

The Future of the Centres – Online discussion Monday 29th November 2021.

Present:

RTX: Erin Criglington (EC), Mark Ireland (MI), Mike Sim (MS), Steve Stannard (SS)

Clubs: Jim McMurray (Forestland Wheelers), Logan Townsend (ASC), Mark Renall (PNP Cycling Club), Richard Justice (Auckland Central), Graeme Blackwood (Counties Manukau), Stephen Cox (Dynamo), David Howden (ACM), Glynis Te Maipi-Kemp (Kapiti Cycling Club), Peter James (ACM), Kelvin McAnulty (Auckland Centre), Brent Sowry (ACM), Mark Coburn (PNP)

Centres: Kerry Ludlam (Auckland Centre), Arwen Page (Northland Centre), Dennis Parker (Canterbury Centre), Steve Elden Gray (WGTN Centre), Chris Foggin (Southland Centre), Ivan Aplin (ECNI Centre), Hamish McDonald (Mid-South Canterbury)

.....
Meeting started at 7pm.

Welcome and housekeeping by EC.

EC spoke to the presentation (a summary of what was sent via email to all clubs and centres) summarised by the two options for discussion:

Option 1

Centres retain the exclusive voting authority in the formal structure on behalf of clubs and individual members. (The current structure)

Option 2

Clubs to have the voting authority on behalf of members and be the conduit to the National Federation. Centres or some other form of regional co-ordination group, would become optional and would not have voting authority.

Council recommendation: The RTX Council recommend Option 2 – For Clubs to hold the voting authority to represent members

EC then opened up for questions/feedback

Kerry Ludlam (KL) – Would centres still be able to attend AGM and have speaking rights?

MI – Yes. We still want engagement from the centres

KL – What would the cost and benefits for centres to affiliate to RTX

MS – This is part of the detail to be confirmed once a decision is made, however we imagine the cost of centres to affiliate would remain the same as clubs. It would be up to them to decide if it's of value. If they want to run a championships they would need to be affiliated. This affiliation would also enable them to attend the AGM and have speaking rights as above.

Graeme Blackwood (GB) – If a centre stayed in place (outside the formal structure) could a club bypass the centre and affiliate directly to RTX.

EC – Yes, the relationship with club and centre would be outside the formal structure so it would be up to the club and centre to establish how they would work. The club would affiliate directly to RTX.

Logan Townsend (LT) – If a centre doesn't exist does that mean that all riders are exempt from joining a centre but if a centre does exist – this this mean that all riders would need to pay the extra fee?

EC – This would be up to each club and centre to establish the role of the centre and to understand the benefit of having a relationship with their region (recognising that there are some really active centres currently). It would be up the club/centre to work out how formal and if any there are any financial obligations.

Jim McMurray (JM) – What are the primary outcomes this is trying to achieve and how will this be measured to understand if this works?

EC – One of the main reasons is to increase membership and connection to RTX – remove the barrier of the additional layer that would provide a structure for new codes coming on board.

MS – Will create more of a direct connection to the riders. Enables a structure to engage in the sport from 2021 and beyond.

Erin – One of the measures will be by increase in numbers over the next 2 -3 years and also member satisfaction (is the current model fit for purpose). The outcome of this discussions will provide the framework to develop a new member structure that the sport are asking for

Jim – I am concerned this will reduce the number of events and the reputation of the sport isn't conducive to growing the sport.

EC – This doesn't mean that events can't be run. Active centres can still run events

Stephen Cox (SC) – Difficult to believe that this would on its own grow membership. Is there a 3rd option? Combining centres? Putting in more criteria to remain as a centre etc.

Stephen Stannard (SS) – This options empower clubs more. The communication channels through the current structure is not streamlined.

Dennis Parker (DP) – Canterbury not fussed around losing voting rights. Not sure if the attendance at the AGM is a measure of the health of the sport? Collaboration and coordination of the clubs is the most important role for their centre. 15 – 20 people come to our centre meetings. We don't operate as a conduit to communicate to members we are more around collaboration of the clubs in the region

Not sure this change would result (on its own) in increase in membership. This is not the magic bullet (this issue is a secondary issue). The power of growth is with the collaboration.

MI/EC – Clarified at a later point – This is part of a range of things that RTX council are looking at to grow the sport. Not intended to be a silver bullet but one of the tools needed

Chris Foggin (CF) – Cycling Southland fully support the removal of the centres. Looking to increase their collaboration with other codes to become more of a regional hub of cycling.

Mark Ireland – this change will enable a new member structure. The change will fundamentally change the focus from R&T to a broader view of cycling.

Arwen Page (AP) – When I started with Bike Northland I didn't even know this was part of my role. We are focused on advocacy and my role is collaborating with all other codes. Removing this layer of administration and associated requirements would be very welcome and can only see a benefit for those active clubs to having more of a direct connection.

LT – Is there risk of one club not ‘collaborating’ with an informal centre structure – they could price gauge the others to gain membership?

MI – If the centre is offering value then the club is likely to engage. If a club is offering and providing value then the market will decide.

LT – How is it envisaged for track championships selection to work that currently falls under Centres– how does this functionally work?

EC – “There is a required standard that could assist qualification”

MI – “This is the sort of detail to review once a decision is made but we would look at the Aus Cycling Model to see if this can be adapted for NZ”

Steve Elden-Gray – We have adapted the running of the centre to our needs and audience. Wellington succeeding as a coordination hub. Supports giving votes to the clubs.

EC – This change will still enable active centres to continue to provide collaboration and coordination at a regional level.

CF – Southland are working to bring together all the codes the sport at a governance level.

EC – This change will enable a new membership structure to be developed to suit the needs of all our sport. The new structure will also have some consideration to how it fits across all codes

SC – Concerned that just removing centres won’t increase membership – not all riders don’t want to engage at the national (CNZ) level.

GB – Members have expressed hesitation on the centre structure as a hindrance so this change would in theory, support an increase in memberships

DP – The sport needs to look more strategically at how to grow numbers – it is much more than just a centre structure.

MI – This is part of a range of things that RTX council are looking at to grow the sport. Not intended to be a silver bullet but one of the tools needed.

Meeting concluded at 7.58pm