

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING
OF THE CPSA BOARD OF DIRECTORS**

**held at Edmonton House, Bisley Camp, Brookwood,
Woking, Surrey, GU24 0NP**

on Tuesday the 24th of February 2009 at 09:00am

(In lieu of the meeting scheduled for the 03/02/09, which was postponed due to adverse weather conditions.)

PRESENT:

| | |
|---------------|---|
| Mr TR Bobbett | Chairman/National Director |
| Mr WA Heeks | Vice Chairman/Regional Director - North |
| Mr PJ Boakes | Chief Executive Officer |
| Mr BD Curtis | Regional Director – East Midlands |
| Mr C Fielding | Regional Director – West Midlands |
| Ms N Heron | Regional Director – South East |
| Mr KJ Newton | Regional Director – South West |
| Mr TWD Blaney | National Director |
| Mr K Walsh | National Director |

GUESTS: (attended part of the meeting, unless specified)

| | |
|--------------|-----------------------------------|
| Mr G Davis | Auditor (attended entire meeting) |
| Mr J Perry | NATSS |
| Mr D Henwood | Performance Matters |
| Mr S Oldman | Operations Manager |
| Ms J Andrews | Marketing Manager |
| Mr C McVerry | Technical Manager |
| Mr P Rendell | Ground Support Manager |

MINUTES SECRETARY:

Miss KJ Boazman

1. APOLOGIES

Connie Pierre, Accountant, and Roger Mooreland, Performance Matters, were unable to attend the meeting. PJB will deliver CP's update on her behalf. DH attended and spoke on behalf of RM.

2. MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON 17th DECEMBER

a) Further to the email submitted to the Board Pack by NH, the minutes of the previous meeting will be amended to include: "it was subsequently noted that Jerry Parks-Young has not resigned as a tutor".

b) A discussion was had about the recent incident involving the database compiled by JLA using some of the information from the Shooting Industry Directory. PJB stated that he gave the directory to JLA. PJB reported that the matter has since been resolved by the Chairman and a sum of money had been paid to Blaze Publishing. A majority of Board members were of the belief it would have been far more costly to the Association had the matter gone to court. In order to avoid future misunderstanding, PJB has clearly instructed all staff that nothing is to be taken from the SI Directory without first seeking the appropriate permissions.

Following the above, the minutes were proposed by WAH and seconded by CF. The minutes were then passed, 5 in favour, 2 against.

3. MATTERS ARISING

There were no matters arising from the previous meeting.

4. NATSS

TRB informed the Board that JP and DH were expected at 10am to give a presentation and update on NATSS. Prior to this, the Board shared thoughts and ideas on the matter.

a) TRB gave an update from the January Steering Group meeting (28th Jan 09), explaining that the NRA presented the CPSA and the NSRA with an ultimatum in that John Jackman's involvement in the proceedings was a "deal breaker" where they are concerned. It would also seem that the NRA do not want a formal amalgamation for some years yet but are happy to maintain a less formal relationship for the time being. The CPSA and the NSRA are still keen to continue proceedings however they are now feeling more doubtful about the future success of NATSS.

b) KJN and KW felt that if only for financial reasons, NATSS is worth pursuing. NH asked PJB if funding is being allocated based on the fact that NATSS (or a similar concept) is a future plan. PJB explained that all funding needs to be carefully managed. An amalgamation is not essential criteria but regional development of the sport as a whole is. PJB suggested that the CPSA needs to bring together the NRA, who want to hold back, and the NSRA who want to go all in.

c) TRB asked if PJB had received a response from Dan Hackett at HBOS with regard to them providing an independent Chairperson for NATSS. PJB has not yet received a response but everyone agreed that an independent Chairperson was desirable. PJB stated that the NRA and NSRA along with the CPSA are willing to support John Perry's salary continuing to be funded by the three NGBs.

d) PJB asked the Board for a decision as to whether the CPSA should continue with NATSS, explaining that for financial reasons NATSS should be pursued, although GBTSF could be used as a vehicle for funding purposes. The Board voted, 5 in favour, 3 against. CF abstained.

e) TWDB proposed that even if the NRA wants to move at a slower pace the CPSA should continue to develop a relationship with NSRA. NH was against this as she felt that this may complicate things with regard to Sport England funding who are only interested in target shooting as a whole body; however the majority agreed that it was an opportunity worth exploring.

NATSS Presentation, John Perry (NATSS) and David Henwood (Performance Matters)

a) DH opened the presentation by explaining that this was an opportunity to share feedback and reactions to the development of NATSS thus far. He underlined the importance of "constant revision and reconsideration" of the proceedings, referring to a "two steps forward, one step back" concept.

b) An open forum has been held, from which stakeholders were invited to get involved with the project. An online survey was conducted, the results of which formed the agenda for a series of workshops and so on. Several structural proposals for NATSS are now currently being discussed. NATSS will strive to fulfil five strategic aims covering legislation, media/public perception; education, increasing membership and heritage. A skills based board would be required with professional staff to support it. The next stages of the project are to develop a NATSS prospectus, hold a second forum to test it, make further alterations as a result and then make recommendations to the various Boards. The final stage will, of course, be approval by members.

c) DH explained the need to establish a trading name, as of the 1st of April, for the purposes of funding, for example the Whole Sport Plan and the London 2012 Olympics. JP added that an organisational group needs to be set up to deliver the Year 1 plan and report back to Sport England, with a view to securing funding for a second year. JP identified that a lack of coordination between the Governing Bodies has been the main weakness so far, not just with regard to funding but also concerning public perception of NATSS. JP urged the Board to capitalise on the Government's current focus on sports. Shooting, although not a high intensity sport, is considered a sustainable sport (people can start at a young age and continue throughout their life) and therefore can benefit from Sport England funding. Nonetheless, Sport England wants to deal with one contact ('body') rather than three individual organisations. A coordinated effort is therefore key.

d) PJB asked what issues the NRA seem to have with regard to NATSS. JP explained that the NRA is made up many small divisions. The large number of people involved has led to a lot of internal agendas and subsequent disagreements. The NRA generally agrees that a 'common vision' is a positive step but they would prefer an 'umbrella body' as opposed to a formal amalgamation for the time being. JP was unable to comment on behalf of the NSRA however he did suggest that Ken Nash does still seem keen to maintain the process. PJB suggested that a focus on financial matters should allay fears all round. DH explained that work is already underway in that area.

e) NH raised the topic of the online survey and felt that the sample size (approximately 2000 people) was too small. DH explained that by most standards, this was actually a rather large number of people and certainly the biggest sample taken in the field of sports change management generally. He did however agree that the wording of the results could be misleading and therefore requires revision. TWDB highlighted that marketing to members should be reconsidered before re-launching a survey and, indeed, putting the idea to a members' vote. DH agreed and explained that the aforementioned prospectus should serve to respond to questions before they are asked.

f) KJN and NH asked what the plan is for the £140K funding that has been allocated. It was too early to comment at this stage but JP has a meeting planned to finalise a plan, which will be based around the interventions outlined in the Sport England bid. CF stated that the members' perception is that NATSS will not benefit them and they think the money is going to be spent on a lot of unnecessary bureaucracy. PJB accepted that this was the members' point of view however reminded CF, and the Board, that it is the job of Regional Directors to explain to members how NATSS is in fact helping them. CF appreciated this point however still felt that members' would not care about a 'bigger vision'.

5. CEO REPORT

a) Sport England

PJB explained how the CPSA needs to return to Sport England with a 'cut down' version of the original proposal, in time for a meeting next Wednesday. The CPSA also needs to choose two people to be directors of GBTSF. KJN suggested that TRB would be an obvious choice and it was then unanimously decided that TRB and PJB would take on this responsibility.

b) Deesons

The Board is happy to go ahead with Deesons. NH highlighted though that there should be no increases to the £5000 threshold agreed. NH also requested that the monthly advertising figures be included in the Board Pack.

ACTION: SO

c) CSF Championship – India

PJB asked the Board if they were wishing for him to attend both the CSF and CG events in India. Following a short discussion, it was agreed that the CPSA would not send anyone. PJB had asked the question as he did not wish to go to India and was going to invite other Board members to go instead. He explained that Sport England usually funds two people – a target manager and another official. PJB asked if the Board wished to have any involvement in the decision of who is sent as Clay Target manager, the board agreed that it wanted to be part of the decision making process. Once applications have been put into the magazine the Board will be notified of those individuals applying

d) World Skeet

PJB was pleased to announce that headline sponsor has been agreed for the World Skeet. Eley has agreed to a £7K sponsorship deal, 50% of which will be paid up front and the remainder one month before the event. PJB plans to put together a press release, in conjunction with Eley, shortly.

TRB raised the fact that a number of members had raised concern about the cost of the World Skeet, particularly considering there are only 150 targets. PJB responded by saying that the Board did approve this in the last Board Pack (NH and CF refuted this point but PJB indicated that all championship detail sheets were supplied with the December board pack) and reiterated that the idea is to arrange a format that is as close to the World DTL format as possible. PJB explained how the £115 entry fee had been arrived at. Each country can submit 2 teams.

e) UK Sport Funding for British Shooting

PJB reported that, as expected, the UK Sport funding for British Shooting has been reduced. John Leighton-Dyson's position of Performance Director has been made redundant with effect from the 31st of March and Alex Stacey, the programme manager, has resigned. British Shooting must submit a report to UK Sport by 2010 detailing and justifying expenditure in a 'no compromise' method. A new 'fit for purpose' board has been formed, including Phil Scanlon (NRSA), Ian Peel (Shotgun), Ian Coley (Head Shotgun Coach), Kimmo Yli-Jaskari (Finnish Rifle Coach), an independent ex-Olympian, an independent Chair (probably Roger Mooreland) and Ricky Sing (disability representative).

f) Visit to ODA / LOCOG re: Bisley Bid

PJB explained that there is still a huge task ahead if the Olympics are to come to Bisley. LOCOG have been provided with all the necessary paperwork, including the MoD agreement to lend land for the event. There are still concerns about the satellite villages. Despite the fact that the University of Surrey and Royal Holloway could potentially provide accommodation, there may be difficulties in matching the facilities to the main Olympic village. In short, the Bisley bid has been recognised by LOCOG and they are considering it. Nonetheless, at this stage Woolwich is still the chosen site for the events. PJB feels that Bisley is beginning to be taken seriously and stands a chance of being successful with its bid. In addition to this, the local councils, Green England and the like are all in support of Bisley hosting the shooting events in 2012.

GD was concerned that there may have been an oversight in the financial planning, as outlined in the Board Pack. He questioned whether the VAT costs could indeed be recovered as proposed. PJB reported that both Synergy (the building contractors) and David Higgins (ODA) have confirmed that it will indeed be possible. GD said that care must be taken that this does not impact on the CPSA's VAT status.

6. MANAGEMENT TEAM UPDATES

a) Finance, Connie Pierre

i) As CP was unavailable for the meeting, PJB reported that the January accounts, which were circulated to the Board, indicate that income is better than budget, by about £15K and expenditure is less than budgeted, by around £10K. NH also stated that the PR and Marketing has increased from month 11 to £130K by the inclusion of the Academy consultant's fees which is not correct way of accounting for it. It should be shown separately as it has nothing to do with PR and Marketing. NH also requested that the month 12 figures be presented in the same way as previous months (individually as opposed to a year-view) to allow for easier comparison and analysis. NH will not pass the accounts until this information is made clearer.

ACTION: CP/PJB

ii) GD explained that the annual accounts were sent to Deeson's for publishing on the 9th of February. It was intended for them to be discussed at the Board meeting of the 3rd of February but since this was rescheduled, it was not possible for the Board to discuss the information prior to publication. NH felt that there was an inaccuracy with the income figures on 'courses' as there is an apparent difference of £8K compared with figures provided by CMcV. Both PJB and GD explained that this is due to inconsistent bookkeeping in the past, which CP has previously mentioned. GD assured the Board that CP is doing a great job and vast improvements in the accounts will become increasingly evident over the next year. It was agreed that GD will re-write the final page of the annual accounts (the Profit and Loss account) to show greater detail. This will be circulated to the Board for comment and published on the website, before being included in the next issue of Pull! magazine.

iii) The Report of the Directors and Financial Statements for the Year Ended 30 November 2008 for CPSA Ltd. was agreed by the Board and signed by TRB, WAH and PJB.

b) Operations, Stuart Oldman

i) It was previously reported that a number of issues of Pull! magazine (and consequently ballot papers for proxy voting) were not received by members in the post. As a result of this, SO analysed data from 1st December to mid January showing who was due to receive copies and who actually did. He broke the data down into counties and removed new members who would not have received anything anyway. Overall, he identified a possible problem in Yorkshire (18 out of 50 recipients did not receive copies) but felt this can be attributed to an error at Royal Mail, which is beyond the CPSA's control. In conclusion, SO feels satisfied that the problem is not as serious as first thought.

ii) SO informed the Board that, from November 2008, there is a new Sport Visitor Visa introduced by the Border Control Agency. A link has been added to the CPSA website to assist those affected. SO highlighted the fact that it is the responsibility of the individual to apply for and fund this Visa. The CPSA has no obligation to be involved in the process.

iii) SO reported that as of 23rd February 2009, Championship entries totalled 635 overall.

c) Commercial, Jenny Andrews

i) JA repeated that the number of regional pages in Pull! magazine have not been reduced and displayed figures to illustrate this.

ii) JA circulated copies of the upcoming issue of Pull! and a sample of the survey for the Board to look over. The website appears to be working well and lots of positive feedback has been received. The syndicated sites also seem to be fine although problems will only begin to manifest themselves once people actually start using the sites. JA and her team are ready to combat any such issues. In the past 3 months, £700 has been invoiced out for online advertising. Regulations and pricing structure is still under constant review but JA is more than happy with the current state of things.

iii) JA asked the Board to make a final decision with regard to the new logo and presented several options based on discussions at the last meeting. JA explained to the Board that marketing and promotional companies, currently working with the CPSA, have indicated a preference for no wording on the logo as it allows far more flexibility with regard to reproducing and resizing the image on a variety of items (letter heads, clothing, promotional items etc.) The Board was unable to reach a unanimous decision about which logo to use. It was generally felt that wording was not necessary on caps but should be included on other items, particularly on printed materials such as headed paper. PJB proposed that the Board should leave it to the discretion of the HQ team as to whether or not to include wording when reproducing the logo. BDC seconded the proposal and the Board agreed unanimously.

iv) JA reported a deal with GM Motors which provides a discount of up to 18% for CPSA members on the Chevrolet range of cars. There is no cost to the CPSA to become involved in the scheme and GM Motors have already placed adverts in Pull! with a commitment to expand on advertising in the future.

v) The Champion of Champions Event letter has been sent out. At present JA is simply trying to judge interest in principal before proceeding with the event itself. The letter should have included a two-page document to explain that they will be shooting sporting. It would appear that this was missed out in the letters circulated. JA will resolve the issue as a matter of urgency.

ACTION: JA

d) Technical, Chris McVerry

i) CMcV explained that now shooting has become one of 46 selected sports, the CPSA's relationship with UKCC and the national coaching framework has changed. It is suggested that the CPSA integrate its programmes with the national framework and CMcV strongly advised that the Association should support this. The standardisation exercise would give CPSA qualifications a level match against nationally recognised standards and, if no significant differences are found, existing CPSA qualified coaches could benefit from UKCC accreditation. CMcV feels that the matching process should be fairly problem-free as the CPSA level 1 qualification is probably already of a higher level than the national equivalent. There may be some 'gaps' in level 2, linked to sports sciences and nutrition elements. CF asked how funds would be spent if the CPSA aligned itself to UKCC in this way. CMcV explained that funds would be used to train coaches in areas where they are needed. CMcV mentioned an under spend on the coaching bursary at UKCC. They would pay for individuals to go through a coaching bursary. PJB added that this would also be part of the regional development plan. NH and CF were concerned about ending up with more coaches than grounds and questioned whether more coaches were really necessary. CMcV explained that it is not simply a question of training new coaches but further developing existing coaches to higher level qualifications.

ii) CMcV has been approached by a company who is also dealing with Reach. They intend to draft a joint email response to convey that 'although we are not directly involved with the chemicals in question, we would be disappointed were they to be banned for no good reason, particularly if this could be detrimental to our sport.' The Board was unsure if it should be involved in the solution-finding process, even though CMcV indicated that BASC has suggested the CPSA should take action to ensure all voices are heard. NH suggested that the Association should wait for more details of the problem to materialise fully before getting involved. She asked CMcV who he would deal with this if he entered into discussions. CMcV did not know at this stage. NH felt that before entering these discussions we should know who we should be talking to and if they were 'friend or foe'. BDC disagreed and felt that it is no good trying to change a decision once it has been made; the Association should be involved from the start to ensure a positive outcome. PJB and TRB both agreed with this notion. PJB proposed that the CPSA should be proactive and not reactive with regard to this issue. BDC seconded the proposal and the Board voted five in favour, two against.

iii) CMcV asked the Board to make a decision about the Referees QAT Recommendations / Questions, included in the Board Pack. The following was decided:

At all major and minor championships, one single manufacturer of clays is used and that the manufacturer is made known to competitors.

No. This will be left at the Ground Owners' discretion.

Qualified referees are used at all major and minor championships.

No. This is too complicated and unrealistic to expect of Ground Owners.

Bring ABT more in line with the rest of the home disciplines whereby separate referees are used.

No. This will incur too much cost to Grounds if it were enforced.

Bring the 'shoot off' procedure STR in line with other events (such as Skeet) and only shoot one round of 25 before entering into a 'sudden death' procedure.

Agree.

The rules for Skeet Doubles are incorrect in the booklet as it advises a shoot off procedure as in ESK.

Agree. There will be sudden death on peg 4.

How should the rule concerning the adjustment of semi-automatics be enforced? (Ref: Booklet 7, Guns 1.28, 2008 version)

The Board agree to remove this rule.

What is the checking procedure for the rule regarding the right of referees to examine and analyse unshot cartridges? (Ref: rule 1.50)

The Board agrees this is a difficult rule to enforce in reality but it shall be left in so as to allow the option where necessary.

There has been a request from Sporting shooters to have a greater alignment between the rules of ESP and FITASC – does the Board agree?

The Board agreed this will be passed to the Sporting Sub-Committee for further discussion.

A set size should be agreed for all new DTL trap houses and stated in the rules.

No. It is too hard to find one rule that suits everyone; this idea was already discussed some years ago and was felt to be unrealistic.

The Board needs to agree the layout drawings included in the Board pack.

The Board agreed to take the advice of the Technical department.

iv) CMcV explained that at present, some of the more popular courses are funding the less popular ones. He asked if he could cancel the non-profitable courses if demand is low. KW felt that the CPSA had a moral obligation to offer all courses regardless of popularity. NH was concerned that too much money is being spent on tutors and assessors, which could explain why money is not being made. PJB reminded the Board that overall, a profit is made from courses and expenditure is far lower (£60K) than, for instance, Championships (£300K) where no profit at all is made. KW proposed that the courses should continue to be provided in the same way as they have been. BDC seconded the proposal and the Board agreed, five in favour and two (CF and NH) against.

v) CMcV illustrated a proposal from Agricycle, a recycling firm, which would allow the CPSA to offer a green alternative to grounds for disposal of cartridges and so on. The Board agreed that it should be offered to ground owners provided it would be at no extra cost to the Association.

vi) WAH raised several queries from members in the North with regard to CMcV's involvement with the Military. CMcV clarified that despite what was intimated in the letter, he does not spend a significant amount of his time working in that area. In response to the queries, CMcV explained that military tutors do need to go through CPSA training if they wish to present CPSA programmes and 102 military personnel have gone through CPSA courses since September 2008 and therefore become members of the Association. NH asked if the military tutors would be selected by the CPSA selection panel of 3 as require. CMcV replied that they did not need to be approved by the CPSA selection panel because the military deliver a fuller course than we do (rifles etc). CMcV will respond to the letter via email.

CMcV was asked by CF and NH who assesses the assessors/Tutors (ie Safety courses etc). CMcV replied that they get re accredited when they deliver a current course. They are paid to deliver the course but they do not have to pay for the re accreditation as it is free to those tutors delivering the course.

ACTION: CMcV

vii) NH requested a breakdown of the 2009 budget and expenditure figures. CMcV will email this to her within two weeks of the meeting.

ACTION: CMcV

7. CORRESPONDENCE

a) Correspondence was received that a CPSA member, Micky Dore, had 'shot from the hip' and risked injuring youngsters who were shooting on an adjoining layout. Both TWDB and WAH said that they had no evidence of this kind of behaviour in the past. CF disagreed: he has been out shooting with MD previously when similar incidents had occurred. CF added that the 'apology' letter (sent in response to PJB's request for an explanation of the incident) is a typical response from him. TRB stated that the response received from Micky Dore, although not actually responding to PJB's initial request, did leave no doubt as to whether the incident occurred as MD had not challenged or disputed any of the detail stated therein. The Board believed that regardless of any kind of explanation offered (or not in this case) Micky Dore's behaviour was grossly irresponsible and appropriate action should be taken. The Board agreed unanimously that, with effect from 1st March 2009 Micky Dore shall be suspended until 1st March 2010, when he must reapply for membership. PJB will write and inform him of the decision, allowing 48 hours for him to receive the letter, after which he will write to ground owners and all other associations to inform them of the decision too. In his letter, PJB will, of course, advise Micky Dore of his right to appeal the decision.

ACTION: PJB

b) NH received correspondence from a CPSA member, Barry Gibb, who wants to inspect grounds on behalf of the Association. PJB stated that his past work in this field has had considerable shortcomings. PJB reminded the Board that Barry Gibb has been informed of this and the CPSA's decision not to use him for this kind of work via a three-way telephone conversation (as referred to in the letter he sent to NH). PJB stated that despite Paul Rendell having coached Barry Gibb to do this kind of work, he is simply not able to carry out the administrative and reporting duties to a satisfactory standard. After some debate amongst the Board, PR was invited into the meeting to give his views. PR confirmed that Barry Gibb has carried out one audit, as part of his training, and the report was 'very sub-standard'. Currently Mike Williams visits all the grounds to carry out 3-year safety audits, and has done since the middle of 2008. His work is of high quality (he sends checklists and reports back to HQ) and charges a very reasonable fee (£150 per ground regardless of location and inclusive of all travel costs). PR can see no reason why work should be taken from Mike Williams in favour of Barry Gibb. It was agreed that NH will respond to Barry Gibb's letter confirming that the Board has taken into account the points he raised.

ACTION: NH

c) Further to correspondence contained within the Board Pack, the Board agreed unanimously that they would recommend to those assembled at the AGM that Lewis Nedas be appointed in role of the CPSPA's honorary Solicitors and Shotgun Advisors

d) PJB will attend a BSSC event on the 19th of March. It is a meeting in central London with a networking opportunity over lunch. He invited members of the Board to accompany him but all declined.

e) PJB raised the point that last year Resolutions for presentation at the AGM were perhaps not correctly submitted and despite correspondence were out of time for the deadline to add them to this year's AGM agenda.

f) It would seem that there is an issue with some shooters joining other CPSPA organisations (Ireland and Scotland) as it seems membership is cheaper but benefits are more or less the same. Correspondence suggests that Irish shooters are joining CPSPA instead of ICPSA. The Board felt that while this was regrettable for Ireland, it is not an issue that the CPSPA can, or perhaps even should, resolve. BDC conceded this point however he reminded the Board that the same thing is happening with shooters in England joining the Scottish CPSPA for the same reasons and that perhaps the Board should consider a more proactive response to this issue.

8. REGIONAL REPORTS

a) BDC attended 3 AGMs since the last Board meeting. In Lincolnshire there is a concern about the provision of insurance for over 75s. PJB explained that this is not within the CPSPA's control and that it is down to the insurance providers to decide who is covered in the policy. Members in Bedfordshire were disappointed that the Board did not discuss issues prior to pulling out of the World Sporting in America. In Northamptonshire, concerns and issues were raised about the Academy. Members from Leicestershire and Rutland were unhappy with the increase in subscription fees as were members in Lincolnshire and also felt that the Board was spending too much time discussing the Olympics.

b) The Board discussed the possibility of engraving the year on the tankards awarded at Inter-County Championships. It was agreed that doing this would prevent tankards from being reused at a later date and therefore incur a higher cost to the Association. The Board agreed, however, that an alternative to a tankard should be sought for lady shooters. PJB will explore this.

ACTION: PJB

c) Some members in BDC's region had also raised the issue of prize money again. As discussed at earlier meetings, the Association cannot enforce a policy with regard to this and therefore the Board cannot endeavour to take further action.

9. REQUESTED ITEMS

a) **BICTSF / British Shooting (TRB)**: TRB is concerned that PJB is spending too much time on 'non-core CPSPA activity' and proposed that someone else should sit on the Boards for BICTSF and British Shooting, thus allowing PJB to spend more time at HQ. PJB responded that he will gladly follow the wishes of the Board but reminded everyone BICTSF activity does not actually take him away from HQ and British Sporting is linked to various other key activities, such as the Bisley bid to LOCOG. He highlighted the need to maintain a strong CPSPA presence and involvement 'at the sharp end'. CF observed that in this very meeting a considerable amount of time had been spent discussing NATSS, Sport England, the Olympics, British Shooting and so on. CF felt that this is not what CPSPA members want or need the Board to be doing and explained that it is growing increasingly difficult for him to justify the Board's activity when confronted by grass-roots shooters. TWDB stated that 100% of members will never fully understand or accept everything the Board does, particularly activity with a higher strategic purpose. He felt that to withdraw PJB from the BICTSF and British Shooting Boards would be a 'backwards step' for the CPSPA. NH suggested that both PJB and JP could be removed from such activity as they are 'too busy' and need to focus on Sport England. KW questioned what constituted 'too busy' and how that was judged. He felt that the Board did not have the necessary information to judge such matters. TRB added that since PJB had been on the BICTSF Board for 12 years, it was time for a change. KJN reminded the Board that it would not be a simple decision to make: in removing PJB from BICTSF, the CPSPA would lose out on involvement with British Shooting as Board membership for both is linked. TWDB and KW felt that without tangible evidence it was pointless pursuing this discussion and suggested a more appropriate approach would be to address and review the situation during PJB's appraisal. It was decided 5 to 3 that NH will attend BICTSF Board meetings with PJB with immediate effect. PJB will update JP of this change.

ACTION: PJB

b) **Safety Officer Course Costs (TRB)**: TRB questioned why the course is so expensive (£47.50 for a correspondence exam for the 3-year re-assessment) PJB explained that the majority of the cost covers the

booklet (about £20) and the rest is for certificates, badges, letters, exam papers, postage, exam marking and other general administration. PJB highlighted the importance of the CPSA being seen to demonstrate governance for the sport and examples of best practice and this is the most cost-effective way. Despite some outstanding issues, the majority of the Board agreed to leave the cost of the courses as they are currently. NH and CF were against this decision.

c) **Shoot08 (KJN)**: KJN reported that the primary concern is that the ranking system seems to be malfunctioning. At present, a list of amendments is compiled and submitted on a yearly basis to update the programme. KJN questioned whether this particular issue could wait another year before being resolved. PJB explained that Peter Tomlin is in continuing discussions with Bob Smith (software author) about small modifications and the cost of ad hoc work. He will report back to the Board with more information as it comes to light. TRB informed The Board that the contract signed for supply of the Shoot08 program left the rights with the software house rather than the CPSA which would have been the more normal practice.

d) **Academy / Technical Manager (CF)**: CF felt that there was not enough time to begin a discussion about the Academy and asked that this item be deferred to the next meeting.

e) **Letter to the Board from HQ Staff (CF)**: CF felt somewhat dismayed at the recent letter sent to the Board in which the HQ staff express some rather negative feedback, particularly with regard to bonuses and the relationship between the Board and HQ. CF felt that he had always maintained a good relationship with HQ staff and was very disappointed at this letter which 'came out of the blue'. PJB agreed that he was not aware the staff were compiling such a letter. TRB was particularly concerned about the comment regarding alleged negative implications about HQ staff included on website forums by Board members. TRB believed this was simply not true. NH also added that when any negative comments were raised on forums that she posted in support of the hard work done by the HQ staff. PJB however stood by the fact that this is how HQ staff are feeling currently.

f) **2008 Achievements (TWDB)**: TWDB felt that TRB should chair a discussion whereby the Board review its achievements over the past year. KJN suggested that the 'usual' things had been achieved with regard to membership, competitions, sponsorship and so on. TWDB added that the Board should recognise the financial savings made on Pull! magazine and the insurance policy as an achievement for the year. PJB felt disappointed at how much time had been spent in 2008 going over small details. KJN added that the lack of communication had been a disappointment too.

g) **2009 Objectives (TWDB)**: TRB felt that an overarching theme for 2009 should be 'survival' suggesting that the current economic climate could affect the Association quite severely and in a variety of ways. PJB added that despite a small rise in fees to compensate for a slower rise in membership numbers, the likelihood is that the CPSA will lose more than the 500 members they had predicted. TRB invited the Board to contemplate ways to overcome potential economic difficulties and achieve the 'survival' objective. This will be discussed at the AGM in March.

ACTION: BOARD

10. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

a) The deadline for proxy votes to be received is 48 hours before the AGM, thus midnight on Wednesday 25th of March. GD suggested that anything found to have been hand delivered into the letter box on the Thursday morning should be accepted but anything arriving in the Post on the Thursday would be too late. The Board agreed with this unanimously. GD has set out the criteria for the validity of proxy votes, as discussed at the last meeting. Votes must include the individual's name and membership number, the name and membership number of the proxy holder, the date of the meeting a signature and a date when assigned to a proxy holder. Votes without this information will not be valid. TRB suggested that someone else from GD's firm should assist with processing the votes on the Thursday. WAH and PJB totally disagreed and underlined the fact that the HQ staff were to be trusted wholeheartedly. GD requested that two CPSA staff assist him with proxies at the AGM and it was agreed by everyone that SO and CP would do this.

b) WAH is scheduled to attend two shoots in East Yorkshire scheduled on the same day at the end of April and asked if any Board member could go to one on his behalf. BDC will be in America and so is not available. CF will check his availability and liaise with WAH. There is a further shoot in early July that WAH cannot attend and requested that Board members contact him directly if they are willing and available to attend instead.

c) With regard to an issue involving JLA, TRB believed there has been a breach of confidentiality by a member of the Board. In an e-mail to TRB, JLA referred to something which had been discussed by the Board 48 hours earlier but which should not have been shared outside of that meeting. JLA indicated in her e-mail that Graeme Davis had provided her with the information. GD vehemently refuted this when asked by TRB. TRB emphasised to all that discussions at Board meetings were to remain confidential, as per The Articles, unless otherwise indicated.
