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| Glouc Bowls Assoc  TRANSPARENT | **GLOUCESTERSHIRE BOWLS ASSOCIATION** **A Member of Bowls England.** |

**G.B.A Joint Executive Committee**

**Minutes of meeting of Wednesday 6 May 2020**

**Held online (‘Zoom’ meeting) : 11.00 a.m.**

**Members present**: Chair and Secretary - Lindsay Collin (County Administrator and WD BE Delegate) LC, Myra Savage (GBA Match Secretary) MS, David Rolls (MD Representative) DR, Roger Harrison (GBA Deputy Match Secretary) RH, Craig Guthrie (MD BE Delegate) CG, Linda Bennett (WD Representative), Anne Beaven (WD co-opted Delegate) AB, David Skeats (Deputy County Administrator) DS

**Apologies :** Avril Hole (Deputy County Treasurer) – technical problems. Host CG would talk with her on the phone during the meeting.

1. **Welcome** by Chair (LC). Chair repeated that, with the limited time available, the meeting would be, on this occasion, largely confined to the matters previously advised, all of which might take a fair time to talk through. She noted the format of the meeting and the way in which it would be organised.

Chair also referred to the passing of Mike Manns, whose experience and knowhow had been so valuable for the County, and who was so well liked and respected. Also noted that 9 people had passed away since the Covid-19 lockdown began, but none directly due to the virus. DS volunteered that the new County Umpires Co-ordinator was to be Joe Taylor. MS and RH to please note.

1. **Minutes of Joint Executive Meeting of Saturday 13 February 2020** (circulated) Would be considered at the next meeting, hopefully an actual live meeting.
2. **The crisis in GBA Treasurers**

Wide-ranging discussion on the lack of candidates for the three GBA Treasurer roles – the County Treasurer, the MD Treasurer and (as of next year) the WD Treasurer, who retires at the end of this year.

* MD position had been twice circulated and two people approached. No positive outcomes so far. A third circulation will be undertaken shortly. [Action – DS]
* The WD position was part of a recent plea for key role nominations, including the President and the Treasurer. No candidates so far. [Action – LC]
* The County Treasurer had not been acted upon so far, as only one month since the position became vacant, and Chair wished to have this present conversation.
* DS asked whether it was necessary to have a County Treasurer. Felt strongly by all others that it was; good reasons to keep the County and Divisional roles separate. LC also suggested that it may well be even more difficult to attract Divisional Treasurers if they knew that they would be required to share the County Treasurer role.
* Would it be possible for one actual County Treasurer, with two divisional roles that just collected money and paid routine bills ? DR
* To solve the County difficulty this year, Maddie Hale has agreed to offer help in producing accounts for 2019/20 at year end. Will be very helpful. Still means we’re looking for an actual County Treasurer. [Action – LC]
* Two people noted that best to try to find people with existing financial skills, and approach them, rather than use general circulations (which sometimes don’t get passed by club secretaries to people who might help out). [Action – LC]
* Still rather inconclusive.
1. **Decisions about the administration of the refunds for BE Affiliation** and what should be done in relation to GBA Affiliation refunds.
* BE affiliation fees must go to clubs anyway.
* Agreed unanimously that GBA affiliation fees should similarly go back to clubs, without any deduction, despite all payments made by GBA2010 in the 7 months so far.
* If GBA2010 is short next year, may need to raise a levy. Last levy in 2016. But only circa £1700 will remain in account at the end of year, after existing expenditure and all refunds.
* No Annual Luncheon this year to affect GBA2010 finances.
* Administrator will probably have to arrange, in the absence of a County Treasurer. [Action – LC]
1. **Refunds of competition entry fees**
* BE Championship Competition entry fees already returned to us, must be distributed to clubs : £4347. Actually paid to BE by GBA2010, so divisions must, in practice, pay back the competition monies for 2020 that they still have in their accounts.
* JEC unanimously agreed that all the County competition monies for 2020 should also be refunded. Too many difficulties to consider rolling over monies [May be more comps per head next year; may be less comps per head next year; people may play in different teams next year; some monies came from clubs, some from individuals; too complicated to leave – we have the time now to deal with].
* Avril will arrange for WD. MD will have to agree who sorts out the refunds – possibly RH ? [Action – AH, RH]
1. **Bowls England National Membership Register** Discussion of David Skeats’ paper particularly on the implications in relation to GDPR.
* LC indicated that, prior to a general discussion – as the person required to collect the data for the Register, and also to give some structure to the exchanges – she wished to start by giving her summary of the situation. This included the following points :
	+ The pressure on her, and on other County Administrators, given the present timescale.
	+ The common requirement for data for three bodies : Clubs, the County and the NGB.
	+ That ‘holding’ data does not require consent, if the data is ‘adequate, relevant and non-excessive’.
	+ ‘Use’ of data requires consent, but use will not commence until the Register ‘goes live’ (probably with affiliation process in September).
	+ Clubs could continue with collection of data, otherwise this will make the process impossible in a reasonable timescale.
	+ DS had produced the model Club GDPR Policy and Consent Form in 2018, which already refer to most of the data and to the required consents. Need updating to refer to Register and to all the data involved.
	+ The only data elements not previously referred to are : Ethnicity; Disability; Title; Emergency contact details; Parental details (for a junior).
	+ Possible to update GDPR paperwork and clubs to continue collecting the data, in parallel.
	+ Updating of GDPR documents can be done quite quickly. New consents then to be gained by clubs.
* LC noted that most aspects of competition entry processes already involved entrants giving permission for their data to be used in organising and running competitions. A few entry forms might need additional wording.
* A lengthy and wide-ranging discussion then took place, including the following elements :
	+ DR indicated that he was comfortable with the general pointers given by LC, a position confirmed by several other committee members.
	+ DR said there were nevertheless a few concerns with the Register and the timescale involved, and the GDPR implications did need dealing with.
	+ DS suggested that the GDPR component was crucial and until it was solved the Register should not proceed. He felt that there was not enough time being allowed.
	+ DS had several other more detailed concerns, particularly in relation to the long BE Privacy Policy (which LC noted was based on a Sport & Recreation Alliance template and agreed by BE’s solicitors) and to the potential (mis)uses of personal e-mails. Some differences of opinion noted on this by other members. LC could not see the same inferences in the BE Privacy Policy; she also pointed out that, even though ‘mandatory’, e-mail addresses did not actually have to be given by members – there is a ‘let-out’ at the data submission stage.
	+ MS noted that clubs were under considerable pressure at the moment (with Covid-19) and didn’t need more complicated processes to undertake.
	+ Reference was made again to competitions generally, but pointed out that consent would be agreed on entry forms for that particular area of activity.
	+ CG queried about consent for details supplied to Match Secretaries and inter-county match officials. Felt by RH and MS that current procedures covered this area, independent of a Register. In that context, Women’s Division ‘County List’ already required permission to be given for storage and use of the county players’ details.
* Finally, after further debate, a consensus emerged - confirmed by a show of hands - for the following solution [DS wished it to be minuted that he disagreed with this approach and felt it did not meet the GDPR regulations of the ICO] :
	+ 1. The model Club GDPR Policy would be updated, also the related Consent Form, to ensure that the Register was covered, also the uses to which BE and GBA might put data. These revised documents would first be circulated to the Committee, and collectively agreed, before circulation to clubs.
		2. In parallel, clubs would be asked – in the background - to continue what they had already been asked to do – to assemble the data for the Register, for their club. But they would not yet be asked to submit it to the County Administrator.
		3. Agreed model GDPR documents would be circulated to clubs with the advice that these be adopted, replacing the 2018 equivalents. On receipt, clubs would be advised to seek again consent from their members.
		4. Assuming the consents to have been gained, the data could then be sent to the County Administrator for collation and then onward transfer to Jamie Chestney, Project Officer at BE.

Much of this would involve the Administrator. She asked if DS would undertake the updating of the GDPR documents, but he declined, because of his reservations. DR consequently undertook to produce the updates for consideration, as a matter of urgency. [Action – DR]

* A number of final background points were noted by LC.
	+ Competition and inter-county match data consents could continue as at present, as previously noted. Possibly needing checking of wording on present forms and other documentation, to ensure GDPR compliance. [Action – LC, MS, RH]
	+ As well as the Club Policy and consent form, it would be necessary for the GBA GDPR Policy and consent form to be also updated to cover the Register or other uses; this will be done secondly, but in the next few weeks. [Action – LC]
	+ It would unavoidably be up to the clubs to put in place the model GDPR Club Policy and consent form as circulated, or at least to amend their existing documentation to cover all necessary references to the Membership Register. [Action – Clubs]
	+ There was no mechanism by which the GBA could force clubs to comply, though the existing BE Privacy Policy referred to possible withdrawal of membership for individuals who did not comply with supplying their data (the GBA might have to consider including something similar).
1. **Any other business**
	1. 2021 GBA Presentation Luncheon. Agreed that LC should confirm the cancellation of this event with Hatherley Manor Hotel. [Action – LC]
	2. Coaching Developments. Good progress made at meeting of 25 February meeting at Cotswold, with events put in place for 2020 season, but these would obviously have to be put in abeyance until 2021.
	3. Coaching budget. Could not yet be considered.
	4. Updates to GBA Constitution and Rules. LC suggested that a few changes should be looked at, in the light of this year’s experience. Somebody would need to look at this.
	5. Restarting lawn bowls in 2020 Chair still was optimistic, though would depend on the Government’s attitude to ‘non-contact sports’ and to our own in particular. LC to monitor and keep clubs and County up to date.

Meeting closed at 1.20 pm

Date of next meeting : To be decided, in the light of developments in certain areas.