terms of Reference, as published on the BOF website. The chairman was asked to raise the following points with the Chair of Events Committee:

- (a) The membership of the group is described as "6 members from the 13 associations; Constituent Associations not represented have the right to elect a correspondent member." Firstly, the current members are not members of the group as representatives of their associations (except possibly SF representing SOA). Secondly, MEG is of the view that new members of the Group should be expected to demonstrate relevant experience/skills before being appointed to the Group. However, the planned appointment by BOF of a paid Events Manager, and it was agreed that it would be appropriate for the holder of that post to be a member of this Group possibly in place of the Marketing Manager).
- (b) Under the Responsibilities, bullet point 4, MEG is charged with "Identifying partners to host major events ...". This is currently done by the National Fixtures Secretary via the Fixtures Group and the rota of events.
- (c) Responsibilities bullet point 7 refers specifically to issues arising from the Mapping Group. Presumably this should extend to all BOF committees and Groups, if agreed by Events Committee.
- (d) Responsibilities bullet point 8. The Group requested clarity on this point. Are the KPIs in question to measure the Group's performance?
- (e) It was also agreed that the group should seek clarity about its responsibilities in respect of the Rules that apply to Major Events.
- (f) The schedule of Major Events needs updating to read as follows:
 - i. JK
 - ii. British Elite – long, middle and sprint
 - iii. British Age Class – long, middle and sprint
 - iv. British Relay Championships
 - v. British Night Championships
 - vi. Area Championships – Southern, Midlands, Northern, Scottish, Welsh and NI

vii. CompassSport Cup and Trophy Final

Note that Area Championships fall within the remit of the Major Events Group, unless the relevant association requests it to be a lower level event.

(g) Following recent decisions at Events Committee, the Major Events Group's terms of reference should refer to the following:

- i. Nomination of IOF event advisers for UK WREs
- ii. Nomination of UK events to be WREs (after consultation with Elite Competitions Group and other relevant committees and groups)
- iii. Appointment of Grade 1 controllers (this currently lies with Rules Group – see also below)

2. Update of matters affecting MEG

MF reported on the following matters from recent Events Committee meetings.

(a) Consultation on British Championships and JK

In response to the consultation, most opinions have said (a) leave the JK alone, (b) it's better to have the elites at the same events as the rest of us (i.e. no separate elite championships), (c) status quo on BOC + BRC on one weekend, and Sprint + Middle on another. The issue of whether the age class Sprint should be combined with the Elite Sprint is being put to the Board at the meeting on 8th July. The Group felt that it was best placed to make proposals as to how these events should be combined, if that were to be the Board's decision. MF agreed to communicate this to the Chair of Events Committee.

The only other significant item discussed at Events Committee was the possibility of ending the practice of British Championships being closed to overseas competitors. This would make them available to be nominated as WREs. It is not clear which group is authorised to make this change, so that is being investigated by the Chair of Events Committee.

(b) Partnership contracts

The partnership agreement is ready to go, but is mired in the sand until Rules Group can provide rules to be appended to the agreement. I have been asked to design some financial procedures around budgeting and monitoring, which should not delay issuing the agreement itself. They have been asked for by the Board for its meeting on 8 July.

(c) Major Events conference

The conference has been booked for 5/6th September 2009 at YHA Sherwood Forest. Current expectations are that it will include: debriefs from 2009 major events (BOC, BEOC – if Charles Daniel is able to attend, JK and BNC, hopefully), sessions on planning for elites, map scales, elite advisers, training of controllers. Any other topical issues that can be put forward and offers of help from committee members would be much appreciated. DP suggested a session on the value of working with an elite adviser.

3. Qualifications for Grade 1 Controllers

It was noted that organisers, planners and controllers at level 3 and level 2 have a good programme of training courses and materials. This has not been extended to level 1 officials. The only training up to now has been delivered as part of the Major Events Conference.

It was agreed that this was not the most appropriate way to train planners, organisers and controllers to deliver quality level 1 (National) events. If there were good P1 and O1 courses, then these would be the best way of training Grade 1 Controllers. It was further agreed that MEG should consult with Coaching Committee, who have recently put similar qualifications in place for coaches.

It was also agreed that the experience criteria for appointment as a Grade 1 Controller should be reviewed.

It was further noted that there are over 80 grade 1 controllers, but many of them have not been involved in any capacity in major events for some time. It was suggested that BOF consider a licensing system, similar to that which applies for IOF Event Advisers, which would include a regular re-accreditation based on recent experience and performance.

The Group agreed that more detailed proposals will need to be developed for both of these issues.

4. IOF Event Advisers

Concerns have been expressed by Elite Competitions Group in the past about the quality of UK Elite competitions. Where an event is designated a WRE, BOF relies on the appointed IOF adviser to ensure that the elite courses are of the appropriate standard. Now that MEG has responsibility for the appointment of IOF Event Advisers, it was agreed that:

- (a) IOF Advisers be asked to provide a “CV” of major event involvement, particularly identifying which discipline of event they have worked with (Long, Middle, Sprint, etc.). MF agreed to request this from all UK based IOF Event Advisers.
- (b) MEG should review the existing criteria that are required of members of BOF who wish to be recommended by BOF as future IOF Event Advisers.

5. BOF Elite Advisers

The meeting considered the draft brief for elite advisers to be appointed for all events which include elite courses, which are not WREs (as they require IOF Event Advisers).

The Group is awaiting suggestions from Elite Competitions Group as to who should be available to act as Elite Advisers (other than DP and Charles Daniel), and agreement with ECG on the process of appointment of elite advisers.

6. Monitoring of Major Events

- (a) 2009 events – members of the Group agreed to provide notes about the events they attended, for summarising at the Major Events Conference. MF agreed to seek a “lessons learned” report from the officials of all of the 2009 major events.
- (b) 2010 and beyond – the importance of keeping to touch with the organising team for all major events in the lead up to its delivery was agreed.
- (c) SB and NM agreed to design a template to cover all of the aspects of Major Events that should be monitored, which will be reviewed and agreed by the group by 10th August.
- (d) It was agreed that this monitoring should be collected from the events’ controllers, via a “buddy system”, using the agreed template.
- (e) The suggested buddies for 2010 are as follows:

i. JK	SM, DP, DM
ii. BOC + BRC	MF
iii. BNC	SF
iv. Elite Sprint + Middle	SB and DM
v. Age Sprint	SM
vi. CSC Final	NM
vii. Southern	SB
viii. Midlands	DP
ix. Northern	NM
x. Scottish	SF

- (f) It is expected that reviews will be needed at least quarterly during the 12 months before events, and less frequently before that.

7. Event Rules

MF reported that Rules to govern the delivery of Major Events are to be delivered to the Board for their approval at their meeting of 8th July. The Group requested that MF convey to the Chair of Events Committee that:

- (a) It has not seen these Rules in time to comment on them before they are approved by the Board, and thus it is possible that there will be practical issues of delivery that MEG will wish to raise once it has had the chance to review the rules.
- (b) It believes that Rules Group should be responsible for questions to do with the interpretation of these Rules.
- (c) However, requests by Event organisers to vary the Rules for a specific event (under BOF Rule 1.3.5) should be managed by MEG.

It was agreed that MEG should make sure that these Rules have been received by the organisers of all affected Major Events.

8. Future Meetings

Everyone attending agreed that the meeting had been valuable, and that the group should aim to meet at least twice annually. It was suggested that these meetings should be held at (1) the Major Events Conference, and (2) at one of the British Championships weekends.

It was noted that the 2009 Major Events Conference clashes with JHI, so it was agreed that an alternative date should be sought for a meeting in London, preferably before the next Events Committee Meeting in November 2009.