

FANS' PARLIAMENT 2011 London

Minutes of the Fans' Parliament, 9 July 2011

1. **Welcome & introduction to the format of the Fans' Parliament**
 - 1.1 FSF Chair Malcolm Clarke opened the Fans' Parliament 2011 and welcomed delegates
 - 1.2 Deputy Chair Jon Keen explained the domestic arrangements for the day
 - 1.3 See appendix 1 for apologies for absence received
 - 1.4 See appendix 2 for proxies put forward by individual members, and appendix 3 for substitute representatives attending on behalf of affiliate groups.

2. **Andrew Jennings – guest speaker**

Andrew Jennings spoke of his background in investigative journalism, making particular reference to corruption in construction work for sport.

He outlined the history of FIFA, and how, in his view it had changed from being an organization which was fairly harmless, run by people who “cared” into one which developed a privatisation agenda and was dominated by personal greed, leading to an increase in corruption. He discussed the need for greater transparency in the running of the game at both national and international level, the role of certain individuals and how to eliminate corruption and poor practice.

Chair Malcolm Clarke offered thanks for Andrew's very interesting contribution.

- 3 **Election of FSF Chair**

Taking the chair, Jon Keen advised that there had only been a single nomination for FSF Chair, Malcolm Clarke.

Election of Malcolm Clarke as FSF Chair carried Nem Con

- 4 **Election of FSF Treasurer**

Resuming the chair Malcolm Clarke advised that there had only been a single nomination for FSF Treasurer, namely Carroll Clark.

Election of Carroll Clark as FSF Treasurer carried Nem Con

- 5 **Election of FSF directly elected members of FSF National Council.**

FANS' PARLIAMENT 2011 London

The Chair introduced the nominees to the assembly, advising that ballot boxes would open during the morning break, and close on the resumption of the Assembly after lunch.

6 Morning Break

National Council election ballot boxes opened

7 Breakout Sessions commenced on –

Policing & Stewarding
Club Governance & Ownership

8 Lunch

9 Resumption of Fans' Parliament

National Council election ballot boxes closed

10 Mark Bradley – guest speaker

Mark Bradley outlined his work for the Football League, with his family acting as “mystery shoppers” to gauge the “customer friendliness” of the match going experience, giving examples of good and bad practice, and how the football industry might improve its performance in these matters.

11 Final Breakout Sessions commenced on-

TV Contracts & Scheduling
Safe Standing
Refereeing – speaker Paul Rejer

12 Resumption of FSF AGM

12a National Council election – announcement of result

FANS' PARLIAMENT 2011 London

Malcolm Clarke announced the results of the National Council elections advising that the successful 16 candidates, duly elected, were as follows (see **appendix 4** for a detailed breakdown of the voting)–

| | |
|----------------------|-----------|
| Kevin Miles | 217 votes |
| Ian Todd | 216 votes |
| Martin O'Hara | 195 votes |
| Raj Chandarana | 189 votes |
| Ric Duniec | 184 votes |
| Vince Alm | 182 votes |
| Tim Hillyer | 180 votes |
| Amanda Jacks | 167 votes |
| Peter Daykin | 166 Votes |
| Ash Connor | 161 votes |
| Anne-Marie Mockridge | 157 votes |
| Mark Longden | 146 votes |
| Colin Hendrie | 127 Votes |
| James McKenna | 114 votes |
| Ian Stirling | 104 votes |
| David Beverley | 97 votes |

Unsuccessful candidates, not elected, were –

| | |
|--------------|----------|
| Geoff Milton | 96 votes |
| Stuart Wood | 92 votes |
| Jon Darch | 82 votes |

The Chair thanked all candidates and those National Council members now standing down.

12b **Minutes of the last FSF AGM held at Wembley on 24 July 2010**

Minutes accepted as a true record Nem Con

12c **Matters arising from the minutes**

In answer to a question from the floor, the Chair advised that Eric Samuelson was continuing the external review of Conflict of Interest issues within the FSF.

12d **Acceptance of FSF Accounts**

The Chair referred to the FSF Accounts, copies of which had previously been published.

Answering a question from the floor about the deficit in FSF International work, Kevin Miles said that this was largely due to the “snapshot” nature of the accounts. Costs had been incurred which had not yet been reimbursed by the Home Office. The deficit could be regarded as an investment. Gaining sponsorship for this work was currently proving problematic, especially in view of the current economic situation, though hard work in this area continued. Government cut backs had affected the work, though the main Government grant was intact. It might be necessary to cease publication of “Free Lions” for home England games.

Accounts accepted Nem Con

12e Acceptance of FSF National Council Report

The Chair highlighted some issues in the Report.

In Section 1 of the Report, concerning **FSF sponsorship**, he advised that PL/PFA sponsorship had ceased. There was funding from the FA for a further year only. There was, therefore, only short term funding for the FSF. Efforts would be made to find alternative funding from commercial sources and possibly appeals to the FSF membership. It was important to maintain the rise in FSF membership as this is attractive to potential commercial sponsors. Delegates were invited to put themselves forward to help in the work of fund raising, especially if they had particular skills in that work.

Moving to Section 2 on **Football Governance**, the Chair said that the outcome of the DCMS Select Committee report was awaited, after which an FSF response would be formulated.

On Section 5, regarding **Supporter Concerns**, there was a need to do further work in this area. A protocol needed to be formulated, regarding how football clubs should handle club supporter bans, with the completed protocol to be put forward to the football authorities.

Moving to Section 6 on **Policing**, the Chair referred to the work of Amanda Jacks on this area. The FSF profile has risen considerably through this area of work. Thanks were offered to FSF sponsors of this work, and to legal advisors M Cooke and D Nicholson.

There was a reference in the report to the claim by ACPO, of an increased use of police cautions, rather than cases being referred to courts but the CPS web site carried a statement signed by the ACPO football lead that cautions will only be offered in extremely exceptional circumstances. It was stated that ACPO was now asserting that the CPS web site is displaying an incorrect version of the statement.

Answering a question from P Ellix of STAR, Raj Chanadarana gave assurances that work on equality legislation would continue.

Alan Bloore answered a question on ticket surcharges for the use of credit cards, stating that the Office of Fair Trading had said that such surcharges were fair unless excessive. The alternative would be simple rises in the basic prices of tickets.

The FSF National Council report was accepted Nem Con

13 Motions for debate

Motions were debated as follows –

Motion 4 to accept the report of the breakout session on Safe Standing

Motion 5 to adopt a revised version of the Fans' Blueprint

Motions 6 and 6a regarding the format of the FA Cup

Motion 7 regarding match timekeeping

Motion 8 regarding the resolution of drawn cup ties other than by penalty deciders

Motion 1 to accept the report of the breakout session on Club Ownership & Governance

Motion 2 to accept the report of the breakout session on Policing & Stewarding

Motion 3 to accept the report of the breakout session on TV Contracts

- **Motion 4**

Motion to refer to the FSF National Council the report of the Fans' Parliament 2011 Breakout Session on Safe Standing

This assembly accepts the report received from the breakout session on Safe Standing, held during the Fans' Parliament 2011 to debate and discuss that issue, and directs that proposals contained in that report shall be referred to the National Council of the Football Supporters' Federation (FSF), in accordance with Bye Law 17 of the FSF, the proposals to be reviewed and considered for adoption as the policy of the FSF.

Proposed by National Council

See **appendix 5** for the report of this breakout session.

Peter Daykin reported that this had been a busy year in the Safe Standing campaign, though he felt that the PR battle was not yet being won, and a mass participation campaign had not been initiated. No changes were proposed to FSF policy. In answer to a question from the floor, Peter Daykin said that it was not proposed that there should be a fixed proportion of standing accommodation in any ground. Delegates discussed differential pricing for different standards of accommodation. It was considered that this could be unfair to disabled fans, and suggested that this ought to be reviewed.

Motion 4 carried NEM CON as above.

- **Motion 5**

Motion to adopt a revised version of the Fans' Blueprint as FSF policy to replace that previously adopted

This assembly, instructs the FSF National Council to adopt as FSF policy, in accordance with the FSF Constitution, the revised version of the Fans' Blueprint that has been made available for members to examine before the date of this Fans' Parliament.

Proposed by National Council

The Chair recommended this updating of the Fans' Blueprint to delegates.

Motion 5 carried NEM CON as above.

- **Motions 6 and 6a**

Motion 6 - Motion regarding the FA Cup format

This Fans' Parliament is concerned about the continuing decline of the FA Challenge Cup in importance within the football calendar; as exemplified in recent seasons by league fixtures being played on the same day as the final. In order to halt the decline of the competition it calls upon the National Council to launch and oversee a wide-reaching campaign, involving affiliates and individual members, aimed particularly, but not exclusively, at countering suggestions or proposals for:

- *seeding teams in later rounds of the competition; and*
- *removing replays in the event of drawn games.*

Proposed by STAR (Supporters Trust at Reading)

Seconded by Pam Wilkins

Motion 6a - Amendment to motion 6 regarding the FA Cup format

This assembly resolves that Motion 6, regarding the format of the FA Cup be amended to read as follows -

Fans Parliament endorses the following response given to the FA by the National Council

1. *That a minimum admission price of £5 to FA Cup games be allowed where the FA and both clubs agree*
2. *That a late afternoon kick-off for the final should be dependent on adequate transport arrangements being put in place*
3. *That support be given to the a rule preventing weak teams being fielded in the FA Cup*
4. *That any abolition of replays be opposed*
5. *That the Cup Final should be a 'stand alone' fixture on the last day of the season and that, if necessary, this be facilitated by the Premier League starting one week earlier*
6. *That Premier League and Championship clubs enter the competition at Round 2, thus increasing considerably the number of ties between lower and higher level clubs*
7. *That as soon as financially practicable, semi-finals be taken away from Wembley*
8. *That each season there should be an FA Cup Heritage tie played in round 1 at the Oval*
9. *That there should be both greater transparency and tighter rules on the numbers and eligibility for tickets for the Cup Final given to the so-called "football family"*
10. *That there should be changes in the rules on the operation of extra time based on reducing team sizes after specified periods.*

Proposed by National Council

The Chair explained that STAR had proposed motion 6 but that National Council proposed that the motion be amended in accordance with motion 6a. He advised a correction to the amendment 6a that the first line be corrected to read as follows -

This assembly resolves that Motion 6, regarding the format of the FA Cup be amended to add the following -

(the rest of the amendment to stand as above)

Paul Ellix of STAR stated that STAR accepted the motion as amended and corrected above, in accordance with standing orders, and spoke in support of it. There had been a decline in the status of the FA Cup and there was a need to ensure that the Competition continued as per the amended motion.

Seconding the motion, Pam Wilkins said that bigger clubs did not have a divine right to progress in the competition.

The Chair said that a wish within the FA to carry out supporter consultation was understood to have been squashed by their Premier League representative. It was understood that the

FANS' PARLIAMENT 2011 London

proposal for seeding of teams had been abandoned. However, proposals for evening kick offs of 5.15 pm or 5.30 pm had been accepted to cater for media rights. The FA wanted the Cup Final to be a "stand-alone" event. .

Referring to the clashing of the Cup Final and PL fixtures, Ian Todd said that the issue had been raised in the Fixture Working Party meetings, but the Premier League refused to move all fixtures to the Sunday unless the clubs involved actually requested it.

In answer to a question from the floor, the Chair said that clause 6 of the amended motion above, regarding the level of entry into the Competition of PL and Championship clubs, the Chair said that this would increase the chance of more interesting ties, including possible "Giant-killing" acts.

Ian Lyon said that clause 10 of the amended motion above was not desirable and proposed a further amendment that clause 10 be deleted from amendment 6a. This was seconded by Ric Duniec. Accepted NEM CON by delegates

A further amendment was proposed from the floor, that the words "in later rounds of the Competition" be deleted from the original motion 6 now forming part of the amended motion. Accepted NEM CON by delegates.

Motion 6 as amended therefore was as follows –

Motion regarding the FA Cup format

This Fans' Parliament is concerned about the continuing decline of the FA Challenge Cup in importance within the football calendar; as exemplified in recent seasons by league fixtures being played on the same day as the final. In order to halt the decline of the competition it calls upon the National Council to launch and oversee a wide-reaching campaign, involving affiliates and individual members, aimed particularly, but not exclusively, at countering suggestions or proposals for:

- *seeding teams and*
- *removing replays in the event of drawn games.*

Fans Parliament endorses the following response given to the FA by the National Council

- 1 *That a minimum admission price of £5 to FA Cup games be allowed where the FA and both clubs agree*
- 2 *That a late afternoon kick-off for the final should be dependent on adequate transport arrangements being put in place*
- 3 *That support be given to the a rule preventing weak teams being fielded in the FA Cup*
- 4 *That any abolition of replays be opposed*
- 5 *That the Cup Final should be a 'stand alone' fixture on the last day of the season and that, if necessary, this be facilitated by the Premier League starting one week earlier*
- 6 *That Premier League and Championship clubs enter the competition at Round 2, thus increasing considerably the number of ties between lower and higher level clubs*
- 7 *That as soon as financially practicable, semi-finals be taken away from Wembley*
- 8 *That each season there should be an FA Cup Heritage tie played in round 1 at the Oval*
- 9 *That there should be both greater transparency and tighter rules on the numbers and eligibility for tickets for the Cup Final given to the so-called "football family"*

Proposed by STAR (Supporters Trust at Reading) and National Council

Seconded by Pam Wilkins

Motion 6 carried with 2 votes against.

- Motion 7

Motion regarding match timekeeping

This Fans' Parliament resolves to instruct the FSF National Council to lobby the Football Association, Football Association of Wales and FIFA for an amendment by the International Football Association Board (IFAB) to the playing laws and regulations of the game as follows:

Timekeeping:

That national associations, continental confederations and FIFA have the option to allow an independent timekeeper (who may be the fourth/sixth official) to control the playing clock under the direction of the referee. The option would include permitting stadium clocks visible to spectators to display the time remaining. The referee would signal the independent time-keeper to stop and re-start the clock for injuries, substitutions or any other reason as determined by the current playing laws. Timekeepers would be permitted in any competition in which the national association, continental confederation or FIFA is satisfied that the technical requirements set down by the IFAB have been met.

PROPOSED: Steven Powell

SECONDED: Ian Todd

Proposing Motion 7 Steven Powell said that the proposal would not include changes to rules as to why time is added onto matches. The proposal would however ensure that a proper amount of time due was added on.

Seconding the motion Ian Todd said that it would be useful for an experiment to be carried out here.

From the floor a view was expressed that 90 minutes of play should mean exactly that and there should be no use of a clock.

Responding Steven Powell said that the match referee would be the sole arbiter of time played in a match.

**Motion 7 carried with voting as follows –
19 affiliated group for the motion, 11 affiliated groups against
38 individuals for the motion, 28 individuals against**

Total votes for the motion 133, total votes against 83

- Motion 8

FANS' PARLIAMENT 2011 London

Motion calling for the introduction of an alternative optional method of resolving drawn cup ties to the use of penalties

This Fans' Parliament resolves to instruct the FSF National Council to lobby the Football Association, Football Association of Wales and FIFA for an amendment by the International Football Association Board (IFAB) to the playing laws and regulations of the game as follows:

Alternative method for determining drawn elimination matches where no replay is allowed under tournament regulations:

That national associations, continental confederations and FIFA have the option to use the following method to determine drawn games in cup/elimination games in place of two extra time periods of fifteen minutes followed by kicks from the penalty mark:

In the event of a game in which a result is required and no replay required under the tournament regulations, national associations, continental confederations and FIFA shall have the option of teams playing two equal ten minute periods of extra time. If neither side is winning at the end of the second ten minute period of extra time then as many additional periods of extra time as are required until one team scores a golden goal which shall end the match.

At the beginning of the first and any additional period of sudden death extra time each team shall be required to withdraw one player from the match who shall not be substituted, reducing the playing strength of both teams by one at the commencement of the first and any subsequent period of sudden death extra time, provided that a team shall play with no fewer than seven players. Any team that has only seven players on the field through expulsions and/or injuries having used its allowed quota of substitutes at the end of the second period of extra time shall not be required to further reduce its number of players on the field.

Teams shall maintain a nominated and distinctively attired goalkeeper on the field at all times. Teams that have made three substitutions prior to the commencement of the first period of sudden death extra time shall be permitted one additional substitution from amongst its remaining nominated substitutes prior to the start of this period or subsequently.

National associations and continental confederations shall notify FIFA and the IFAB in advance of any competition in respect of which they intend to exercise this option. The option of using the current fifteen minutes each way then penalties shall be used in all cases where the IFAB and FIFA have not been previously notified.

Proposed by: Steven Powell

Seconded by: Paul Corkrey

Proposing this motion Steven Powell said that the suggested method of deciding drawn ties would be optional. The attraction would be to get rid of penalty deciders. Procedures using extra time have failed. Replays are always preferable but often impractical.

Jon Keen said that this proposal could only be one possible solution to the problem, and it is not for the FSF to propose a single solution.

C Nash of Barnet suggested that difficulties could be caused by the uncertainty of when a game could end, for example for away fans transport.

David Beverley said that there could be a problem if a team's size fell below that required under rules.

The Chair suggested that a motion to remit Motion 8 to the National Council for consideration could be tabled. Steven Powell accepted that suggestion.

Motion to remit Motion 8 to FSF National Council for consideration carried NEM CON

- Motion 1

Motion to refer to the FSF National Council the report of the Fans' Parliament 2011 Breakout Session on Club Ownership & Governance

This assembly accepts the report received from the breakout session on Club Ownership & Governance, held during the Fans' Parliament 2011 to debate and discuss that issue, and directs that proposals contained in that report shall be referred to the National Council of the Football Supporters' Federation (FSF), in accordance with Bye Law 17 of the FSF, the proposals to be reviewed and considered for adoption as the policy of the FSF.

Proposed by National Council

See **appendix 6** for the report of this breakout session

Reporting verbally on the Breakout Session on Club Ownership & Governance, Tim Hillyer advised that the following proposals were put forward in the **2010** workshop and reviewed by the workshop with conclusions being shown in bold below—

1. *That the FSF welcomes and endorses the new regulations introduced by the FA, Premier League and Football League but that this Fans' Parliament believes that further steps remain to be taken; **evidence was provided to the DCMS enquiry. There has been welcome progress but there is a long way to go.***
2. *That the FSF study different models and methods of governance employed with success in other countries and in other sports; **comparisons with the Australian sports commission model vis a vis the English Premier League were made. Oral evidence was given to the DCMS enquiry.***
3. *That the issue of competitive balance be raised as part of the debate on the governance of football and its clubs; **there is recognition within England, Scotland and UEFA that this is an issue.***
4. *That the FA should be the prime governing body and regulator of football and its clubs in England and that attention needs to be paid to conflicts between the FA and its Football Regulatory Authority; **Ian Watmore's resignation may be attributed to the undue influence of vested interests. William Gaillard has stated to UEFA that The FA is a weak organisation compared to other national FAs.***
5. *That the FSF monitor the implementation of the new regulations; **There is cross-party consensus in Parliament that supporters have a right to know who owns their clubs.***
6. *That the FSF look at sports laws enacted in other countries and approach the Government on this issue; **Hugh Robertson, MP and Sports Minister is believed to be interested in developing legal registration and oversight in football as minimum standards for eligibility for grants and State support.***

7. *That football should be recognised for its cultural significance not just viewed as a business like any other; supporters are the driver for sustainability of club finances.*
8. *That regulations should be introduced to prohibit the leveraged buy-outs of football clubs in England & Wales; it will prove difficult to persuade senior figures that over-leveraging is not healthy. Affordable debt can be tolerated. A licensing system should include limits to the level of debt.*
9. *That the recommendations for reform of governance of the FA set out in the Burns Review should be fully implemented; appropriate regulation is needed; ownership of clubs is not a question of nationality.*
10. *That the FA membership should be dependent on clear criteria “graded” to reflect the level at which the member plays and that FA membership should be compulsory for all clubs wishing to play in FA sanctioned competitions; currently FA membership is an entitlement to tickets for the FA Cup Final and a vote at the FA AGM but has little meaningful impact. The exclusion of non-members from sanctioned competitions would be more appropriate.*
11. *That the Premier League and the Football League should establish appropriately resourced regulatory units to oversee and enforce their regulations; regulation without enforcement is meaningless. The encouragement to football authorities to develop strong investigative powers must continue.*

Conclusions from the 2011 Breakout Session were –

- a. There should be a Golden Share in football clubs held by supporters, giving the power to veto.
- b. Total transparency of ownership.
- c. The Board of The FA or its regulatory board must be independent.
- d. The Financial Fair Play Protocol must be applied.
- e. Referring to Point 10. , regulation should be applied throughout the Pyramid.
- f. The regulatory unit(s) in Point 11. should be independent.
- g. There should be regulation of ticket prices.
- h. Delete Point 9.
- i. The governing bodies of sports should be subject to Freedom of Information regulations.

National Council were instructed to develop:

- I. A simple manifesto for Club Ownership and Governance.
- II. A campaign at club level.
- III. And build a Yahoo group.

The Chair said that as last year there were 11 points put forward. In the workshop there had been some opposition to Burns' proposals.

Allison Franklin said there was a need to form a working group to campaign on these issues.

John Reid suggested that fans were being disenfranchised by clubs, and economic discrimination was removing lower income fans from the game.

R Chard said there should be pressure for a really independent FA.

Motion 1 to accept the Breakout Session report carried NEM CON.

- **Motion 2**

Motion to refer to the FSF National Council the report of the Fans' Parliament 2011 Breakout Session on Policing & Stewarding

This assembly accepts the report received from the breakout session on Policing & Stewarding, held during the Fans' Parliament 2011 to debate and discuss that issue, and directs that proposals contained in that report shall be referred to the National Council of the Football Supporters' Federation (FSF), in accordance with Bye Law 17 of the FSF, the proposals to be reviewed and considered for adoption as the policy of the FSF.

Proposed by National Council

See **appendix 7** for the report of this breakout session.

Paul Corkery summarised the events of this workshop in which the policing and stewarding of football had been explored extensively. It was proposed that there be a thorough review of legislation covering this area, and the following proposal was recommended to the main Conference –

A group of National Council members and other FSF volunteers should be set up to oversee the delivery of this work, which should involve wide consultation with, and involvement of, as many other interested parties as can be encouraged to take part. These should include all agencies and individuals with relevant expertise and experience, such as Liberty, the UKFPU, police officers past and present, academics, the Safety Officers Association, the Magistrates' Association, the Crown Prosecution Service, independent solicitors and barristers etc., as well as any supporters' groups willing to engage in the project.

The timescale should allow for a presentation of the findings of this work to be made at the 2012 Fans' Parliament.

Proposed: Paul Corkrey (NC member)

Seconded: Kevin Miles (NC member)

Motion 2 to accept the breakout session report was carried NEM CON.

FANS' PARLIAMENT 2011 London

- Motion 3

Motion to refer to the FSF National Council the report of the Fans' Parliament 2011 Breakout Session on TV Contracts

This assembly accepts the report received from the breakout session on TV Contracts, held during the Fans' Parliament 2011 to debate and discuss that issue, and directs that proposals contained in that report shall be referred to the National Council of the Football Supporters' Federation (FSF), in accordance with Bye Law 17 of the FSF, the proposals to be reviewed and considered for adoption as the policy of the FSF.

Proposed by National Council

See **appendix 8** for the report of this breakout session.

Jon Keen summarised the work of this breakout session. The session proposed that a paper should be submitted to the Premier League, based around the below concepts :

- The inclusion in the next round of TV contracts of a central fund from which to compensate supporters for travel/accommodation expenses which are properly receipted and non-refundable and which cannot be used due to a match being rescheduled for TV later than a specified deadline before the date scheduled for the match.
- Determine which match broadcast timeslots create the greatest transport/accessibility problems to supporters and press for a reduction of these timeslots in the breakdown of TV packages.
- Press for a set minimum level of distance or accessibility (e.g. travel time), above which no weekday matches should be televised.
- Matches already moved to Sundays due to Europa League fixtures should be televised before other matches are moved for televising.

Additionally, it was decided to press The FA to ensure that no England matches are televised at 3 pm on Saturdays due to the impact on attendances of clubs at Tier 3 and below.

Motion 3 to accept the breakout session report was carried NEM CON.

14 **Any other business**

There were no items of other business.

15 5:40 pm (approx) **Close**

The Chair declared the Fans' Parliament 2011 closed.



FANS' PARLIAMENT 2011 London

Secretary
Football Supporters' Federation
9 July 2011

FANS' PARLIAMENT 2011 London

Appendix 1

Apologies for absence received

| | |
|------------------|--------------------|
| Shepherd, Mark | Agate, Mark & Mrs. |
| Franklin, Stuart | Lodge, Ian |
| Procter, Maureen | Walton, Kit |
| Marsden, John | Rigby, Eileen |
| Paterson, John | Tams, Anthony |
| Wright, Craig | Hamil, Sean |
| Pritchard, Rob | Biggs, Adrian |
| Hine, Stephen | Spry, Paul |
| McGowan, Michael | French, David |
| Stephenson, Mark | Barrat, Karl |
| Hicks, Paul | Corrigan, David |
| Wheeler, Simon | Brady, Monica |

Appendix 2

Voting proxies put forward by individual members

| Individual member giving proxy | Memb id | Proxy given to | Memb id |
|--------------------------------|---------|-----------------|---------|
| Shepherd, Mark | 966 | Beverley, David | 47840 |
| Franklin, Stuart | 39244 | Beverley, David | 47840 |
| Procter, Maureen | 58657 | Bloore, Alan | 8364 |
| Marsden, John | 1169 | Bloore, Alan | 1333 |
| Paterson, John | 3687 | Clarke, Malcolm | 1258 |
| Wright, Craig | 443 | Clarke, Malcolm | 1258 |
| Pritchard, Rob | 944 | Clarke, Zara | 1213 |
| Hine, Stephen | 34938 | Clarke, Zara | 1213 |
| McGowan, Michael | 33380 | Duniec, Rick | 28414 |
| Stephenson, Mark | 59784 | Duniec, Rick | 28414 |
| Hicks, Paul | 4301 | Gallagher, Paul | 1398 |
| Wheeler, Simon | 1194 | Hillyer, Tim | 476 |
| Brady, Monica | 1239 | Longden, Mark | 1048 |
| Corrigan, David | 1240 | Longden, Mark | 1048 |
| Barrat, Karl | 36133 | Milton, Geoff | 103 |
| French, David | 37222 | Milton, Geoff | 103 |
| Spry, Paul | 27071 | O'Hara, Martin | 27218 |
| Biggs, Adrian | 41069 | O'Hara, Martin | 27218 |
| Hamil, Sean | 1129 | Powell, Steven | 1314 |
| Tams, Anthony | 46592 | Ross, Richard | 360 |
| Rigby, Eileen | 47059 | Ross, Richard | 360 |
| Walton, Kit | 33068 | Taylor, Phil | 1279 |
| Lodge, Ian | 1354 | Taylor, Phil | 1279 |

FANS' PARLIAMENT 2011 London

Appendix 3

Appointment of substitute representatives for affiliate groups

| Affiliate or Associate group member | Substitute representative | Memb id |
|--------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|----------------|
| Benelux LUSC (Leeds United) | Duniec, Rick | 28414 |
| WISA | Hillyer, Tim | 476 |
| MUST (Manchester United Supporters' Trust) | Longden, Mark | 1048 |
| Cardiff City Supporters' Trust | Morgan, Keith | (trust member) |
| Viking Supporters Cooperative (Doncaster Rovers) | O'Hara, Martin | 27218 |
| Doncaster Rovers Supporters Club | O'Hara, Martin | 27218 |

Appendix 4

Election of FSF National Council directly elected representatives – voting

16 to be elected

| Name | A Number of affiliate groups voting for this nominee | B affiliate votes gained (A x 5) | C Individual and associate votes for this nominee | TOTAL VOTES (B + C) | VOTING ORDER | ELECTED OR NOT |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------|----------------------|
| Kevin Miles | 28 | 140 | 77 | 217 | 1 | ELECTED |
| Ian Todd | 28 | 140 | 76 | 216 | 2 | ELECTED |
| Martin O'Hara | 24 | 120 | 75 | 195 | 3 | ELECTED |
| Raj Chandarana | 24 | 120 | 69 | 189 | 4 | ELECTED |
| Rick Duniec | 24 | 120 | 64 | 184 | 5 | ELECTED |
| Vince Alm | 23 | 115 | 67 | 182 | 6 | ELECTED |
| Tim Hillyer | 23 | 115 | 65 | 180 | 7 | ELECTED |
| Amanda Jacks | 21 | 105 | 62 | 167 | 8 | ELECTED |
| Peter Daykin | 21 | 105 | 61 | 166 | 9 | ELECTED |
| Ash Connor | 21 | 105 | 56 | 161 | 10 | ELECTED |
| Anne-Marie Mockridge | 20 | 100 | 57 | 157 | 11 | ELECTED |

FANS' PARLIAMENT 2011 London

| | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|----|----|----|-----|----|--------------------|
| Mark Longden | 18 | 90 | 56 | 146 | 12 | ELECTED |
| Colin Hendrie | 15 | 75 | 52 | 127 | 13 | ELECTED |
| James McKenna | 12 | 60 | 54 | 114 | 14 | ELECTED |
| Ian Stirling | 12 | 60 | 44 | 104 | 15 | ELECTED |
| David Beverley | 12 | 60 | 37 | 97 | 16 | ELECTED |
| Geoff Milton | 12 | 60 | 36 | 96 | 17 | NOT ELECTED |
| Stuart Wood | 10 | 50 | 42 | 92 | 18 | NOT ELECTED |
| Jon Darch | 11 | 55 | 27 | 82 | 19 | NOT ELECTED |

Appendix 5

Report from the breakout session on SAFE STANDING

A. Present (From the SS Campaign Committee):

- Jon Darch (JD) – Safe Standing Roadshow
- Stu Wood (SW) – FSF NC
- Malcolm Clarke (MC) – FSF Chair
- Michael Brunskill (MB) – FSF Communications
- David Rose (DR) – FSF Office
- Peter Caton (PC) – Protection of Existing Terraces
- Peter Daykin (PD) – Interim Safe Standing Portfolio Holder, Workshop Chair

B. Fans' Parliament 2011 – Workshop Overview

Last year's FP workshop was interesting and well attended, but the SS group considered that we failed to engage the diverse group of willing volunteers and spur them into action.

Most people are aware of the arguments surrounding Safe Standing and while we mustn't assume everyone is an expert, we saw no need to rehash the substantive debate around standing in anything other than cursory terms. Rather this year's workshop took the format of:

1. Brief show & tell outlining framework of the campaign to date, concentrating on last year's actions (CN & PD)
2. Brief introduction to the SS Road Show (JD), which was present
3. Report on protection of terraces (PC)
4. Question and Answer
5. Appeal for working volunteers (PD)

FANS' PARLIAMENT 2011 London

1. The Stand Up Sit Down/FSF Safe Standing Campaign

- a. Information on some of the local, on-the-ground campaigns launched over the course of the last year (CN).
- b. Overview of what we decided last year and progress made in the areas outlined in last year's report (PD).
 - i. Safety
 1. Safety argument not contentious
 2. Liverpool meeting
 3. Roadshow – (very brief mention)
 - ii. Economics
 1. Some economic model done, needs more work next season
 2. Agreed last year to consult members on appropriate prices for standing, needs to be picked up next season
 - iii. Politics
 1. Don Foster - Adjournment debate
 2. Legal review by Guy and Mark
 - iv. Civil Engineering
 1. Would be helpful to have deeper understanding of CE issues (possibilities for retro-fitting, implications of rake etc.), needs addressing this year
 - v. Customer Care/Control
 1. Arguments against sitting being easier to police/for emergencies
 2. Amanda and her pet academics looking into this
 - vi. Local Activities
 1. Chris and Peter's various meetings (very brief mention)
 2. Yorkshire/Scunthorpe
 - vii. General
 1. Not yet winning the PR war – looking at ways to improve this (video, virals, better briefings/press packs for journos and fans)
 2. Petition

2. The Safe Standing Roadshow

- a. JD delivered a summary of recent action of the SSRS, including:
 - i. Wolves
 - ii. Celtic
 - iii. Oxford
 - iv. Liverpool
 - v. Meeting with the FLA (confidential)
 - vi. Appeal for help organising visits

3. Protection of Existing Terraces

- a. PC delivered a summary of recent activity in respect of the 23 clubs that still retain terracing, and efforts to protect those standing assets.

4. Q&A

- a. Importance of activism on the ground – petition, Scunthorpe...
- b. Request for better management of standing in seated areas, explanation of the difficulties of arguing for this (where it is tolerated we jeopardise it, where it isn't, hard to argue it's safe)
- c. Have we thought about the green angle/carbon footprint issues – can rail seats use recycled materials etc?
- d. Is reducing ticket prices for standing areas a contravention of the DDA laws as not everyone can stand?

FANS' PARLIAMENT 2011 London

5. Appeal for volunteers

- a. We need help next season in the following areas:
 - i. Political campaign – writing to MPs/sourcing willing constituents etc.
(co-ordinated by MB)
 - ii. Roadshow – arranging visits, inviting local press etc.
(co-ordinated by JD)
 - iii. Fortnight of action – organising local physical petitions at every club (target 100k signatures nationally), leveraging contacts network, publicity & PR
(co-ordinated by DR)
 - iv. Economic modelling – can clubs reduce prices and make more money under the 1.8/1 standing to sitting ratio? Higher density of fans = more stewarding and policing costs etc. Needs detailed and careful fact-finding and analysis, preferably through liaison with a friendly and curious club.
(co-ordinated by SW)
 - v. Civil engineering – can we retrofit rail seats? What are the dangers to children for whom the rail is at throat/face height? Can RSs prevent lateral movement?
(co-ordinated by CN)

6. Conclusion

- a. The campaign has been very active this last year. By the time we updated delegates on the latest situation and fielded their questions, there wasn't time to break up into smaller groups to engage volunteers in action.

Appendix 6

Report from the breakout Session on CLUB OWNERSHIP & GOVERNANCE

Chair – Malcolm Clarke

The chair opened the workshop by welcoming the panel members:

Brian Burgess, Acting CEO, Supporters Direct

Steve Powell, Director of Policy FSF, and a member of Supporters Direct Board

Rapporteur: Tim Hillyer

Progress on the recommendations from the 2010 workshop were reviewed by Steve Powell (in **bold**):

Recommendations from the 2010 workshop

12. *That the FSF welcomes and endorses the new regulations introduced by the FA, Premier League and Football League but that this Fans' Parliament believes that further steps remain to be taken; **evidence was provided to the DCMS enquiry. There has been welcome progress but there is a long way to go.***
13. *That the FSF study different models and methods of governance employed with success in other countries and in other sports; **comparisons with the Australian sports commission model vis a vis the English Premier League were made. Oral evidence was given to the DCMS enquiry.***

FANS' PARLIAMENT 2011 London

14. *That the issue of competitive balance be raised as part of the debate on the governance of football and its clubs; **there is recognition within England, Scotland and UEFA that this is an issue.***
15. *That the FA should be the prime governing body and regulator of football and its clubs in England and that attention needs to be paid to conflicts between the FA and its Football Regulatory Authority; **Ian Watmore's resignation may be attributed to the undue influence of vested interests. William Gaillard has stated to UEFA that The FA is a weak organisation compared to other national FAs.***
16. *That the FSF monitor the implementation of the new regulations; **it is regrettable that Ken Bates was unable to attend the DCMS enquiry. There is cross-party consensus in Parliament that supporters have a right to know who owns their clubs.***
17. *That the FSF look at sports laws enacted in other countries and approach the Government on this issue; **Hugh Robertson, MP and Sports Minister is believed to be interested in developing legal registration and oversight in football as minimum standards for eligibility for grants and State support.***
18. *That football should be recognised for its cultural significance not just viewed as a business like any other; **supporters are the driver for sustainability of club finances.***
19. *That regulations should be introduced to prohibit the leveraged buy-outs of football clubs in England & Wales; **it will prove difficult to persuade senior figures that over-leveraging is not healthy. Affordable debt can be tolerated. A licensing system should include limits to the level of debt.***
20. *That the recommendations for reform of governance of the FA set out in the Burns Review should be fully implemented; **appropriate regulation is needed; ownership of clubs is not a question of nationality.***
21. *That the FA membership should be dependent on clear criteria "graded" to reflect the level at which the member plays and that FA membership should be compulsory for all clubs wishing to play in FA sanctioned competitions; **currently FA membership is an entitlement to tickets for the FA Cup Final but has little meaningful impact. The exclusion of non-members from sanctioned competitions would be more appropriate.***
22. *That the Premier League and the Football League should establish appropriately resourced regulatory units to oversee and enforce their regulations; **regulation without enforcement is meaningless. The encouragement to football authorities to develop strong investigative powers must continue.***

Brian Burgess summarised that the good were getting better and the bad were getting worse. Clear role models were: Swansea City (20% fans owned), Exeter City, AFC Wimbledon, AFC Telford and Chester. Bad examples include Portsmouth and Chester City. He asked where is the tipping point and how can we encourage good practice?

Looking at point 4. a regulatory regime is only as good as its enforcing body. The Burns Review showed that independent directors of The FA are essential.

Under point 10. a licensing system is needed throughout the leagues. Sustainable debt must be published in annual accounts and balance sheets with a golden share to prevent asset stripping. He asked what role can fans play in this?

Colin Hendrie from IMUSA was concerned that the ultimate ownership of MUFC is obscured by a move to Delaware. The English Premier League states that they know but will not disclose who it is. He thinks that the level of governance is an illusion. UEFA rules, such as the ownership of more than one football club across Europe, can not be enforced. A lack of transparency allows scope for corruption. Self-regulation is inadequate. It does not work in newspapers or banks. Fans are the only group who can be trusted to monitor clubs. The 51% ownership rule such as used in Germany should be the aim.

FANS' PARLIAMENT 2011 London

Dr John Beech linked Governance with Competitive Balance. Under point 3. he predicted that the Financial Fair Play protocol would lead to Competitive Balance. The lack of Financial Fair Play was demonstrated at Crawley Town, Fleetwood Town, Eastwood Town and Croydon Athletic. On the matter of the Regulation of leagues, The FA has lost its role. The governing body should be The FA. It isn't.

Victoria Connolly stated that regulation is 'only as good as its regulatory body' should be more correctly stated as 'only as good as the regulatory policy'. Points 4. and 6. should be merged.

Mark Ogbourne demanded Commonality. Regulations in the Football Conference are not as thorough as in the Football league, citing the intense scrutiny regarding the ownership of Crawley Town.

James McKenna pointed out the lack of trust in The FA, Football League and English Premier League to implement good Governance. Governments are focused on re-election. A nationally led campaign, club-based whilst nationally coordinated is required.

Pam Wilkins highlighted the need to follow up. There had been a lack of balance in the evidence to the DCMAS enquiry. $\frac{3}{4}$ were written submissions compared to $\frac{1}{4}$ given in oral evidence.

Raj Chandarana stated that the English Premier League is a membership body and appears to work well for its members. There needs to be an independent body across the leagues throughout the Pyramid. Whilst there is cross-party support for fans' representation and better Governance, there are alternative models available – whether a strong, independent Commission(er) or another alternative. On the issue of funding for supporters' groups – FSF and SD – the area under attack is that of Policy.

Ian Todd highlighted that 83% of the turnover of Premier League clubs, which are privately owned, is being spent on wages. He believes that the framework of regulation is sound. Board members and officials showed a lack of strength in their failure to use the investigative powers and sanctions available.

Tony Roome identified himself as a regulator by profession. He has though no confidence in self-regulation in football. Referring to Point 11., all regulatory units should be resourced and empowered. To develop Point 2. a simple manifesto is required to be the focus of a campaign, which needs to be published and distributed to all clubs.

In his response to the debate, Steve Powell agreed that action is now required. As a national organisation the FSF must welcome campaigns at individual clubs. He recommended an email group on Yahoo as a start. There are practical difficulties in implementing a 51% ownership rule. The Burns Review had proved difficult to implement.

Membership of The FA is subject to clearly guided criteria. It should be a prerequisite for participation in FA competitions such as The FA Cup that a club be a full member of The FA.

Summing up, Brian Burgess explained that it would prove difficult for a regulatory regime to enforce legislation that is not comprehensive. There is however no need to wait for legislation. Linking Points 4. and 6. there should be a standardised regime with two tiers of licence, setting common standards across all levels, with specific requirements for the different levels.

Reviewing Point 9. Malcolm Clarke explained that the Burns Review was a compromise. A fully independent FA Board is not mentioned in Burns. As Vice-Chairman of the FA Membership Committee, he would push to make full membership status of The FA a starting point for club licensing. He agreed that regulation has not been used to its fullest extent. The FA Board is currently dominated by the professional game and the English Premier League.

Colin Hendrie demanded no ownership of a football club be permitted without independent ratification. There should be a golden 51% share owned by fans.

FANS' PARLIAMENT 2011 London

Conclusions

- j. There should be a Golden Share in football clubs held by supporters, giving the power to veto.
- k. Total transparency of ownership.
- l. The Board of The FA or its regulatory board must be independent.
- m. The Financial Fair Play Protocol must be applied.
- n. Referring to Point 10. , regulation should be applied throughout the Pyramid.
- o. The regulatory unit(s) in Point 11. should be independent.
- p. There should be regulation of ticket prices.
- q. Delete Point 9.
- r. The governing bodies of sports should be subject to Freedom of Information regulations.

National Council were instructed to develop:

- IV. A simple manifesto for Club Ownership and Governance.
- V. A campaign at club level.
- VI. And build a Yahoo group.

Appendix 7

Report from the breakout Session on POLICING & STEWARDING

Appendix 8

Report from the breakout Session on TV CONTRACTS

Participants

Chair – Jon Keen

Expert Speaker – Joel Seymour-Hyde, Strategy Director, Octagon UK.

Joel works with both corporate sponsors and rights holders across Octagon's client base. From a sponsor perspective, Joel is the day to day lead on the Cisco London 2012 Olympics programme, and manages strategic output across MasterCard's European Sponsorship portfolio, which includes the UEFA Champions League and forthcoming Rugby World Cup 2011. Specifically from a football perspective, Joel works on the majority of the our client's new sponsorship deals, and in the past year has been involved in the negotiations that have seen MARS, Npower and Budweiser become involved with British football.

Joel also works with a number of our rights holder clients, and with a background in media planning and buying has helped to consult them in the development of their commercial offerings including media rights, sponsorship and marketing. He has recently be involved with projects for Arsenal, QPR, Celtic and NFL UK, in addition to spending time in India working on the IPL. He has a keen interest in the development of media rights and the impact of new technology on the industry, and has also advised a number of media companies looking to purchase rights from organisations such as the Premier League.

FANS' PARLIAMENT 2011 London

He is a lifelong Reading fan, born and bred in the town...and now is slowly coming to terms with the heartbreak of yet another play off final defeat !

Rapporteur – Fiona Keen

Workshop Background

Since the inception of the Premier League, fixture changes made for the purposes of TV coverage have impacted match-going supporters. As years have passed, and the value of TV income has increased, such fixture changes have become more and more frequent, and are no longer confined to Tier One.

For years the Premier League in particular has been intractable on this issue, refusing to do anything that “might compromise the income from our broadcast partners.”

At a meeting with the FSF in January 2011, the Premier League indicated that they would be amenable to us presenting a paper to them for inclusion in the next round of TV contract bidding.

A key deliverable from this workshop session is to define what supporters would like to see included in this submission to the Premier League, whilst also bearing in mind the commercial implications from such submissions.

Style & Format

As far as possible, the workshop will be interactive rather than „top down“ in style, with encouragement of contributions and ideas from the floor.

It will commence with a welcome from the Chair, who will provide a brief overview of the problems faced by match-going supporters, together with the FSF’s current policies, and the attitude of the Premier League and football clubs.

This will be followed by a presentation from our speaker, Joel Seymour-Hyde, who will outline the commercial background to the current Premier League TV rights deals, including how the deals are structured and what makes them so important to the Premier League and the clubs. He will also discuss the growing influence of overseas rights and discuss possible future implications of new technology.

The Chair will then open the discussion to all attendees, with the aim of establishing a set of realistic principles, aims and priorities for submission to the Premier League for inclusion in their next round of TV contracts.

Although by necessity this session focuses on the Premier League TV contract and the experiences suffered by supporters of Premier League teams, it is intended that the principles, aims and priorities established in this workshop will be presented to other relevant leagues when possible.

Session Conclusions

It was decided that a paper should be submitted to the Premier League, based around the below concepts :

The inclusion in the next round of TV contracts of a central fund from which to compensate supporters for travel/accommodation expenses which are properly receipted and non-refundable and which cannot be used due to a match being rescheduled for TV later than a specified deadline before the date scheduled for the match.

FANS' PARLIAMENT 2011 London

- Determine which match broadcast timeslots create the greatest transport/accessibility problems to supporters and press for a reduction of these timeslots in the breakdown of TV packages.
- Press for a set minimum level of distance or accessibility (e.g. travel time), above which no weekday matches should be televised.
- Matches already moved to Sundays due to Europa League fixtures should be televised before other matches are moved for televising.

Additionally, it was decided to press The FA to ensure that no England matches are televised at 3 pm on Saturdays due to the impact on attendances of clubs at Tier 3 and below.