

The British Flyball Association

Minutes of Committee Meeting Sunday 10 January 1999, Compass Inn, Tormarton

Aim to be finished by 4.30pm.

Present: Kevin McNicholas (KMc), Debbie Bouckley (DB), Nigel Bouckley (NB), Wayne O'Rourke (WO), Peter Roberts (PR), Gwain Theobald (GT) and Anton Wittwer (AW).

Apologies: Roger Chambers (RC) and Alison Sharpe (AS).

The Chairman informed the Committee, the Flyball Record Editor had been asked to attend today's meeting to discuss the Flyball Record (FBR). Anton said he thought Stef Banyard would be along later.

A discussion took place prior to Stefs attendance.

The main questions are: *why had the Record cost so much to produce?* and *why wasn't it proof read prior to publication.*

Wayne - thought we'd agreed the Record didn't need to be proof read, so long as a disclaimer was put on the front and no names and addresses were published, this would enable a long overdue FBR to be distributed in December.

Nigel - stated it was pointed out at the last meeting, that once a set of guidelines with Rules & Regulations had been agreed by the Committee (which was still in hand), then the FBR would not need proof reading.

Anton - thought Alison was going to liase with Stef to get the ball rolling.

Kevin - Alison's tried to contact Stef leaving messages etc, but has had no response, so has gone ahead and started to put together a set of guidelines.

Nigel - Is very concerned over the cost, the actual FBR is good, - everyone agreed. We need to be positive, we need some guidelines, which both editors of both publications adhere to and if there is any breach we then have cause for redress. But once a set of Rules & Regulations are in place there should be no cause for re-dress. The main concerns are to look after budgetary constraints as well as editorial matters.

Wayne - thought the BFA Committee should 'get their own house in order first' before we start saying what the Editor can and can't do. If we check with members, all they want is their FBR's.

Anton - as far as he was aware, Stef didn't know what exactly the BFA expected of her. She didn't realise, being the FBR Editor meant collating information, publishing, reproducing and posting. On the financial side, he thought the cost of a FBR was what we tried to sell it at - £1.

Nigel - pointed out the FBR could actually be produced and send out for about 80p - (10 pieces of paper, [printed to A5 size, gives you 40 sides/pages of information], an envelope, staple and a current 2nd class stamp [20p]).

Anton - thought that following the Area Reps meeting, the membership thought that part of their value for money, was getting their FBR. Whether members have joined on a single/joint or family membership, they still only get 1 FBR per issue. So for their £10 single or £15 joint membership, they should be getting

8 publications a year (4 newsletters & 4 FBR's). Therefore this issue of the FBR as we haven't had one for such a long time, the membership would not argue over the cost, as this actually is 2 issues.

Nigel - we still have to put postage on top of this, and it will not go out at the cheapest 2nd class post - 20p. Together with the cost of reproducing this issue on to A3 size paper has doubled the cost. If it had been reproduced on to A4 paper it would have kept the cost down. This issue of the FBR has cost about £550, for reproduction of about 250 and to be posted.

Anton - pointed out, even though this issue was A4 and not A5 the membership could still say they still are few issues short, we've only put out 2 FBR's & 1 Newsletter for 1998. He though this edition was good value for money. This is in fact the same as 2 FBR's. So we have underspent the memberships money. He thought that we'd agreed at the last meeting, that we would give help to Stef.

Nigel - has offered, but had no feedback.

Debbie - items included in this issue have duplicated items from Alisons Newsletter, which didn't need to be, together with outdated information.

Nigel - said we need criteria, when he purchases items for the BFA, he spends the money as he would spend his own - he shops around.

Anton - pointed out that Stef had done this. Could it be possible that Stefs machine can't reproduce an A5 size booklet.

Kevin - pointed out that you could take an A4 booklet to a printer, and tell them that you want it duplicated in A5 size and they have no problem. Lets see if we can get a FBR record out, the way that we want, with the content we want.

Peter - said, if someone's prepared to do the FBR, we have to be positive, but the editor should still be answerable to the Committee.

Anton - had seen & proof read 3/4 of this issue as it was initially going to be the May/June issue.

Kevin - hoped we would be able to come up with a set of guidelines for publishing and costing, when Stef arrives. However, we won't go too much into the costing.

Anton - said Stef had checked with Roger, that the BFA had the funds to pay for the FBR. He believed Roger had also asked Kevin, if he was happy that the BFA pay for it, but Kevin had stressed at the time he wasn't happy with the costing.

Peter - the problem arose, because he thinks Stef had already committed the printers to reproducing the issue.

Kevin - asked if everyone was happy with what we were going to discuss on Stefs arrival, move away from the budget, but get on with the guidelines.

All Committee present agreed and was happy with what would be discussed if Stef arrived.

12.30pm - Stef Banyard arrived. Kevin thanked her for coming. He also asked if the FBR had gone out yet, to which Stef replied "No not yet". Kevin went on to explain that the Committee had agreed that we need a clear set of guidelines that should apply to the FBR/Newsletter/Minutes and Web pages. What we are aiming for is getting a message to the world, we must have some sort of ethos. Kevin read out his and Alisons ideas which would be discussed (copies were made available to all present). **[Amended & agreed version - see Attachment 1].**

Anton - commented that after hearing the proposals put forward, if we went down that road, then the FBR becomes the official journal of the BFA. Of late, he has regarded the FBR as a magazine for Flyball enthusiasts. Why should the BFA be financing a general magazine for Flyball enthusiasts out of club money, when it should be funding a publication that is its official journal?

Stef - got impression following the Area Reps meeting, the membership felt the FBR was a magazine, which very much reflected what they thought and wanted not what the committee thought or wanted, but what they wanted. That was the spirit in how this magazine had been put together. Stef knows there are members out there that want a FBR that reflects what they want. Should the Committee really be saying what the membership could and can't be reading?

Kevin - pointed out that he had tried to put together a role for a magazine published by a governing body. There are magazines out there eg: Dog Training Weekly, Agility Eye etc, who are provided by people of the sport.

Nigel - pointed out that people choose to buy those magazines, the magazines do not become part of their membership fees. Eg: you join the Kennel Club and get the Kennel Gazette, but you don't get Dog Training Weekly etc.

Anton - The problem with the sport at the moment, its doubtful if it would finance all the sort of magazines that exist that are based on numerous dog activities. If Stef wants an enthusiast's magazine, then she could produce and sell it. The reality is, out of all the 250+ members out there, some may want it and some wont, especially if there is the official journal produced by the BFA which is at no extra cost because its part of their membership fee. If we had more members, then there may be room for 2 magazines.

Kevin - Following the meeting in October there was no other point of view put across, so there was actually only 1 choice given to the membership.

Stef - disagreed, she pointed out that Peter saw the vote what the membership wanted.

Peter - was present at the Area Reps meeting to respond, and not to sway the decision. There is nothing wrong with Kevin's guidelines, which stop a record going out and keeping the membership informed. Bearing in mind these guidelines for this recent issue, there is nothing wrong with it apart from the cost.

Stef - queried "this was allegedly unauthorised?"

Kevin - pointed out that we had already agreed this would not be discussed.

Stef - was not happy about a letter she had seen to Anton about her from Kevin attacking her integrity and probity, and also attacking her over the question of proof reading this issue. She went on to say that what was in this edition was a majority of was going to go out in the May/June edition, which HAD been proof read, this issue contained a few additions.

Peter - pointed out that this is all down to lack of communication.

Stef - said that we wouldn't have had all these problems with this, if this had gone out on time and been printed as one thought it was going to be done.

Peter - reiterated that this was still a communication problem, as no one knew exactly what was supposed to be happening.

Anton - asked for the record, that Stef was authorised the money to produce this FBR.

Stef - said she was authorised the money by Roger Chambers, she asked him, and he got back to her and said yes go ahead.

Kevin - asked if anyone had a problem with him asking the question

Anton - as far as she was concerned it was £448.62 for the reproduction, + £95.00 for postage, so as far as she was concerned that was authorised by Roger.

Stef - it most certainly was.

Anton - commented that there is probably something there to be dealt with, but we do need to accept that as far as Stef was concerned she was authorised by the Treasurer that she could do that.

Peter - said no one is blaming Stef, but it was never the less too much to be spent on one edition.

Anton - pointed out that he still thought it was in fact 2 issues. He asked if she would be prepared to work to a budget. She said "yes".

Nigel - referred to the provisional criteria that we have just read from Kevin and Alison, that Stef seems to think is over riding what the membership want, he actually thinks that rather than saying what can and can't go into it, it says what takes president. He agreed with what Peter said, from a publication that belongs to a governing body, there is nothing at all in this issue that shouldn't be in there, however within the set of guidelines put forward, there is official BFA matters that would take president over other items. He then asked Stef if there was anything in the guidelines that would restrict her.

Nigel - suggested addressing the issues listed.

Kevin - asked do we believe that our publication should be that of a governing body that is promoting a sport and giving out positive messages to its membership and the world about its sport, or should we be a fanzine a regular dog press type thing that is independent from the governing body that can say what it likes, when it likes.

Stef - commented that she was surprised that the governing body was not prepared to accept criticism in print from its own members.

Kevin - made it clear in his guidelines, that negative comments come to the committee first through the correct channels. He did not see the FBR as being a soap box for everyone to moan about everyone else.

Nigel - went on to define positive and negative comments. He didn't see any problem with positive comments.

A lengthy discussion ensued concerning the first letter in this issue from Peter Scott.

Anton - gave a parallel, the Agility Voice is the official journal of the Agility Club. People look at it, and find it sterile, cliquey and almost predictable, so it gave opportunity to the Agility Eye to get off the ground. People usually get one or the other, because people don't like the aura of control. His feelings towards the guidelines are that we could also end up with a sterile predictable bland magazine.

Stef - pointed out that she is hoping for a virile publication for what we are hoping for a virile sport.

Kevin - The publications: Agility Voice, Dog Training Weekly etc exist because the Kennel Club doesn't publish results and show dates, people don't subscribe to these magazines just for the letters page. He believes that we publish items of interest, diary, results etc. We don't need people slagging the BFA off.

Nigel - suggested going through Kevin's guidelines and agreeing on something:

BUDGETARY CONSTRAINTS - On average, membership fees work out to be about £7-£8 per year.

Debbie - pointed out that the membership fee doesn't go just towards FBR's, there are certificates, web site etc. Wayne - said half the membership is not interested in web site, all they want is their FBR. Anton - suggested that Alison's Newsletter will work out to be about 58p to produce and Stef's FBR will be about £1.06 an issue. Or rather than the committee fixing a price per issue, should we put it to the membership that for your current membership this is what you will be getting, if you want more, then we will have to put the membership fees up. You tell us what you want. Gwain - asked if we can get the next one out on the above budget, then we can put that to the membership at the AGM. Peter - then quoted Rogers comments in the previous Treasurers report that we spent £1,500 last year on publications, and if we spend any more we will make a dent in our £2,000 we currently have.

PUBLISHING DATES - Nigel asked if Stef was happy with the dates set out, she agreed, Peter did point out that a little leeway should be given due to peoples work commitments. But it was agreed by all that the dates would be adhered to as closely as possible. However, the current FBR will go out next week.

QUALITY ASSURANCE - Nigel asked if Stef was happy with the guidelines, eg print quality, she said she was.

COMMUNICATIONS - We have already highlighted communications as a 'problem' so Nigel felt electronic communications "Email" was vital for editors. If Stef has any formatting problems etc, then she can forward to Nigel who will throw it around and re-format accordingly, and send back to Stef. Anton asked if this publication was done in A4 deliberately. She said, as there was so much, she thought it would be better presented in A4. However, Debbie pointed out that copying onto A3 size paper works out to be more expensive than copying onto A4 paper. Peter pointed out all up-to-date information could be got from the Web pages.

COMMITTEE ATTENDANCE - Kevin suggested adding on the proviso that we don't need editors attendance unless there's a problem. If we all agree on the guidelines, then there shouldn't be a problem. It was suggested that the doors are always open, if an editor wants to make a social/informal visit, then they are welcome. However, if they are requested to attend, then they should make every effort to attend. Anton pointed out that Alison's guidelines had a different approach, regarding an editor to be present at committee meetings. Kevin reiterated that if we all agreed on the guidelines, then there should be no need for attendance. Anton asked Stef if she was happy with this and would she like to attend committee meetings, she said it wasn't essential to be present at every committee meeting. Nigel said that we must have the understanding that the editor should have a much more free reign, and so long as we agree on a set of guidelines, then there should be no need to proof read publications. Peter pointed out that proof reading is not a censorship its to make sure comments are not one sided. Stef commented that if she received an iffy item did the committee not think that she would consult them first. Nigel pointed out that we did not think she was stupid, but if for some reason someone else took over, they might not have the same sense, therefore, if there were a Policy of guidelines in place, then the next person would have no excuse.

EFFICIENT USE OF SPACE - it was agreed to give free reign but do the next issue as an A5 publication and let the membership decide what they want, whether they want to pay more for an A4 document.

WASTAGE OF PAPER - Nigel agreed to help Stef out with small text in tables. If Stef has any problems Nigel can be contacted by phone, fax or preferably email.

LEGAL IMPLICATIONS - Gwain asked whether the disclaimer on the back was ok. Kevin pointed out that he had received papers concerning legal implications, which identified the need for anyone publishing material eg in a newsletter, on the web etc. to take out insurance for their publications. Because WE ARE LIABLE for what is said and where the money is spent. Stef questioned where was Nigel's disclaimer

when he was Editor. He said he didn't have one, as his editions were proof read by Debbie, who then forwarded it to members of the committee PRIOR to publication. Kevin pointed out that a disclaimer would not help you out of a liable court. If we move away from proof reading, are we as a committee prepared to accept a liable suite from someone on the basis of what someone else has said. The only way forward is if the BFA takes out insurance against those actions or they give CLEAR guidelines on the way that we do our business. Anton said if we are looking at something that could be liabess, then this makes sense, we're in a situation that the letters that may well be written in a negative attitude. This is no different to any other publication. Kevin is trying to help us out by looking ahead. Where Anton said it sounds like a bridge too far. However, Peter brought up the letter from C. Fulford that could have been published. Peter considers that letter could have been liabess and he would have taken action. This type of disclaimer only has a limited effect as there is an act called the "Unfair Contract Terms Act" which effectively legates that. Kevin pointed out that if someone has a moan, then they should use the correct channels and write to the committee. It was pointed out that the committee has a responsibility to protect the membership. Anton believes it's the membership's magazine and not the committees. Kevin pointed out the other way of looking at it (positively) is reduce the membership fee, and not have a publication, which would then allow someone to put together their own magazine and sell it if there was a demand. This also dissolves us from the liabess side. Kevin asked why the Kennel Club and NAFA don't have a vibrant magazine. Could it be that the governing body don't want to be held legally responsible? A lengthy discussion ensued on the legal implications paragraph, it was agreed to have: *"We live today in a litigious world, the BFA committee ie: individually and collectively are responsible for all of their actions including liability for damages awarded by the Courts against the BFA by reason of liable action or miss information published in any of its publications. That is why we must have a positive policy of our publications and endeavour not to deliberately cause offence to anyone inside or outside the British Flyball Association"*.

A lengthy discussion then followed concerning P.Scotts letter and the response to it.

Peter suggested making the Newsletter the official publication to publish the diary, results, and official items from the committee e.g.: Disciplinary items and rules changes, and make the FBR semiautonomous, where we agree to pay someone a fee and let them put something together and charge for their own publication. Anton suggested we ask the membership what they want. Kevin pointed out that there has to be an ethos, we don't want negative stuff, where Stef commented that you would never get rid of negative comments. Peter stated that we don't want anything to cause offence or be liabess. Kevin suggested a vote to decide to go ahead with guidance with non-offending.

Anton said we have 2 propositions for the membership:

- a) Do they want a FBR to be the journal of the association of which they are a member and which to a certain extend comes under the control of the elected committee? or
- b) Do they want a publication more independent with very few strings attached, which would give rise to a magazine that Stef would like to publish? or Kevin pointed out there is another option:
- c) Do they want membership fees reduced to enable independent subscription?

Anton asked Stef if she was happy to go ahead with the next publication under these new legal implications, she said she was. Nigel pointed out that we have probably encompassed the "Readers Letters" section, all present agreed.

OTHER DOG SPORTS - eg Clever Dogs, which is agility and Flyball combined but not Flyball on its own. Wayne pointed out it's a fun dog sport. To which Nigel said it may be but it takes up 6½ pages, items from sanctioned shows should take precedence. Or if we do have other dog sports included, then perhaps we should seek some sort of revenue. Peter pointed out that the target audience may be interested, but we should stick to primary Flyball items. A very lengthy discussion followed concerning this matter, to which it was agreed that all Sanctioned Flyball & official Flyball items take precedence, and if space and money allowed then other items could be included.

The BFA Committee then continued with their Meeting.

It was agreed to abandon the original agenda, and discuss the most important issues still outstanding.

ACTION

1. **Apologies for absence** – Roger Chambers (RC) and Alison Sharpe (AS).
2. **Minutes of last meeting** – Saturday 28 November 1998, all agreed that they were a very straight set of transcribed minutes.
3. **Matters Arising**

- a. **Sherborne** - Kevin received a fax from Sally outlining what had happened to date. Sally had spoken to Pat Doyle, and forwarded a letter from the BFA, together with a cheque (made payable to RSPCA West Dorset Branch, P.Doyle will forward a receipt to the BFA), all which had been received by P.Doyle. Sally had also spoken with Chris Fulford, if P.Doyle is happy with the outcome, then Chris is prepared to drop all charges.

Debbie - commented the cheque was sent via P.Doyle as after contacting the head office of the RSPCA, was informed there is no "West Dorset Branch" but there are other RSPCA centres around, but not in the Sherborne area.

Kevin - read out Sally's progress report concerning the whole issue, which made comment to the BFA disassociating itself with Liz Guy-Halke as she didn't sign the letter, and didn't provide financial accountability.

Anton - commented, following Sally's hard work, if we disassociated ourselves with Liz Guy-Halke, she may wish to lodge a protest to the BFA as Nigel didn't sign the letter either. He didn't think we would have a problem with Liz or P.Doyle. Let's let sleeping dogs lie. He also thinks Chris will drop all charges, once Sally's got a letter back from P.Doyle, Sally can then officially write to Chris and the BFA Secretary. Chris could then respond if he wanted.

Nigel - confirmed that the BFA would not refuse Liz G-H's membership if she renewed.

Anton - stated we didn't have any grounds to refuse her renewal.

- b. **Gift for Sally** - Nigel and Debbie to get hold of Gary, and find out what sort of Bonsai Sally would like. They would purchase one to the value of £50 and it would be presented at the Winter League (if attending). Kevin to let Nigel know.
- c. **NAFA Guidelines** - We want to stay close to NAFA's rules (where possible) and seeing if we are able to in context with our rules. Nigel's still awaiting these from Melanie.

Anton - with reference the Racing Rules, we would have to have a very good reason why ours aren't exactly the same as NAFA. Try and keep changes to absolute minimum.

NB/DB

KMc

NB

All

Kevin - suggested as soon as Nigel gets NAFA's racing rules, then they are distributed, the committee views them and has a look to see if we can throw anything out/or change in our rules. For example our amnesty on Multi-breed. We actually run Multi-breed as per NAFA, except that we relax the ability to put dogs in to teams from other teams.

Kevin asked if everyone was clear on this point - everyone is.

Anton - pointed out what he thought the definition was he thought it was the same as NAFA.

Nigel - read out the definition as per our Rules (5.2 - Teams). The Committee all agreed on section 5.2 a. & b. But part 5.2 c. needs to be changed perhaps the wording 'Multi-breed' should be changed to 'fun classes'.

Anton - Once people see we're running proper Multi-breed classes that are receiving points, and seed times, they will start to enter. Lets stick to NAFAs Multi-breed guidelines.

Kevin - do NAFA allow 2 dogs from San Francisco & 2 dogs from Toronto get together and race as a Multi-breed?

Anton - Yes. They will have a team registration number as a Multi-breed team, and the same dogs who run in an Open class would have a registration number as an Open team. The only other proviso they have is they won't allow a dog to compete in an open & Multi-breed class at the same event. Because they don't want their dogs doing too much running

Peter - is this not counter productive to our efforts to getting dogs to run in Multi-breed.

Nigel - pointed out it wasn't because if we change 5.2 c wording from 'Multi-breed' to 'fun classes'

Anton - Lets get hold of NAFA's rulebook and read it carefully.

All

Kevin - suggested it may be beneficial that once we're happy with what should and shouldn't in the wording, perhaps we should also put out an explanation sheet in the FBR, to say exactly what this certain rules mean.

Anton - we should highlight the areas in the racing rules. Also our point system is very different. A dog in this country getting a title is not comparable with a dog getting the same title in Canada. We must be careful that once the Europeans and Australians start racing for points, whose point system will they adopt? Would we be able to convert our points that our dogs have accumulated so far by some agreed mathematical formula that is comparable with NAFA. This is something that needs to be looked at.

Nigel - we currently race more and get more points, NAFA race less but want the titles.

Kevin - They are awarded the title 'Champion', which we threw out before, due to being provocative to the Kennel Club.

Nigel - suggested we place a note in the forthcoming Newsletter, and try and get some feedback prior to the AGM, reference the awards.

AGM

Anton - asked Nigel if he just mentions to Melanie about us using the same titles as NAFA. Hopefully it shouldn't be a problem

NB

Peter - Will only be a problem once quarantine rules are lifted.

Anton - from a practical side, if everyone follows NAFA it will bring us in line with mainland Europe. People are always asking when will they be able to bring their dogs to England?

Kevin - pointed out there is no point system currently in place in Europe.

Anton - however, they've made a lot of progress in Europe, they have no formal association in mainland Europe, - no points, no titles, no bureaucracy. They've made progress cause there are no barriers. They would actually be seeded 2 and 4 in the UK. Every team out there is getting faster.

- d. **Area Reps Update** - Wayne said he'd spoken to Terry Condra's wife, but Terry hasn't got back to him. He'd left messages on Lynn Crooks answer phone and she hasn't got back to him. Could Nigel take over the Cornwall area? Gwain had tried to contact Belinda, with no success. Wayne said he had 2 people interested in Belinda's area: someone from the K9'ers and someone from the Jumping Jacks. However the K9'ers just wanted to concentrate on racing at the moment. Michael Shepherd (Jumping Jacks) had written to Wayne stating he was happy to do this area. As for the other areas, we can put the PO Box address. Wayne had heard from Alison Booth, as she couldn't get hold of Kevin as she wanted more membership forms (Debbie sent these last week), she also wanted confirmation re her team name change, that she said she'd sent to Nigel. Nigel has since spoken to Alison, and informed her all team and membership details go to Carol at the PO Box address BEFORE he receives anything. Alison also wanted more A5 sticky labels with Area Reps details on; Wayne told her he would sort this out after this Committee meeting. Nigel suggested Wayne writes to Terry Condra, asking if he is happy to continue as Area Rep, and if we don't hear from him within 7 days, then the PO address will go on all future correspondence, and we look for someone else for his area. Wayne to let Debbie know ASAP of the current up-to-date list.

**WO
WO**

WO

- e. **Area Reps Criteria** - Wayne pointed out the area reps meetings are a good idea and we should carry on with them, but the problem is everyone is spread out so far and with the monetary costs involved, the meetings have not been achievable.

Anton - queried what did we mean by Area Reps Criteria.

Peter - reiterated that at the last meeting it was discussed that an area rep needed to be in a team to be an Area Rep.

Wayne - pointed out that John Dodsworth (Scotland) doesn't run in a team but is VERY keen, and is hoping to put on a training day this year.

Anton - read out our guidelines as per our Rules & Policies.

Kevin - asked why the Area Rep set up isn't working in some areas. Should we put

it to the membership and ask what they want from the Area Reps, or should the BFA be telling the Area Reps what is expected of them? The point of an Area Rep is to promote Flyball in certain areas. The BFA is not actually any farther down the road. Than what it was 12 months ago.

A. Reps

Wayne - Doreen from Wakefield is hoping to put on some pairs competitions this year.

Anton - voiced his concerns that the principle duty of the Area Rep is not so much to organise tournaments but to get people into the sport via training. He read out the BFA Rules & Policies attaining to the Area Reps - our Area Reps are actually the BFA's sales reps for the sport - they should be getting the business, and he doesn't think it's working.

Kevin - stated that teams are trying to put on big events, where we hope to draw people into the sport, and they should be going away and putting on training days to encourage more interest, rather than trying to host a big show. It appears that there isn't this growth being generated from the Area Reps. So we either stick with the system and give them a clear plan of what we want, e.g., if you want to be an Area Rep you must put on at least 2 training days. Why do we have 1 area rep per area, perhaps we should have more, why are they called area reps, perhaps they should be called Flyball promoters, that's what they are.

A.Reps

Wayne - asked if we are still sending out the minutes to Area Reps?

Debbie - pointed out - yes, he should still be doing this.

WO

Nigel - pointed out, from the last set of minutes, apart from the front page, there was nothing in the minutes that was confidential.

Wayne - confirmed if it was ok to send the last 2 lots of minutes out (without the front page of the last set). Perhaps we have been doing too much for them already; perhaps they should be doing things for themselves now?

WO

Anton - stated that we need to look at where we're going. He doesn't think the membership is growing. We currently have 380 active members, 30 primary teams and 90 teams including secondary teams. The Stats don't look too bad. However, we're not making progress with primary teams only secondary ones. Regional reps need to have something to offer apart from an introduction and 1 training day.

Peter - The regional reps need to be able to offer regular training days.

A.Reps

Anton - If there's a lack of training from existing teams then there's a lack of facilities to introduce new people into the sport.

Peter - Limited shows are becoming a problem, as there is now only room for primary teams.

Nigel - unless shows are held over a weekend then it will be a problem.

Anton - 24 teams is a lot to us, but not compared with NAFA this would be a disaster, that's not even a mornings racing, 40 - 50 teams is small to them.

Nigel - But they hold shows over a weekend, some of our shows, eg the Winter

League have time constraints, and unfortunately we haven't been very hard on teams, people still mess about on the starts. NAFA runs smooth and swiftly because they sort themselves out and crack on with it. It may be hard to try and introduce over here.

Anton - NAFA would look at Luton and have 2 sets of racing lanes.

Peter - we haven't got the administrative team, or sufficient members of teams to do this. A lot of teams haven't got enough handlers to race 2 teams at the same time.

Anton - People think they can come along to Flyball and take their time, which is how they approach dog & Flyball training. NAFA don't look on Flyball as a bolt on extra, they put a lot of time and money into Flyball. The people we're getting are quite laid back about Flyball in general, some teams may possibly show up at the winter league, because there's not much going on in agility! Then you don't see the team again for the rest of the year.

Kevin - pointed out that people over here don't spend the same sort of money on dog training.

Anton - But people spend loads on agility for their 1-minute in the ring.

Kevin - We've identified a big problem, people don't spend money on dog show sports/entries, and they don't like to spend loads on venues or training. In our sport you need to spend money on venues etc.

Anton - however, with obedience training, they do spend a lot.

Peter - thinks it's improving steadily.

Anton - expected more than 380 active members. If we're looking at areas and what they're not achieving, the BFA need to look at areas that haven't got a lot of input and possibly going there and helping and advising them what to do. People we have are probably retrospective of an area that they're in. Nicky Dickenson and Doreen Smith are making headway. We have too many constraints. We need all new reps to be taken by the hand and shown what is expected of them, we need to educate and give more assistance. We need some way of monitoring the Area Reps, there should have been at least another Area Reps meeting following the one in October.

WO

Nigel - The area reps are currently muddled in with team captains, so there's no responsibility on area reps. A meeting for area reps is needed, where they report back to team captains, and the area rep co-ordinator should then get feedback from team captains as to whether or not information is being passed to them.

Peter - suggested that Wayne chooses a more central area for meetings.

WO

Kevin - going back to the Area Reps Criteria, Kevin and Peter don't think that we have a problem, they don't think we would be able to cope with a big influx of people. Yes you can identify problems in isolated areas, so we must start to nurture the area reps. Do we need some commitment from the committee towards area reps, where we offer assistance?

Peter - pointed out that the committee has already been helping area reps as and where possible.

Anton - stated that the main problem is, they've got to put on at least 1 training day, and then offer regular training, possibly with teams. The area reps should also be encouraging new teams.	A.Reps
Kevin - suggested coming up with a better way of getting established clubs into Flyball, that must be our target.	
Anton - following an AGM, perhaps the Area Reps Co-ordinator post should be filled first, with possibly 1 or 2 people, that have the time and facilities to do the job to the best of their ability - it's a very demanding job.	AGM
Kevin - We must look at getting Flyball into clubs.	A.Reps
Anton - pointed out the main problem is with facilities.	
Peter - the area rep co-ordinator can't look after every area rep, so perhaps could committee members could take under their wing an area rep?	All
f. Judges Training - not much progress so far. Possibly waiting for an outside venue up North direction. We are looking at a Judges, dog and instructors training to make it financially viable.	PR
Anton - One problem we do have, is getting to grip with the diary that is well enough ahead for most people. We don't get the turnout because people are already committed to other projects.	
Peter - Brands Hatch doesn't meet our criteria.	
Anton - When we look at funding projects for the BFA - we haven't got a money less pot. However, we should be looking at self-financing projects.	All
Nigel - Perhaps looking at late autumn.	All
Wayne – suggested getting people to pay in advance.	
Kevin - The way forward is to book a date first, then worry about a venue. Possibly looking at halls of residence, agricultural college's etc.	
g. Winter League Dates - The dates for the Winter League have been confirmed as:	
Saturday 23 Jan 99, Saturday 20 Feb 99 & Sunday 28 Mar 99.	
Anton asked about the wording of "may be a limited Show".	
Kevin - pointed out that the winter leagues are currently limited to 24 teams per show. If however, 24 do not enter, the show can still be called a Limited Show.	
Anton - asked if it could be made clear on the schedules, what show organisers actually mean by a show being limited, and what procedure is followed for sending out schedules for a limited show?	
Kevin - pointed out that schedules are sent out at exactly the same time, to all primary team captains.	

Anton – stressed that all his shows will be limited, and he feels there will be a problem this year with teams not getting acceptance at shows.

It was agreed, when the Secretary who approves the schedules, receives one, she is to check it thoroughly, and if it states "Limited show", she must inform the show organiser, that all schedules must go out to all Primary Team Captains in the same post.

DB

It was also agreed that once a show organiser receives entries, all primary teams get accepted first, then and only if there are places left the secondary teams get placed in the order they were received. It therefore works on a first come first served basis.

When sending schedules out, a show organiser must send out all schedules at the same time, either by:

- Normal post, or
- 'Recorded Delivery' 60p + stamp - the sender automatically gets proof of posting and a signature at the receiving end, or
- Gets an 'Advice of Delivery' 33p + stamp - where anyone can sign for it at the receiving end. Or even
- A 'free' proof of posting certificate.

When the show organiser receives entries back they can write the received date on the entry to make the sorting out easier. It was suggested that Nigel contacts Melanie and asks what system NAFA use.

NB

It was also suggested, a space is made available on the schedules, stating: if a team doesn't get a successful entry to this show, do they want their entry putting forward to the next show date?

Unfortunately, we have slipped up once last year, with the way a limited show was run, but it was agreed no malice was intended, we're all aware of what happened, and it won't occur again.

Peter - asked if there was a facility to hold a show for teams that do not get into a limited show, eg teams that don't get into the Winter League.

Kevin – suggested Peter put on a show later in the year for such teams, but he must make sure that teams or dogs that did race at say, the Winter League, don't try and race again. Could be hard to police.

Anton – suggested Peter set up 2 more racing lanes at Luton.

It was agreed that this probably wouldn't work, as some teams do not have enough handlers to be able to race 2 of their teams at the same time, in different parts of the hall.

h. **Flyball Certificates** - Nigel has purchased 500 certificates (£69.00).

i. **Blue Award** – Nigel's spoken to Liz Payne, whose suggested some form of crystal relating to 'Blue's full name - 'Ice Blue Moon', but we must bear in mind (the cost) this award will go to everyone who reaches 20,000 points, (possibly 2 dogs a year).

Anton suggested Nigel looks for something in the region of £25 if it looks too tatty, then he's to get back to the Committee, so we can agree on another price.

NB

j. **Pins** - Kevin apologised, as no progress as yet.

KMc

k. **AGM Venue** – Unfortunately Peter has not been able to find a suitable venue in the Midlands area. It was suggested Peter see if he can get hold of the SAAB Centre again.

PR

l. **1999 Summer Championship Proposals** - Peter to expand on his previous suggestions – from last meeting. Anton put forward some different suggestions, which could also include Area Reps (copy attached) [Attachment 2]. It was suggested that we put the proposals to the membership.

PR

AGM

Kevin - for suggestions for a venue for the final of the Summer Championship.

Peter - said that Stoneleigh is pretty central and could host at least 16 teams.

m. **Team of Year** - Nigel had put together a rough guideline to enable the working out of the Team of the Year. His main objectives when working the points out were:

- Getting people to attend shows,
- Getting people to actually race,
- Provide close racing for team and spectators alike.

In relation to the above, Anton brought up a suggestion 'Flyball Racing v Flyball Points' and he felt the BFA has lost its way, especially concerning points for dogs. He feels we should make more of 'fuss' when dogs reach the titles, especially the different breed awards. We should make more of an effort to do presentations: e.g., at the AGM, Summer Championship etc. He would like to put more emphasis on those points. We don't make much out of teams achieving their own goals, e.g.: the PODs last year got faster and faster.

Cmte

Another problem due to the pressure of being able to get certain titles is that people possibly feel under pressure to keep running their dogs. NAFA don't have such awards as 'Dog of the Year', 'Bitch of the Year' etc. He is concerned because of our point system set up for these awards, he feels people may go out of their way to make sure their dog gets X amount of points over a weekend, even considering stopping their bitch coming into season etc.

Anton - felt lifetime achievements are more important than yearly awards.

4. **Correspondence** – Debbie had received a letter dated 5 Dec '98 from Shirley Paine, requesting it to be read out at the next committee meeting:

5. **Head Judges** – Nigel confirmed with the Committee who the current Head Judges are:

Nigel Bouckley

Gary Metherall

Peter Robers

Chris Fulford

Neil Meeking

Gwain Theobald

Dave Hume

Wayne O'Rourke

Keith Williams

Kevin McNicholas

Betty Owen

Anton Wittwer

He asked if there was anyone he had missed off? - Andy Bawden. Peter suggested we try and expand the list.

6. **Projects** - Getting Flyball into existing clubs? That is perhaps where we ought to be guiding the Area Reps. Wayne suggested finding out where the local dog training clubs are, and sending flyers, with an invite, to come and watch training or a show.

Peter - thought the problem we are up against, is that most clubs are registered and would like to do Kennel Club Flyball to get to Crufts. Perhaps we let them know we are 99% the same, so come along and watch

Anton - said there are clubs out there who unfortunately only specialise in one discipline, e.g.: agility, obedience. There are however, a lot of potential venues e.g.: Rescue Centres who do have the facilities and willingness of people to help.

Kevin - suggested lets get info out to area reps, getting them to hunt out their local rescue centres etc.

7. **AOB:**

- a. **Committee Positions** - Nigel mentioned Alison had put forward she would not be re-standing for election at the AGM. She would also be handing over the Newsletter position, as she feels it's a committee position. She is however, happy to do a hand over with her successor.
- b. Nigel and Debbie said they would not be re-standing for election. Anton asked if Nigel was prepared to continue with the Web. He said he would. The Stats position was again discussed, and Nigel felt it should be a Committee position, however the decision would lie with the next Committee. He did point out the communication problems etc, that have taken place this year concerning the FBR, and quite possibly a lot of these may not have arisen if she had been on the Committee. Anton however, did not feel Roy would like to stand for Committee. Wayne asked Nigel if he was happy to take on the Area Rep position for Cornwall, Nigel said he was. Debbie pointed out that she would NOT be taking the AGM minutes. Therefore someone needs to be found to do the minutes, either get a volunteer, or Gwain & Wayne to ask the 2 persons who took the Area Reps minutes, and let Debbie know ASAP of the outcome.
- c. Gwain would also be standing down, and not re-standing.
- d. Therefore 4 posts will become vacant. Nigel, Debbie & Gwain are due to stand down this year, together with Peter, but Peter said he would probably re-stand. Everyone else should be standing down the following year. Kevin was unsure whether he would re-stand. Anton asked if we had a procedure where by you can elect officers if not enough persons stand, Kevin suggested we decide whether we wish persons to see out their term and at re-election not be re-elected, or Nigel suggested we push for being accepted and current. Nigel suggested if we don't get the 9 posts filled then we drop to 7 positions. It was in agreement, no team, family or household should have more than 1 serving officer on the committee at any one time.
- e. Nigel - proposed at the AGM once the previous years reports have been read out, we then elect the new Committee, and we proceed with the remainder of the AGM with the new committee.
- f. Peter - wished it to go on record, that it was a great shame that Nigel & Debbie were

A.Reps

A.Reps

standing down, much to be regretted, Kevin mentioned that he thought the whole Committee echoed Peters comments.

g. Anton hoped that with new blood on the committee there would also be some new ideas. Hopefully all the Area Reps would be better represented, if we can get people coming from different areas.

8. **AGM Notice** – Debbie to put together a draft AGM Agenda for all Committee to comment on soonest. Debbie will aim to get the AGM Notice to all members out with the Newsletter.

GT/WO

AGM

**Meeting closed 4.30pm,
Next meeting - Annual General Meeting - Sunday 20 March 1999
SAAB Centre (Confirmation to follow)**

Chairman thanked all for attending.

PLEASE NOTE:

SAAB Centre, Northampton has been booked for our AGM to start promptly at 1100am.

Tea & coffee available from 1030am. (Lunch will be available at lunch time ish!)

Proposed 1999 AGM Agenda
Saturday 20 March 1999 - SAAB Learning Centre - 1100am

1. Apologies
2. Minutes of last AGM 15 March 1998.
3. Matters arising
4. Reports from:
 - a. Chairman - Kevin
 - b. Secretary - Debbie
 - c. Treasurer - Roger
 - d. Statistics Co-ordinator - Nigel
 - e. Membership Secretary - Carol.
 - f. Education & Training Offers Report - Peter
 - g. Regional Representatives Co-ordinator - Wayne
 - h. Press/Public Relations Officer - Anton/Kevins
 - i. Flyball Record/Newsletter Editor - Stef/Alison
5. Annual Awards
6. LUNCH BREAK
7. Elections for forthcoming committee, following due to stand down:

Debbie, Nigel, Gwain, Peter

Alison will also be standing down.

Persons up for re-election:

Kevin, Anton, Roger, Wayne, Carol.
8. Nominations:
9. Proposed Rule Changes:
10. Suggestions for additions to Rules (1)
11. Any other business
 - a. Awards - Point system/allocation of points.
 - b. Summer Championship Layout.
 - c. Flyball Record - How many per year, A4/A5, what do we want in it (freedom of speech/controlled by Committee)? Reduced membership & purchasing privately run magazine?
 - d. Newsletter - Official journal of BFA?
 - e. What purchases should the BFA be making? How could we increase our income to make these purchases?

(1) BFA Committee

The composition of the Committee in the future should be in accordance with the following criteria:

- a. No team should have more than 1 serving officer on the Committee at any one time.
- b. No more than 1 person from any household or family should serve as (i) An Officer of the Committee (ii) Regional Representative, (iii) In any other capacity as a BFA Official at any one time.
- c. Members cannot be Officers of the Committee and Regional Representatives at the same time.

Attachment 1

Kevin read out his and Alisons ideas which would be discussed (copies were made available to all present).
[Amended & agreed version - see Attachment 1].

1999 Summer Championship Proposals - Peter to expand on his previous suggestions - from last meeting. Anton put forward some different suggestions, which could also include Area Reps (copy attached) [Attachment 2].