



LFR
Regular Committee Meeting
Tuesday 4th May 2021

Co-Presidents: Naseem Allmomen (NA) and Andrew Corti (AC)

Club Secretary: Christos Bitzis-Politis (CBP)

Club Treasurer: James Handerson (JH)

Membership Secretary: Geoff Hicks (GH)

Races Secretaries: Erika Kulikova (EK) and Francis O'Callaghan (FC)

Publicity & Communications Officers: Jonathan Lissemore (JL) and Gareth Fletcher (GF)

Social Secretaries: Daniel Brittle (DB) and Charlie Abrines (CA)

Agenda

*Greenwich Park LFR Run Proposal (AC)

* Lockdown easing & socials (AC)

*Say It Out Loud Club, Refugee & Asylum Seeker proposal (NA)

* Membership Engagement (NA)

* Bringing Inclusivity Forward(AC)

Financial Updates (CT)

Bank signatories update

Races Update (RS)

Publicity Update (P&C O)

Confirm access of P&C Officers to the LFR Triathlon FB page

Reminder of the FB policy

Social Activities update (SS)

LFR Summer Party venue proposals and budget estimations

Membership Update (MS)

Membership Renewals Updates

Membership Cards

Renewal deadlines & relative communications

Specific Membership Cases

Club Secretary

Review of Spod Monday numbers

LFR Archives Project voting

Out For Sport

Co-Presidents

LFR International Trip update

LFR email addresses

AOB

Chair: NA

Minutes: CBP

Apologies: CA

Greenwich Park LFR Run Proposal

Committee is starting with this item first, in view of the emails we have received these past few days and as a consequence of the exchange of emails we have had amongst us. The Club has incidentally had other similar proposals not so long ago, as there was a very similar suggestion from RW for a run in the southwest of London, a suggestion that didn't have a follow up. So, obviously there is an actual need for the creation of such smaller runs, as members find it still difficult to travel, with many of them working from home or who also feel unsafe, in terms of having to use public transportation to reach Hyde Park and the other existing runs.

The proposal we have received from MC is a very good proposal, and MC along with other Club members has put a lot of effort into this proposal, as you may have noticed from the Risk Assessment and the positive points presented in support of this suggestion. It is true that as mentioned before, with many people still working from home due to the pandemic, they feel the need to have a run to an area close to where they are living, so that they don't need to travel to the standard LFR runs. On the other hand we may come to a point where we have too many runs around London and we need to start thinking what will be happening to the Club and how will this situation evolve once the pandemic is over. We are confident, with leisure centres ready to open for a larger number of guests, that the Club will eventually be able to return using these facilities and we need to start thinking about what will happen to these satellite runs. DB, NA and I had already had an informal discussion both on the proposal of MC and on how to approach the current situation but this leaves us with the need to plan in advance on what to do afterwards. It is very important to make members feel part of the Club and feel included, especially during this period and in particular those who are not able anymore to attend the existing Club runs, it is really important to listen to members' needs and to demonstrate ourselves flexible. In addition there is the potential that such a run could attract new runners from the area, who never had the opportunity to attend our existing runs because of the commuting distance.

A great consideration has to go to the point of whether we believe that every new LFR run could or should have changing facilities. We have the Victoria Park run, which is a new run and which has become very popular, and we may have to consider the option of having to provide changing facilities for this run. Is the Club in a position to afford any new changing facilities and the answer to that is no. Another point to consider is that such smaller runs may have the potential to detract members from our existing runs. It might be worth going ahead

with this proposal though only on a temporary basis and we will have to review it as and when afterwards, in the post covid period.

A couple of considerations on my part: working practices are going to change for many companies in the near future and in consequence this will apply to a lot of Club members. There is of course still the possibility that many members will return to their previous offices, which are mostly located in central London, but many companies will not, and a great number of people will continue working from home for the foreseeable future. So at the end of this pandemic, it is not said that things will return to the exact same state as they previously were. The second point is that by having this run in Greenwich Park we are thinking of it as a possibility for bringing new members, that we could attract more new members by having a lot of additional runs. The location of the park happens to be a very good one, as a lot of LFR members already live in the area, and we have chosen Wednesday as the best possible day to hold this new run. On that same day there is the run in Regent's Park, and Primrose Hill is at the extreme end of central London towards north London, actually it is more north than central and it would take a whole hour for someone to travel from southeast London to Primrose Hill, accordingly we have chosen as a potential day the day which we think will have anyway had the smallest impact on attendance numbers. (JL)

I would still be very cautious, because once we start something and we create a precedence, then it becomes very difficult to stop it. We should be very careful on how we communicate this to MC and those who have initiated this proposal, that this run will be tested for a trial period and then it will be reviewed, as there is still the possibility that we may need to change back to the old way (DB)

I think the run needs to be tried. Coming back to what you have said, we all need to keep in mind from the start that this is going to be a seasonal run, as the run will carry on for when the park will remain open, currently the park is open until 9pm but the park closes at 6pm in October, at the reverse to the winter time, so we could make it a trial run, see how it goes, and then review it in time (JL)

Given the current situation, we are very much in a position to try a new run now, as it has become quite simple without having the changing facilities, so probably this is the best period to introduce something like that. This new run will take place on the understanding that it will be done without any changing facilities, as the post-covid working situations are likely to change for a substantial period of time. (GF)

I take the point of what people are saying and we are uncertain of whether people will be able to return to central London in their previous offices, in my opinion the critical thing is to manage expectations, nor to over-commit. It has already been an extremely uncertain year and we are not in a position to say what might be available in the near future in six or in nine months. In my opinion this proposal is worth giving it a go for a trial period and then it should be reviewed. There is also another thing which I would like to bring to your attention, that once we start splitting up the runs, we automatically reduce the number of people one used to see in these runs, I used to be able to see a group of my friends in Hyde Park every Saturday morning and this was a fixture for me but now I have had to come to terms with the reality that a good number of them go to Victoria Park, and I don't have the opportunity of seeing them anymore. As mentioned, it is all very unclear and we don't really know where we stand at the moment, that dynamic may change, or we may be forced to end up in a situation where each run is operating on a small number of people, I just think that it just affects a bit the social point of meeting with friends. (GH)

I believe that we need to be explicit on the amount of time this trial run will be running on and when we plan to revise it and then on how we to communicate this to members (JH)

As you know from my emails on the subject, I am in favour of the run going forward because it is part of our role to listen attentively and actively to the needs of membership and to act upon them, this is part of our commitment to the Club, naturally to the point that we believe that this this is feasible. The group of people who have brought this proposal to the table have clearly demonstrated to us, with deeds, that they are very keen on having this run for a

number of what I believe are very valid reasons. In addition, we keep talking about returning to our changing facilities, which we all hope and very much wish that this is going to happen, and we more or less take this for granted though we don't really know under which conditions we will be asked to return or if ever. I think it is also important to consider in more ample terms this return back to what we used to consider as normal and used to take as granted, for instead of returning back to use facilities in central London, based on what you have been saying, we may have to start seeking changing facilities closer to these peripheral runs, also because changing facilities which are not in central London come often with more convenient financial terms for the Club (CBP)

Thank you everybody for all your opinions on the subject, I think, and as many of you have already mentioned, I am of the opinion that we need to set a fixed term for this trial period and review it earlier on. MC has created a Risk assessment which you all had the opportunity to view, with two separate sets of routes, one is a 3.3K and the other is a 5.4 k per loop, so there is a certain flexibility in terms of choices for runners (NA).

I still think that the park is very small, it's a bit small and there is this big hill right in the middle, and I am naturally concerned for all new runners, whether they will be able to run this hill or not (DB).

I don't think new runners will mind this hill, new runners will join the run simply because they can join this run because it is going to be closer to them (JL)

I see what you are saying but we want all new runners coming back, we don't want new runners coming to the run once to never return, we just need to communicate these two options to new runners in advance and give them the overview of the different routes around the park (DB)

If the Committee decides to go ahead, how long do you all think the trial period for this run should be? (NA)

We should give it at least eight weeks, from next week until the 21st of June, it will be sufficient to form an opinion for the time being, also in line with the governments re-opening of other things at the same period. (JL)

The objective is that we should run the new event past the point that the government has set, meaning past the 21st of June, if we really want to prove whether this run is sustainable in terms of number of participants. (AC)

If people feel that naturally they are going to go back to their offices in the centre of London after that date, then the run will not attract many runners after that period anyway, we want to have this proposal running for a period long enough that will allow us to monitor it properly and see how it goes but also not for too long, to the point that it isn't attended anymore (NA)

After a short deliberation, the Club Committee comes to the conclusion that the LFR run in Greenwich Park will go ahead for the trial period of three months, which is deemed as the most sensible to everyone, as this period will offer a fair opportunity to the new run to prove itself as sustainable as possible while the Committee will be able to assess in the meantime its impact on other Club runs, if any.

Actions to be taken: The Co-Presidents are kindly requested to please set up the new LFR Greenwich Run on Spond for the next 12 weeks, starting from Wednesday the 12th of May and to please contact and communicate the above decision to MC.

In addition, a relative communication needs to be drafted for the ebulletin so that the launching of the new run is also communicated to all Club members.

Lockdown easing and socials

We need to start discussing the post-run socials which the Club used to hold, in view of the 17th of May, when some of the present restrictions will be eased and whether we should start getting in touch with our social venues. Most restrictions on meeting others outdoors will be lifted, whereas indoors the rule of six will continue to apply, unless they are people meeting from two different households.

We need to know which of our previous venues will be reopening and which not and whether they will have tables which may accommodate groups of six, and whether they are able to do this for LFR or not.

Action to be taken: CBP is kindly requested to please contact all the venues LFR used to frequent and report back to the Committee

Say It Out Loud Club, Refugee & Asylum Seekers Charity

This is a proposal about including in the Club runs LGBT+ people who are in the state of refugee and of asylum seeker, assisted by the above charity for advocacy and support. The people who are working for the charity and who are supporting LGBT+ people, would like to be able provide for them an activity that will help refugees and asylum seekers both physically and mentally, and have come to the conclusion that people often would have wanted to join a club like ours but cannot do so because of their financial conditions which are very restrictive. The proposal is to admit and include to the Club runs for free a small number of people from this charity who could wish to run and socialise with LFR. We are obviously not talking about a vast number of people, as for certain people running is not really part of their culture and may not seem appealing to them, but it could be an outlet for some others and it would be great if we were able as Club to enable those who are interested, to come and run with us. (NA)

This is a great project and it would be equally great if we could include this to the other plans relative to promoting inclusivity which the Club has as a priority in the agenda for this year. There could be though some practical implications for bringing this forward, the England Athletics insurance, for example (AC)

Just to put everyone's mind in a state of relative peace in regards to the England Athletics insurance, besides the individual EA fees which are paid by the Club for each member, the Club enjoys a yearly insurance coverage as a running club in general, through the club affiliation fees which we regularly pay to EA every year. This insurance provides automatic coverage to all the Club's athletic activities, which also includes new runners, when they first come to run with LFR. Those from the charity who could be interested in coming to run with the Club will be covered by this general type of club insurance, for as long as they are running with the Club, and for as long as they are considered by the Club as new runners, it will make no difference, if they came to run with us for the customary three times, or if they stayed on for one month or even for three months, as they will be covered by this type of club insurance during the whole period which they will be considered as new (CBP)

Action to be taken: CBP is kindly requested to please contact EA and request a further clarification for insurance purposes on this matter

It is going to be a very important issue having to manage numbers of attendees from the start, as I think that we are happy to take some people initially on board and then take a couple of others more, as we go, step by step (AC)

As I also come from a similar professional experience of working for a charity, people who are refugees and asylum seekers have gone through extremely traumatic experiences and by the time they manage to reach the UK they need further assistance and psychological support, some of them even for life, as they are also trying to cope with the demands of a new, totally different life in the UK. This could potentially present some safeguarding challenges for the Club and some issues to those dealing with the Circles, so it could be good to ask whether this charity is able to provide some type of training for our Club officers, whether this is something that they may provide for us themselves or whether this type of training could be provided by a different charity, as I happen to know that they are charities who are expert in providing this kind of training. This will enable the Club to address any potential issues immediately and in the right way but it will also support us as well. (DB)

This seems to me like a really good idea and I would be in favour of giving it a go now at this point in time when we are not using any changing facilities, as it makes everything much

more simple. In the longer term, when we return to use the changing facilities, and there is a potential funding shortfall, we may always look to obtain a minor sponsorship towards this cause from Club members, as I think Club members will be very sympathetic to this proposal and they would definitely support us on this, so I don't think that we have very much to worry about at this stage, from a financial point of view for the future. (JL)

AK has also suggested in the past year a very decent proposal relative to the financial support of LFR runners who are not able to pay for their own membership fees, with all contributions in support and towards this purpose coming from other Club members. If we were to go forward with this project, I am sure that it will find a lot of support among other Club members as well and that there will not be any problem in terms of finances. (AC)

I also happen to find it a very good idea and presumably we will not be anyway needing a huge amount of money, as potentially it will just be the £15 towards their EA membership (GH)

In my opinion I think that we should go back to the charity and phrase the proposal in terms of timeline and of numbers, for how long do we think that we should commit and give this proposal a try but also on the number of how many people will there be running with LFR from this charity, with the condition that there is going to be a trial period stipulated by both sides. (JH)

To the question on whether LFR will have a specific run designated for this purpose or whether all runs will be accessible to those joining us from the charity : I don't think we should be putting such a barrier since the very beginning, I would say that first timers should be able to come to all runs; additionally we could provide them with some relative guidance in regards to the runs and on what to expect and let them choose a run from the existing ones (NA)

Discussion on the welfare of all those involved and on how the Club Committee should be in a position to prepare CL and CLA for all eventualities as a priority, and as to what type of information needs to be communicated, on both sides, in order to be able to assist and simplify an initial official approach.

Based on the above it is deemed as necessary that a relevant exchange of information should be taking place in due course in order to be able to offer some practical advice to all the Circle volunteers, with the intention of being able to minimise all potential concerns both from Club officers and members.

If it important to sort certain potentially emerging issues beforehand and not just to see this as a good news story first (JL)

Based on the concerns raised, I think the best way forward would be at this stage to be able to exchange some vital information which will allow us to create some basic guidelines, and then to move forward bit by bit, one step at a time (AC)

Action to be taken: NA is kindly requested to please liaise with the charity officials in regards to the concerns voiced above and to facilitate the information exchange process between LFR and the Say It Out Loud Club.

Bringing Inclusivity Forward

The plan of bridging inclusivity forward as one of the main aims for this Club Year has finally started moving forward. There are some ideas coming from NA and AC which have been inspired by the Manchester Frontrunners website, where there are a couple of pages on inclusivity, mainly the policy on trans people released from the leisure centres which the Manchester Frontrunners are using. This is a very good point to start with as the leisure

centres which the London Frontrunners have been using must have a similar policy already in place. What we could do, after obtaining it, is communicate this policy to members, reach out to them and engage with them in a one to one conversation on their own experiences, and thus making them feel more included

It would be great if the Committee could get SC who is super active in promoting gender issues and who is also very much involved in themes relative to inclusion, to offer her view, and also draw in some other Club members who happen to be professionally involved in themes of inclusion and education such as BC and MG etc, and discuss with them which is the best practice to look at and to bring forward from the Club's point of view. In addition, we could ask from members of the Club to come up with any suggestions, by dropping the Co-Presidents a line and sharing with them some relative thoughts.

As this is a subject which concerns the whole of the Club Committee, if there are any other Committee members who may wish to be actively engaged together with the Co-Presidents on this particular topic, then they should please let them know. (AC)

Financial Updates (CT)

Discussion on invoices relative to Club membership renewals and the subsequent amounts which need to be paid towards the England Athletics fees. The Club from the 1st of March has received about £9000 in membership fees, out of which £4200 have already been paid to EA but this is just an indicative figure as many more registrations have been processed in the meantime since then.

In regards to the LFR Lloyds Bank account, there is going to be a physical meeting in the following days between JH and AD, as to hand over the Club bank card. For the moment AD is still going through Club payments and paying them on JH behalf, as the clearance for the new CT has taken some time.

Races Update (RS)

Things are starting to look much better and the Club Championships are on, starting with the 5 miles race. Our intention is to try and schedule all the Championship races by the end of August, as lots of races which have been cancelled last year or have been postponed are now going to be taking place in September, so we want to be able to do as many of our Club races as possible by then, so as not to have any races overlapping. The Big Half will become part of the Club Championships, as so many Club members have already registered for the event and we still have quite a lot of Community Entries available. We are currently looking into a 10k race for the Championships and finally, the Battersea Park Relay will be apparently happening in July.

Publicity Update (P&C O)

Ebulletin-wise the situation is currently up to speed, with new members having already been added on the mailing list as they are sent to us by GH. The LFR instagram account has been reanimated and properly we are starting only now, we would say almost from scratch. We have started posting some pictures, there was particularly one which attracted new runners and we already had messages from these runners enquiring about running with us, so the new web page for new runners has proved to be a very useful page to direct people to.

In regards to the guidelines relative to people posting on FB. It must be said that the greatest majority of posts which we have received were sensible posts, relevant to Club activities, related to LGBT+ sports, and although the parameters may seem to some as fairly narrow, there is still possibility to post something which is not strictly %100 relevant to the Club, so we believe that there is still some space for more "creative" posts. In case you ever happen

to notice any post that you are uncertain of, then please leave it to the P & C officers to deal with, or even drop them a line, if you believe that it should be dealt with as a matter of urgency.

The P&C Officers are currently working on a submissions form for internal Committee use and relative to the ebulletin. The article submissions for the ebulletin are kept as tidy as possible while in the meantime trying to fit in as much information as possible. This submission form could prove to be an extremely practical tool for the Race Secretaries in regards to the race results,

Action to be taken: JL is kindly requested to please email the link to the Google Form for submissions to the Race Secretaries

At the same time, both P & C Officers have become members of the Tri FB group and are “spying” on the Tri group interesting stories and activities so that they may have to share them with the rest of the Club. In addition they are also in contact with AC.

It would be good to invite AC and MH to the next RCM, as to discuss with them and it will also provide the opportunity to discuss any communications plans for the Tri group.

Action to be taken: CBP is kindly requested to please invite AC and MH to the next RCM.

Coming back to the LFR instagram account, it would be great if we could please receive some photos from Club members, as it would be important to involve more members with their own postings and also with what is being posted. In addition it would be great to create an inbox where these photos can be send from other Club members, and in consequence get the account to the next stage, give it more of a face and of a presence, where members could post on their favorite races, as it should be more members whom we would want to engage with this platform than committee members.

The instagram account will help us with the recruitment of new members, in particular if we were to include from stories coming from existing members, about their first run with the Club, as it will help encourage new members to join, there should also be some form of interaction between the instagram administrators and the people using it, we could post a few questions, a couple of photographs, possibly create a post about the LFR runner of the month, or something similar. In such a way, people are more encouraged to participate as we need to find ways to attract more members into it but also to recruit new runners.

Social Activities update (SS)

We are currently planning the Eurovision watch along zoom social. For the moment we have not managed to figure out how exactly to do it, but DB is meeting with CA to try out and discuss the possible use of different platforms. In any case the subject will be out next week with the ebulletin and there will be included details on how to join and such.

Updates on the LFR Summer Party.

CA and DB have been going through an assorted number of venues and are presenting to the Club Committee the most popular among the options.

The issues which are taken into consideration are possible numbers of LFR attendees and how many people can these venues actually accommodate, whether this will be an indoor or an outdoor venue, or whether there will be an indoors venue with the possibility of using an outdoor space, and naturally the costs. The venue options presented are in different parts of London, north London (Wood Green), Bermondsey, central London, etc.

The common factor is that they all come with the minimum spend possibility, which from one side could potentially simplify the whole affair, from the moment the Club Committee will have established the amount which could be willfully spent by one person during one evening on the event, thus guaranteeing a reasonably inexpensive venue hire.

There is again a large range of options for the minimum spend, as some of the venues also include in the minimum spend option also food and not just drinks.

There is the possibility to ask members to partially subsidise with contributions the hiring of a venue and to help the Club towards reaching a target, by setting a £5 ticket.

JH considers that asking members to spend £48 pounds each on an evening is a lot and then Club could be potentially left with a huge amount to pay back to the venue for covering the gap left by members with the minimum spend option and considers a much safer option hiring a venue instead and subsidising this by cutting tickets.

We need to take into consideration that although many members will be enthusiastic about an actual social event, others may not be so enthusiastic, and remain sceptical due to the pandemic.

Discussion on the sums which have been spent for similar events in the past. Based on the historic amounts of the past, the Committee may decide on the amount which we may consider as relevant to pay on this occasion.

Naturally the hiring costs need to be kept very low and there should also take place some negotiations in advance, as most of these venues are just opening up and DB is referring now to what is currently reported on each venue's website.

Further indications in regards to the venue elimination process is the number of people they may accommodate, so venues available for just 80 guests need to be eliminated as they are at the lower end of membership.

The Club has previously hosted events for about 100 seated and 150 standing persons but we still need to take into consideration whether people are going to attend or whether they are still considering their attendance because of the pandemic.

The last consideration is relative to the date, as the LFR Summer Party will in all probability be taking place sometime in July after most of the restrictions, if not all, will have been lifted.

Membership Update (MS)

Starting with some figures, as promised from our last meeting, by a first rough estimate we have had 320 returning or new members, while we are still waiting for those who will decide to renew their membership after the deadline, as members are continuing to renew at a very slow pace.

As it has already been discussed that the 14th of May will be the implicit cut off among Committee members, meaning this is the date when we are going to effectuate the real practical cut off, by removing people from FB and other Club mailing lists.

Currently coming out after having battled against a long and demanding period of handover, as during the month of March there haven't been processed any renewals by the previous MS and GH had to pick up everything almost from scratch. Naturally the main priority is getting members registered with EA. Based on current calculations we are roughly a month behind, which, as long standing Committee members have been assuring GH, is quite the norm. Up to this point I have managed to process 150 memberships and it will take about another month to complete this process. The renewal process for first claim members takes between one and one hour and a half per person, whereas second claim members are a bit more complicated. Once this process is over, we will have much more clarity of the situation and I will be able to share better stats on who has renewed or not.

Unfortunately nothing can be done in order to assist GH with the whole task of the registrations and renewals process, because it will take a lot of time trying to instill knowledge and coach from zero to efficiency others on how to process memberships, and this time could be employed in registering members, so although it may seem helpful, it does not seem very effective. Facing the practical reality is an operation which has to be done.

In order to get people promptly on the ebuletin, in collaboration with the P&C Officers we have sped up the process, with processed memberships going into MailChimp right away, and only the EA payments are delayed at this point and this happens to be our only concern, other than that, members will not even be aware of any other potential delays, if there are going to be any.

When all this is behind us, we need to think constructively about the future, what can we do with all these time-consuming procedures and how to facilitate this whole process of renewals, we need to think about improving the handover in the future and on how may we strive to have an efficient handover system.

HS Case

One specific issue which we feel needs to be assessed by the Club Committee: one of our long standing members lives overseas, we came across an arrangement which has been agreed by the MS of seven years ago, and according to this arrangement they are paying an unwaged membership for themselves and their partner because they are living overseas and as a results of not participating to the weekly Club activities, coming to the runs or ever using the changing facilities. The Club does not have such a policy in regards to members living abroad and there are several others who happen to live overseas and who happen to be charged full fees and who also are excellent advocates for the Club and who incidentally have been paying for many years now what is the standard membership fees without any complaints on their part, so as this arrangement seems to be unfair to many Club members who are not taking advantage of it, we need to discuss whether we as Committee agree to this or not.

Discussion on the above subject.

In such a case, where transparency is of essence and where the Club does not embrace the alternative option of offering this same rate to everybody who happens to be living abroad, the Committee is unanimously in disagreement with the continuation of this arrangement, as it makes everybody feel extremely uneasy, when the same rules are not applied to all Club members.

The Committee comes to the decision that this issue needs to be addressed now by writing to the person in question and after presenting the situation to them, it is important to also have their view on the matter, and according to how they respond, take this matter forward.

Actions to be taken: GH is kindly requested to please forward all emails relative to the above subject to the Co-Presidents. Co-Presidents have assumed the responsibility of contacting the person in question on behalf of the Club Committee and of communicating to them what has been discussed.

Discussion on the subject of the LFR Membership cards,

The previous Club Committee had taken the very sensible decision to stop having physical membership cards and the current Committee was considering whether it would have been possible to create electronic cards instead. JK has suggested last year to use a system which SM was unable to put into any action, as this suggestion anyway requested to insert every members data individually, and so at this point we are very skeptical of adopting what

seems an apparent solution which would require separate tailoring of emails as it already seems very time consuming,

There are some serious reservations about continuing with the membership cards, as most of the Club members don't use membership cards anymore or ever, if not only sporadically for discount purposes at various sports shops, in consequence we are strongly skeptical.

To this AC has come up with the following simple solution: in case members happen to need some sort of evidence of their LFR membership, then all they need to do is to log into their respective Webcollect accounts, then direct their attention to My LFR link towards the top left of the homepage. Clicking on this will produce a small screen with the LFR logo at the top, with the person's name and details of subscription in the little box on the left, and further important details like LFR membership number and the EA URN on the right, so all they now need is to get to that screen and they will be able to find in one place all the information which they may need. This screen can be used instead of a physical membership card.

The Club Committee has absolutely no objection to adopting and endorsing the above solution.

Action to be taken: AC is kindly requested to please create a relative blurb for the next ebulletin, containing instructions on how members may get proof of their membership through the above procedure

Club Secretary

Review of Spond Monday numbers

Have noticed that Monday seems to be the only day which keeps having people on a waiting list. The early Wednesday run proposal was completely unsuccessful and I am the last person who would even consider suggesting the same solution for the Monday run.

What I was going to suggest is increasing the number of attendees on a Monday on Spond by five, from 35 to 40. And I will leave this subject entirely to your consideration.

The suggestion produces no apparent or evident response whatsoever, by no one and to any of the suggested above, as obviously the CS has succeeded, yet again, to make every Committee member fall profoundly asleep with their suggestions.

LFR Archives Project voting

Based on relative emails which have been previously circulated by the CS, the Club Committee agrees and votes on the Conditions of Deposit for the LFR Archives and Oral History Project, based on the recommendations which have been suggested by the CS, namely that the Archives Collection will be deposited as a gift from LFR to the Bishopsgate Institute, that LFR retains copyright of the collection and of the Oral History Project and that the collection will be accessible to all researchers and historians.

Out For Sport

OFS is an LGBT sports umbrella organisation of which LFR are members. What we would like to do is stay as a member but have a more active presence and figure out how we may utilise OFS much more and for the benefit of the Club, by further improving the Clubs connection with them, while at the same time increasing our social media presence. OFS holds regular meetings, which would be really good to attend and also webinars, which are very useful. These all are assets which could be of potential advantage to the Club.

Co-Presidents

LFR International Trip update

The Co-Presidents met with MH as chair of the IT subcommittee and discussed the possibility of having a trip in HK, for the 2022 GG. MH reported back what was being discussed to the IT subcommittee and they were not what one would describe a super enthusiastic at the prospect. Although they recognise that such a trip is a great opportunity for LFR and it could provide great exposure to the Club, for reasons of accessibility, for reasons of time, as such a trip will require more than the customary four days off and for financial reasons, they do not find that such a trip could be taken on board. In addition, four members of the IT subcommittee would not be able to attend a trip to HK, two members of the subcommittee were not sure, and MH would like to step down completely. So at this point what we need to do is to continue asking for volunteers to replace MH, and decide on the possibility of whether we could have a European Club trip in June 2022, a Club trip in HK or even promote, endorse and attend both.

Discussion on the political situation that currently happens to exist in HK.

The HK GG will be the first of their kind in Asia and the organisers have repeatedly communicated that they are non political, they have the municipal and local authorities on board, so there is nothing really political beyond demonstrating support to the local LGBT community, given also the times, when LGBT issues in HK are under threat.

There are serious concerns, as raised by JL, that the HK municipal government is anyway entirely controlled by Beijing.

There are difficulties of a financial nature, as raised by JH, as there could be a number of members unable to attend such a trip, due to the high costs.

The Club needs to ask the assistance of volunteers, as from my understanding the intention is to have the HK trip along with a European trip, which will definitely need some additional organisation and the backing of volunteers (NA)

AC makes the point that the HK trip needs to be endorsed under an official Club capacity, more than previous such trips have been endorsed, and not simply to have this trip being suggested to membership as an alternative. This HK trip should be supported in an official capacity and in case members may have issues of a political or financial nature then it is only fair that there will be an alternative trip to a European destination by June, as it would be unwise not to have a European trip, if not for anything else, then at least for a good number of practical issues. The more sensible solution would be to endorse both as official Club trips.

After a discussion the Committee agrees to the solution of going ahead and officially endorse both trips, a European one in June and the HK GG in November, in addition to having a shout out for volunteers.

LFR email addresses

Discussion on the potential of having londonfronrunners.org email addresses for certain Club officials, such as the Welfare Officers, and what are the pros and the cons of an .org email address.

The Club pays subscription to Google workspace and accordingly there is an amount being paid yearly for every single .org email account which is being used by Club officials. The .org email addresses cost the Club £47 pound per year per address, and there was a very positive motion of cutting all underused email addresses in order to save money, which proved to be profitable for the Club as a large sum of money has thus been saved.

The Gdpr aspect of any emails received by the Welfare Officers is not the most important, the most important aspect is consideration and discretion. There should be in place protocols on how quickly emails that are confidential are deleted, as this is the most important issue in this case.

Discussion on the possibility of creating a general gmail account, with the .org part incorporated into the email address, which is anyway inexpensive to the Club, and then set up an email alias, which will divert the email to another mailbox, which will be more secure.

The Club Committee is satisfied with the existence of these two options, of the gmail and of the alias account.

Action to be taken : AC is kindly requested to please cancel the extra 6.30 pm Wednesday run

Action to be taken : CBP is kindly requested to please send out the next RCM Doodle Poll