Association of Commonwealth Triathlon

**Minutes**

Meeting Management Committee (MC) (by Skype)

Date 12 January 2015 at 21:00 GMT

Attending Sarah Springman (SMS), Jem Lawson (JL), Luc Landriault (LL), David Ferrier (DF), Alan Beckford (AB), David Sales (DS)(First Ascent), Gergely Markus (GM) (ITU).

Apologies Jane Moncrieff (JM), Sam Wickramasinghe (SW).

Not attending Alain St Louis (ASL)

Mentioned Debbie Alexander (DA), Louise Martin (LM), Matthew Curtain (MCu), Marisol Casada (MCa), Peter Gibbs (PG), David Markham (DM)

1. **Opening remarks**

SMS introduced the meeting, thanking all for being available.

There were no declarations of interest other than by those heading National Federations, DF and AB.

SMS welcomed DS and thanked him for his help and support.

It was noted that SW had stated he would be present; it was assumed that there were difficulties with connecting.

SMS went on to draw attention to the progress made by the group whilst pointing out that there remained some gaps to be filled.

SMS briefly mentioned the ITU EB meeting in Avignon last December where she was able to provide an update on the progress of the Association of Commonwealth Triathlon. SMS also reported the greater clarification of Commonwealth issues at this meeting.

DS would take chair the call for items in partnership with SMS.

1. **Previous minutes**

The minutes of the Skype call from November 2014 were accepted and approved *nem con*.

**JL to send AB notes from the previous meeting relating to the Pakistan Triathlon Association.**

**Management Board members are asked to send comprehensive contact details to JL for collating and circulation.**

JL thanked for the provision of minutes in a timely fashion.

1. **Discussion on submissions from work packages following Skype 1**

DS explained that each of the work packages would be looked at in turn and MC members would have the opportunity to comment and question.

* **Strategy Development** JL/LL .. accepted as a competent, one page opener.
* **Governance** DF/SMS/JL .. it was agreed that ACT should be a role model in terms of its own governance and also that use of correct names and terms was important to avoid confusion.

It was pointed out that people and organisations held different views of the nature of good governance, but that we should try to distil the essential features. Individual International Federations (IFs) also have different versions and the IOC has good intentions relating to the principles of governance but has ‘no teeth’.

* **Relations with ITU and CGF** SMS/JL .. **GM has tried to contact MC, so far unsuccessfully, and will try again.** It’s appropriate the main communication be with the CGF Director for Sport; JL will be repository for the results of such communication. The ITU, as IF for the sport, will do what they must for the furtherance of Triathlon and ACT would commend the ITU’s acknowledgment of expertise in the field of Commonwealth sport. MCa’s support is much welcomed, based on the work largely of SMS and GM. She will bring the attention of the IOC to the Commonwealth priorities. We note, with appreciation, MCa’s presence in Glasgow.
* **CWG** SMS/AB/DF .. The final bullet point on the paper before the MC: “..negative effects of the high percentage of athletes who were withdrawn (in Glasgow)..”, has been manifested by a communication to CGF from a Ghanaian athlete. We should see what can be gleaned from various reports following the Glasgow Games. **GM will do his best to source and notify us of such reports [DONE]**. DF remarked on the need for greater understanding if we are to lobby for Triathlon as a future core sport. AB asked whether there is a checklist of requirements for core sports, an identification of the way we might maximise the chances of a bid for core sport status being successful and, further asked, who would choose. SMS responded that indicators had not been released but speculated that core sports would need to attract the best athletes, give opportunities to a wide spread of federations, be TV friendly, be competitively costed and would be an attraction to host cities. **It may be possible for GM to follow up on this with MC. SMS will approach the subject with LM in London on 4th February**.
* **National Federations** LL/JM/AB/ASL ... LL drew attention to enhanced definitions of the ‘small’, ‘medium’ and ‘large’ federations. He acknowledged a requirement for more detail with respect to the needs analysis. SMS drew attention to the ‘Mindmap’ she had drawn up at an earlier stage which she thought would inform the process. **LL undertook to arrange a Skype call with the group to identify the sorts of questions to be posed for the needs analysis within a time frame of a ‘couple of weeks’, i.e. by 27th January, and to communicate these to JL.**
* **Performance with Events** JM/DF/AB .. JL described the communication difficulties with this group and that he had drawn up the paper at short notice simply to stimulate discussion. It is acknowledged that there is a degree of overlap between this work package and the one following: Development with Events.
* **Development with Events** AB/SW/DF/ASL .. AB pointed out, as an example of the overlap, that Paratriathlon, though a performance discipline, was still very much a development area for many federations. AB posited the view that progression would entail the setting up of a pathway lasting 10-15 years for some federations. He asked at what age the process would begin, citing a proposal by PG for a competition framework starting at age eleven in the Caribbean. GM mentioned an example of similar age group competition in eastern Europe and JL described similar scheme involving the British home nations.

The Finance and Operational work packages are still in abeyance, though Operational Process may well be a subject for discussion at the next call.

1. **Formulation and Agreement of Final Document**

There is still work for the groups to carry out with respect to the work packages and there are areas of overlap across the packages, nevertheless the document needs to be pulled together**. JL undertook to carry out this element and bring everything together as a consolidated whole**. He welcomed offers of help from others and predicted that he would draw on such help. There needed to be more work on the ‘Commonwealth Games’ aspect and there was an offer of help from DM. **JL would endeavour to meet his obligations by late January/early February and it time to circulate a proposal to the group in time for discussion at a fourth Skype call to take place on 9th February at 21:00 GMT**.

1. **Actions with respect to CGF/ITU ahead of key dates.**

This was deemed to be firmly in the scope of GM, in discussion with MC, at one level, and also within the remit of SMS who will draw on her considerable experience of lobbying (e.g. previous CWG, Olympic and Paralympic inclusion). **LL will liaise with the Edmonton bid and SMS in respect of the bid from Durban. JL will be a depository for information.** The final discussion on the new core sports will come after the recommendation from the CGF to the participating nations and territories in September. We must do our utmost to mitigate the effects of the dismay which may be articulated by the smaller nations.

1. **Dissemination to all CWG nations’ and territories’ federations.**

The method by which the final manifestation of the current work is to be distributed to the Commonwealth member nations and territories will be discussed subsequently.

JL described a process by which all of the potential members of ACT would be notified of their relationship with ACT**. JL will source contact details for each of the relevant federations. GM remarked that the ITU database was regularly updated and would help**, though attention was drawn to the fact that not all CWG participant areas were federations in membership of ITU.

1. **Other Business**

None.

SMS thanked all for their contributions, particularly DS and GM.

Call terminated at 22:06 GMT