LFR

Regular Committee Meeting

Co-Presidents: Geoff Hicks (GH) and Wojciech Panków (WP)

Club Secretary: Christos Bitzis-Politis (CBP)

Club Treasurer: Derwin Brennan (DB)

Membership Secretary: Gwen Wright (GW)

Races Secretary: Marius Thies (MT)

Publicity & Communications Secretary: Craig Munn (CM)

Social Secretary: Mark Randall (MR)

Operations Secretary: Matt Hunter (MH)

Triathlon Secretary: Ben Humphrys (BH)

Tuesday 7th April 2026

RCM Agenda

Financial Updates (CT)

Review of the Club's financial reserves, including the International Trip surplus

Races Update (RS)

Club Championships and Race Calendar Overview

Triathlon Updates (TS)

Triathlon Race Calendar

Budget Proposal

Publicity Updates (P&C O)

Social Activities Update (SS)
Membership Update (MS)

Operations Secretary (OS)
Proposals on the Future Development of the Operations Secretary Role

Club Secretary
Pride Run 10K donation

Micro Rainbow proposal updates

Co-Presidents

- Incorporation Proposal
- Couch to 5K Programme Proposal
- DEI Regular Monthly Update
- Improving Inclusion and Selection Processes

AOB

Chair: WP

Minutes: CBP

Apologies: CM

Opening Remark. The meeting commenced with a welcoming statement to the team from Co-President Wojciech, who greeted the 2026/27 Club Committee and opened proceedings.

Financial Updates (CT)

The Committee received an overview of the Club's current financial position. The total funds currently held by the Club amount to £83,668.13, comprising £37,802.98 in the current account, £19,912.33 in the instant access saver, £15,481.13 in the 32-day notice saver, and £10,471.69 in the 95-day notice saver. Over the previous month, outgoings came to £2,072.58, while income totalled to £6,213.56. There were no individual income items above £500 besides one notable outgoing that was recorded, namely the £509.40 refunded to MR for the LFR Birthday Party pizzas.

The Club budget has now been presented, and at the same time membership subscriptions for the current club year have begun to come in; accordingly, further income is expected over the coming month.

Publication of Accounts Discussion

The Committee turned to the question of when would be the appropriate moment for publishing the accounts in the weekly e-bulletin. The Treasurer confirmed that he had prepared the accounts for the previous financial club year and made some minor adjustments to bring them into a suitable form for publication. As part of this, the International Trip funds have been set at £15,000 in the balance sheet as the officially designated reserve, with the remaining surplus transferred into general Club funds.

It was noted by the CT that there may be some minor imperfections here and there, as it often is the case with accounts of this kind, but the figures are in good order overall and the Treasurer feels confident to have them published and shared with membership.

International Trip Reserve Discussion

The proposed £15,000 reserve for the International Trip was discussed and this figure reflects the £8,000 once required from LFR to support the IT in 2022, with an additional margin included as a prudent safeguard, when one of the planned events for that year did not go according to schedule, and with the solicitor expenses in what proved to be a vain attempt of trying to recuperate some of the funds the Club had lost in Lisbon, the overall loss amounted close to £12K. It was observed that this suggested reserve is, in practice, an accounting designation rather than a separately held fund, as all monies anyway sit within the same accounts; nonetheless, it provides a clear contingency.

The reasoning behind the proposed approach rests on a question of proportion and good stewardship. If all surpluses generated by recent International Trips were to be held indefinitely in a separate, ringfenced reserve, the total would, in relatively short order, rise beyond the amount of £20,000, given the run of favourable outcomes in recent years. While prudence dictates that a contingency should be maintained, it seems unlikely that the Club would ever need to underwrite the IT to such an extent. To allow funds to accumulate beyond what is reasonably required, risks creating a surplus in all but name, mostly sitting idle without clear purpose. In that light, it appears more sensible to define an appropriate level of

reserve and return any excess to the Club's general funds, where it may be put to more active use. There is also a practical consideration to signal to the International Trip subcommittee, that a sum in excess of £20,000 being effectively at its disposal, may unintentionally encourage a more relaxed attitude to budgeting. It is better, therefore, to avoid creating conditions in which such a moral hazard might arise (DB)

On the specific question of ringfencing funds for the International Trip, the proposed level of reserve has not previously been discussed or formally agreed by the Committee, and, if understood correctly, the approach entails taking funds contributed for the purposes of the IT and, beyond a defined threshold, absorbing them into the Club's general finances. While in principle there is no objection to such an arrangement, it is not a trivial matter and would definitely benefit from proper consideration, where it should be openly discussed and agreed as a matter of Committee policy. (GH)

If this point is raised, the underlying issue is one of governance and clarity of expectation. On an unrestricted reading of the policy, it is important to recognise that the Club has not, in practice, ever returned IT funds directly to the trip itself as a separately controlled pot in the long term. The proposal, therefore, is to formalise a reserve policy which acts as a buffer for surplus rather than a growing accumulation. In that context, the £15,000 figure is intended to function as the agreed reserve threshold. This should be communicated clearly and formally by the Committee to the International Trip subcommittee, with the expectation that budgeting should aim, as far as reasonably possible, to break even, rather than generate ongoing surplus. Once the reserve level is reached, additional surplus should not be retained within the IT structure. (DB)

It was noted that, due to great application of diligence and astute organisational skills over the past four years by the IT subcommittee members, over a number of recent trips, cumulative surpluses have effectively built up to around £20,000, equating broadly to approximately £300 per participant. Against that backdrop, the proposal is to release approximately £5,000 back into general Club funds, while retaining £15,000 as a narrower, defined contingency. This strikes a balance between prudence and ensuring that funds are not left idle without clear purpose.

The intention is that this buffer is maintained as an accounting tool rather than an expanding reserve. Accordingly, the cap is set at £15,000, with any excess returned to the Club's general funds. It is also made clear that future surpluses will not be treated as refundable to members

or participants but that they will remain within the Club as a whole; individual refunds are only envisaged in specific cases where there is a problem requiring remediation (DB)

In summary, the Committee's position is that the International Trip should not be run with a view to accumulating surplus year on year, but rather to operate broadly at break-even, with a defined and limited contingency held centrally by the Club.

The Committee voted on the subject and unanimously agreed to cap the International Trip reserve at £15,000 and to formalise this position.

It was further agreed that the International Trip Subcommittee should be informed of this decision, together with a clear explanation of the rationale and the approach adopted.

Action to be taken: GH to write to the International Trip subcommittee setting out the agreed reserve policy, including the expectation that the IT should be run on a broadly break-even basis rather than with the intention of generating surplus beyond the agreed contingency. An additional request was suggested as to some clarification from the International Trip subcommittee regarding their future plans, including which members intend to step down and which will continue in post, simply coming from a position of concern over the appropriate time for a timely hand-over

In addition, the Committee reiterated and many thanks were expressed for the work undertaken in preparing the accounts to the CT.

A wider review of the Club's financial reserves will also be undertaken in the future months, including consideration of the treatment and role of International Trip surpluses within the Club's overall financial framework.

Races Update (RS)

Club Championships and Race Calendar Overview

The RS presented a season overview sheet covering all known races scheduled across the club year, alongside proposed additions for consideration by the Committee within the Club Championships. The document includes a calendar-style breakdown indicating agreed races, suggested races and already known and well-established Club trips and social events, while Committee members were invited to contribute any further relevant dates, including events such as the summer picnic date, the tri-camp trip, the LFR Women's trip, and other Club activities not yet captured.

A transition discussion has taken place by the RS regarding the handover from TW. In relation to the Club Championships structure, with a key suggestion coming from the RS as

to remove the 10-mile race, on the basis that the race calendar is already densely populated with events.

The RS also proposed that the ranking system be made more transparent and simplified. Under this approach, overall positioning in races would take a shift away from time-based scoring towards finishing position and placement, with marathon performance as the only time-based component to be considered. Participation and finishing position were emphasised as the more important factors, with the aim of encouraging broader member engagement across races, which was identified as the central objective for the Club.

It was further suggested that the Championship calendar should include a broader variety of events, incorporating at least one trail race, one Met League fixture, and one SEAA race, in order to diversify participation and reflect different running disciplines.

Several logistical updates were also noted, such as that there are accommodation restrictions relating to the James Herriot event; the Sri Chinmoy 5k is now sold out, with approximately 50 Club members having already entered. In addition, the 1-mile event currently has 80 allocated places, of which 70 have already been taken, with a formal sign-up form in circulation, which is again excellent news.

Finally, it was noted that the RC will circulate an email detailing the races he intends to suggest for membership participation, for formal sign-off and alignment with the Club Championships structure.

Action to be taken: the RC is kindly requested to circulate an email setting out the races he proposes for membership participation, for Committee sign-off and alignment with the suggested Club Championships structure.

It was proposed that clear instructions for members should be made readily available, both for sign-up purposes and in a permanent, clearly accessible location potentially on the Club website. This would provide a stable point of reference and reduce an exclusive reliance on the weekly e-bulletins, thus allowing members to consult the information at any time in a consistent and centralised form.

In relation to the Club Championships structure, the RS suggested that the 10-mile race be removed and that the volume of cross-country events be reduced, with a view to making the overall calendar more inclusive and encouraging for LFR members. It was also noted that cross-country races can be difficult to access in terms of geographical location and that they may feel particularly demanding, which can be off-putting for some members scarred during their childhood by being forced to attend them during their school years. A broader emphasis was placed on introducing more variety across the racing calendar, with additional trail-based

events suggested, examples include the Box Hill Half as a potential trail half-marathon option, as well as consideration of the Vitality 1 Mile event.

Action to be taken: CBP is kindly requested to please investigate in relation to the latter and report back to the RS

It was further noted that cross-country, by its nature, can feel more performance-oriented and potentially intimidating, whereas track races tend to offer a different and often more accessible atmosphere compared to road racing. In this context, there was also additional support for greater engagement and coordination with other running clubs, both to broaden participation opportunities and to strengthen wider club relationships.

Overall, it was agreed by all Committee members that discretion should remain with the RS to refine the selection of races and to develop the structure accordingly.

In response to a query from GW, it was confirmed that the Club Championships are expected to comprise seven races in total: five distance-based events, two cross-country races, and one marathon.

Action to be taken: MT to confirm the final list of races he proposes for inclusion in the Club Championships for Committee approval in the following days or whenever possible.

Discussion on Race Results

Power of 10 was noted as a persistent source of frustration, with limited functionality for automatically retrieving results. It was also observed that it is not always reliable, which creates additional manual work when compiling race data. It was additionally noted that once new runners have been affiliated, MT will be able to review and track their results more easily through the system. In parallel, it was suggested that members should submit race results via a simple form to Publicity, including basic details such as name, race, and time.

A broader discussion was had around communications and the structure of the e-bulletin. It was suggested that, in a future consultation with the Publicity team, consideration could be given to potentially splitting the current e-bulletin into more focused sections, for example separating racing and running content from broader Club culture and event updates, with one proposal being to run two shorter ebulletins per week, rather than a single, very long email.

It was pointed out that the current bulletin format has become rather substantial in size, often requiring users to click through or scroll extensively, which may discourage full engagement. Given the volume of Club activity, it was felt that it is becoming increasingly difficult to ensure that a single email is read in full by members. In consequence to the above, the RS expressed his strong support for exploring a more digestible communications format,

emphasising that this should be seen as an open suggestion rather than a fixed proposal. The underlying aim would be to improve clarity and accessibility of information for members.

It was highlighted and acknowledged that CM is already working on refreshing the e-bulletin, both in terms of appearance and format. Attention was also drawn to the fact that the Club has grown significantly in activity, as a consequence contributing to an ever increasing volume of content.

One suggestion was to consider a templated approach, whereby different sections of content could be duplicated into separate formats depending on theme or audience. It was agreed that this is a conversation worth having further and directly with the Publicity Secretary first and the ebulletin team afterwards.

It was also noted that members engage with Club communications through multiple channels, including WhatsApp groups, where updates are often checked more frequently, while some older members continue to rely on Facebook.

A question was raised as to whether races, triathlon, and coaching content should be consolidated into a single bulletin or separated. It was agreed that this should also be discussed directly with CM, and not progressed in his absence.

Triathlon Updates (TS)

The TS presented the proposed triathlon race calendar for the club year. The only clash identified was with the James Herriot Run, which was raised for the Committee's consideration. It was also suggested that these triathlon events could be included within the list of eligible races as part of the London marathon Club Places qualification.

The Committee considered the calendar and expressed its support. It was recognised that, given the volume of activity within the Club, some overlap between events is inevitable. It was further observed that, with a membership approaching 800, there is sufficient depth of participation to support concurrent events without materially affecting attendance at either.

The Committee therefore unanimously agreed to adopt the proposed triathlon calendar as presented.

Three funding proposals were put forward by TS for the Committee's consideration.

1. A proposal was brought forward by the TS to allocate £300 to fund a British Triathlon Foundation coaching course during the new club year. The course was described as requiring a meaningful commitment, both in terms of time and engagement, with the expectation that those who complete it will be required to contribute a minimum of 15 hours of coaching back to the Club.

It needs to be mentioned that at present, the triathlon section has only two active coaches, Alex Carington and BH. It was noted that there are a small number of members who have expressed interest in undertaking the course and who would obviously represent a valuable addition to the coaching group.

The Committee expressed its support for funding at least one additional coach and unanimously agreed to proceed on that basis. It was further acknowledged that one of the individuals who has already come forward brings relevant experience and is actively engaged in triathlon, thus is is a good match to the

The possibility of supporting a second candidate was also discussed and the Committee indicated that it would be open to funding a second place, should there be more than one strong applicant of suitable calibre. It was, however, recognised that in previous years some members have begun the course but have not completed it, given the level of commitment required and competing demands on their time; this was noted as a consideration in assessing future applicants.

2. The second proposal is for a budget of up to £200 to purchase a small quantity of athletic merchandise to be used as prizes and incentives for Club members, with a view to the 2026–27 season. Suggested items include thermos flasks, (8 Thermos flasks at £15 each), swim hats (8 swim hats at £5 each), and buffs (8 buffs at £6 each), with the possibility of adding some stickers to the purchase. It was noted that such items have, to date, been funded personally by AC, which was felt to be unfair and inappropriate. The Committee agreed that these modest but well-received incentives should properly be supported by the Club. There was also recognition that, if branded in Club colours and with the LFR logo, these items would serve a useful promotional purpose. Thus the proposal was well received, and the Committee expressed its support.
3. The third proposal is for a fund of up to £500, to be distributed in bursaries of no more than £100 per person. This would be aimed at supporting members on reduced membership rates, enabling them to access race entries, events such as Splash and Dash, and/or access to swim coaching. The intention is to improve accessibility and encourage participation among members who might otherwise face financial barriers.

In considering how such funding should be allocated, it was suggested that a small review group be formed, comprising BH, AC, and the Club Treasurer, to ensure that support is directed appropriately to those who would apply, and that absolute discretion is additionally enforced. The funding would be limited to relatively low-cost events, with a focus on those aligned with the Club Championships. Initially, it was proposed that the scheme could potentially support up to five members during the current Club year, with scope for some flexibility should additional suitable applicants come forward, subject to the Committee's discretion.

The Committee indicated that applications would better be considered on a case-by-case basis, with a degree of trust placed in members' expressions of requirement, while maintaining appropriate oversight. The proposal was supported in principle, with the intention of reviewing its effectiveness after an initial period.

The timing of all these proposals, and in particular the very last one, is excellent, as the Club is actively exploring how to allocate its funds in promoting and supporting Club activities in line with the previously suggested initiative (proposed by Andrew Corti and already approved in principle by the Committee) on funding members who may face financial barriers to participation in a number of established Club events.

The Committee has agreed in principle to explore this latter proposal further, subject to further detail, appropriate governance and GDPR considerations.

Action to be taken: The TS is kindly requested to develop a suitable system for implementing the above proposal and to present it to the Committee for approval. The aim is to support participation by unwaged and low-income members, given that disciplines and triathlon-related activities can be costly.

A key question that was raised is how eligibility would be determined. The current approach would rely on members' self-declaration at registration via WebCollect. The Club does not have the means to independently verify individual financial circumstances and will therefore operate on a trust basis, on members' own declarations, in good faith.

It is also not yet accurately defined where the threshold lies between "low income" and other categories, as this is extremely subjective, thus further discussion and clarification is definitely required, as members may be asked to self-declare their status as part of the process.

Action to be taken: the TS is delegated to develop a proposed framework for this system and to return to the Committee in due course with a recommended approach.

Additional Triathlon initiatives

- A women's coached Splash and Dash session is proposed, combining pool coaching and open water sessions. Logistics are still being finalised.
- Consideration is being given to running swimming sets on Monday evenings during the summer period, potentially at the E&C Centre, to complement existing Club activities. This may help offset reduced availability of weekend swim coaching during the triathlon season.
- Coordination with existing sessions, including the E&C runs and Saturday Club activities will be considered to ensure integration rather than duplication. With

approximately 800 members, trialling additional Monday swim sessions over the summer will not cause any further issues and was approved in principle.

Allocation of London Marathon Club Places

There was a discussion regarding the current list of qualifying events required for applicants seeking London Marathon Club Places, and in particular the apparent disparity in the types of events included, as at present, the qualifying list does not include any triathlon events, which feels like an awkward omission given the breadth of the Club's activities and the genuine wish to improve inclusion even further. This raises a certain concern in regards to the current criteria, as it appears inconsistent that triathlon participation is not recognised within the same framework, despite there being numerous triathlon events within the annual race calendar. It was noted that participation in one of these events, the running section, could reasonably count towards an applicant's accumulation of qualifying points.

There are up to seven triathlon events available in the race calendar, although in practice very few members would typically complete more than two or possibly three per year, due primarily to the significant cost and logistical demands involved. It is generally not feasible for members to participate in a higher number of triathlon events annually.

The Committee wishes to consider whether the London Marathon Club Places selection criteria could be revised to feel more inclusive of the triathlon section of LFR. It was also noted that triathlon participation presents additional barriers compared to running events alone, as mentioned above, including higher costs, specialist equipment requirements, and logistical challenges such as bicycle transport, whereas by contrast, running events typically require only race entry, without the same level of equipment or associated expense.

It was also noted that the London Triathlon will not be included this year to the proposed LFR triathlon events calendar due to increased costs.

The question was raised as to how many members who are actively interested in pursuing triathlon events throughout the club year, would do this as part of their qualifying activity for London Marathon Club Places. It was observed that a number of triathlon-focused members do apply with a certain regularity through the general ballot for London Marathon, and that recognising triathlon participation would be a relatively small but meaningful adjustment that reflects the broader Club community. Overall, the impact on the selection system would likely be marginal in scale, but the matter is considered as a fair request and as important from an inclusion perspective, and therefore worth further discussion.

Action to be taken: The RS was kindly asked to review the parameters document and, following his review, to report back to the Committee with recommendations on whether and how triathlon events could be incorporated into the qualifying structure.

Finally, a reminder was raised that the London Marathon ballot opens immediately after the marathon, and that members should be reminded accordingly.

Action to be taken: Include a note in the Club bulletin reminding members that they must be rejected from the ballot in order to be eligible for a Club place application process.

Publicity Updates (P & C O) in absentia

March Round-Up

Instagram**:** Activity on Instagram has seen a significant increase over March, reels and posts generated approximately 122k views, representing a 256% uplift compared to February. Notably, 82% of these views came from non-followers, indicating strong reach beyond the existing audience. The account has now reached 4,000 followers, reflecting a net gain of 90 over the past month. Five posts were shared during this period, the top-performing non-organic post overall was the Apple Music feature, reaching 131k views as of 5 April, whereas the top-performing organic post was the Monopoly Run, with 4.6k views over the same timeframe.

WhatsApp**:** Engagement on WhatsApp remains steady, with 417 members currently active. The general chat continues to function well, with no issues or moderation concerns reported. A new "Parkrun of the Month" group has been created and is showing positive engagement. Activity within the London Marathon group has also increased as the event approaches. The London Landmarks 24 group has now been deleted following the conclusion of the event cycle.

E-Bulletin**:** All weekly E-Bulletins were successfully distributed on schedule at 12:00pm each Monday. The new team has now been fully trained and has begun delivering these independently, with only limited support required. All content was received within the agreed Saturday 5:00pm deadline, with one exception: the Parkrun of the Month submission, which arrived 15 minutes after distribution on Monday, and it was exactly this which prompted the creation of a dedicated WhatsApp group to improve coordination and timeliness.

Facebook**:** The Facebook Members Group has grown to 589 members and continues to be used primarily for sharing photos and updates. No major issues have been reported.

Focus for April

Instagram: Content planning for April includes:

- Coverage of the London Landmarks Half Marathon and associated social events
- Evening Drinks with the Goslings
- London Marathon and post-event social

- Continued posts from weekly runs, with a focus on summer routes (e.g. Regent's Park and Greenwich)
- Parkrun of the Month features
- Ongoing engagement with other running clubs, member stories, and relevant events

WhatsApp: A full clean-up of legacy group chats relating to past events will be undertaken to streamline communication channels.

E-Bulletin: Continued development of the new team, alongside maintaining the commitment to Monday 12:00pm distribution.

Facebook: No significant changes planned. Long run leaders will continue to be encouraged to share routes and photos within the Members Group.

On the Agenda (Forward Planning)

- Updating the E-Bulletin to align with the Club's new design and colour scheme
- Enhancing Instagram with structured, informative posts about weekly runs
- Developing a more comprehensive Instagram content plan, including championship races, Club events, and social activities

The LFR Instagram continues to show strong organic growth and increasing levels of engagement, including a notable rise in direct messages and queries. To ensure sustainability and continuity, it is recommended that an additional team member be identified to support account management, particularly in responding to messages. Ideally, this individual would already be involved in Club communications and trusted by CM, providing both immediate support and longer-term succession planning.

Social Activities update (SS)

The SS reported that there had been relatively little activity over the past month; however, this is expected to change significantly in the coming period, with a number of events now scheduled.

The social following the AGM went ahead, though it was noted that no deposit had been taken. Looking ahead, there is a full calendar of informal and planned gatherings, with an impromptu social is planned at The two Brewers, and the Understudy event that will take place this Sunday, with the expectation of large table bookings similar to last year. It was advised that members should arrive early in order to secure a place

On 18 April, the Goslings social will take place, with a suggestion to hold it in Elephant & Castle rather than defaulting to The Two Brewers; this was supported on the basis that a

significant number of members live locally in that area. It was noted that this will be highlighted in the next e-bulletin, where it is hoped it will attract strong attendance.

A post-London Marathon social is scheduled for the 26th of April at Compton's, running from 3pm to 8pm, with a £200 deposit having been already paid. GH will be attending to present the LM trophies, though he will be doing so alone in terms of formal presentation duties. There was discussion around ensuring accurate tracking of participants at the LM and results, but also at the post LM event, with agreement that additional oversight would be beneficial; GW will also attend to assist on the day.

It was agreed that a second set of eyes should be used to verify entries, with GW and MT tasked with cross-checking Power of 10 data and Webcollect records to confirm new members and current membership status; Gh will liaise with them to ensure consistency in the final list.

For May, a post-HH social will be booked at the same venue as previously used, the Approach Tavern.

Looking further ahead, consideration was given to hosting a social at The Black Cap, as this has been suggested by several members and also as a change of setting from the usual venues. Saturday 23 May was proposed, with the possibility of moving this into June instead, potentially aligning with the Club's Pride Month activities. It was also noted that timing should avoid clashing with GBR-related commitments, in order to maximise attendance.

Membership Updates (MS)

The MS reported that weekly communications are being circulated in relation to the end of the Club year and the renewal of memberships. At present, a number of members have yet to confirm cancellation; however, only around ten members have formally opted out. In addition, five membership payments did not initially process as expected and required to be re-submitted. Overall, retention has been considered very strong, with the Club experiencing a loss of approximately 10% of its membership base, as current registered membership stands at 740 registered members, with a realistic expectation of reaching 800 over the course of the year.

The annual England Athletics registration process was commented upon as remaining entirely manual, and described as both time-consuming and somewhat repetitive in nature.

CM will be provided with access to Mailchimp and will proceed with removing non-members from the mailing list, ensuring that all the LFR communications platforms are kept up to date and aligned with current membership status.

Club Operations Updates (OS)

Kit Shop & Merchandise: the kit shop will remain open until midnight on Saturday 12th April and as of 31st March, 18 items have been ordered. Accordingly members will be reminded of the approaching deadline in the next Monday e-bulletin. Once the shop closes, the relative sales performance will be reviewed.

Following the March Committee meeting, an action point was taken to progress the additional LFR merchandise proposal. Engagement will continue towards this direction with the Triathlon Coordinator to align next steps in expanding the range.

Action to be taken: The OS is kindly to liaise with Alex Carington regarding potential merchandise items, including t-shirts and snoods, with a view to exploring suitable additions to the Club kit offering and ensuring any proposals are aligned with existing Club branding and practical requirements.

It might be worth seeking ideas from members, including through a future e-bulletin announcement following the conclusion of the current kit sale, with the aim of gathering wider input on potential additions to the Club merchandise range and ensuring member-led suggestions are captured in a structured way.

Action to be taken: WP to share Google Drive links with all Committee members to ensure consistent access to relevant documents and materials.

Venues & Member Experience: The OS will be contacting all LFR leisure centres and pub venues in order to introduce himself and begin building direct relationships with venue partners. Over the coming weeks, there is also a plan to attend each Club run in person, with a view to assessing both leisure centre facilities and the quality and suitability of post-run social venues.

Operational updates: the Monday run venue and associated leisure centre were informed in advance of non-attendance on Easter Monday. There is also awareness of recent issues affecting Clapham venues, which will be reviewed directly during an upcoming run visit.

In Clapham specifically, ongoing issues were reported with The Sun, including repeated instances of the LFR booking not being properly retained and, on occasion, unannounced changes to room allocation, including last-minute relocation downstairs after upstairs space had been agreed; this has caused disruption and was described as unsatisfactory.

At The Railway Tavern, the Club has now visited on two occasions during a period of refurbishment. In view of the venue having allocated the upstairs space to another group and LFR being placed downstairs, the arrangement has at times led to congestion. It was mentioned that the manager remains really keen to accommodate LFR, and that food provision is consistent with The Sun given they are part of the same company. However, limitations in table availability mean the setup does not always work optimally for larger

Club numbers. Overall, it was acknowledged that Clapham venue arrangements remain somewhat unsettled and it was suggested that a short survey be circulated to Clapham runners to better understand preferences and experiences, potentially via a Google Form to ensure clarity and transparency in responses. It was also noted that there is currently no dedicated WhatsApp group for Clapham, although informal WhatsApp communication more generally plays a significant role across the Club. It was additionally confirmed that The Sun is expected to be operational again from the 16th April.

Action to be taken: MR to add MH to the internal Clapham WhatsApp group, while GH will liaise ith both the above on the scope and content of the relative informational email

Handover & Coordination: an initial handover meeting has taken place with Joe Finch including access to the Operations Secretary email account and a further discussion has taken place with the Club Secretary ahead of tonight's Committee meeting.

Future Steps: looking ahead, and once the current kit shop cycle will be brought to a close, the latest sales will be reviewed to inform future decisions. In addition, cooperation will continue with the Triathlon Coordinator on expanding the merchandise offering, with any proposals shaped in part by feedback gathered from members.

The OS will continue to attend Club runs over the coming weeks, both to assess leisure centre facilities and to review the suitability of post-run venues. Alongside this, he will take on a more visible role as the main point of contact for leisure centres and pub partners, with the scope of the position to be further clarified following discussion with the Co-Presidents. More broadly, there is be a willingness to support the CS where needed, helping to ensure the smooth day-to-day running of the Club.

In Clapham, venue arrangements will remain under close review, with the intention of arriving at a more consistent and reliable setup for members

Club Secretary Updates

Pride Run 10K donation: The Committee considered a request for support in relation to the Pride Run 10K and following discussion, it was agreed to provide sponsorship at a minimum level of £300. It was further recognised that, should the PR10K Committee encounter any unforeseen cost pressures or inflationary challenges, they would be more than welcome to return to the Club Committee for further consideration, as in such circumstances, the Club Committee would remain open to reviewing its contribution in order to support the successful delivery of the event.

The Committee unanimously voted the approved sponsorship of a minimum contribution of £300; DB and CBP abstained from the vote in order to avoid any potential conflict of interest.

Micro Rainbow Proposal Updates: The Committee had previously discussed the feasibility of supporting an initial trial, supporting costs for a three-month pilot of up to five participants. While this was considered manageable from current Club surplus on a trial basis, it was recognised that scaling the model on a sustained basis would present conspicuous financial challenges. Next steps are about involving further Committee discussion to refine the proposal and explore its potential prior to implementation.

The above update prompted a broader and more reflective discussion around the use of Club funds. While there was clear goodwill and support for the underlying cause, the Committee acknowledged the need to consider carefully how such support aligns with the Club's structure and responsibilities. In particular, it was recognised that member subscriptions are contributed with the expectation that they support Club activities and participation, rather than being directed towards external charitable purposes. It was observed that, were the Club constituted as a charity, there would be clearer constraints on how funds could be used. As matters stand, there remains a degree of responsibility to ensure that any such decisions are both appropriate and transparent to the membership.

The question was therefore raised as to how the Club might offer meaningful support without straying beyond its remit.

In light of this, the idea of offering free or subsidised membership to individuals supported by Micro Rainbow was discussed as a more fitting and sustainable form of contribution. While broader forms of direct support, such as funding day-to-day needs, were considered more difficult to administer and less clearly aligned with the Club's purpose, facilitating access to the Club itself was seen as a constructive and relevant approach. The importance of clear communication was emphasised, particularly in setting expectations with participants from the outset, ensuring clarity that any enhanced support would be time-limited while maintaining a focus on continuity, inclusion, and participation within the Club.

It was also agreed that this area would benefit from further exploration. As an initial step, CBP will look into the feasibility of offering free membership in a structured and manageable way, with further proposals to be brought back to the Committee in due course for further consideration.

Action to be taken: CBP to communicate all the above to Micro rainbow

Co-Presidents Updates

Incorporation Proposal: The Committee was informed that there has been no negative feedback received to date in regards to the proposal, with all members who made the effort to approach and comment on the matter with GH, either broadly positive or, in some few cases, with no feedback at all. It was also observed that in the meantime and since the subject was first announced offically at the March AGM, the topic is already being discussed informally among members.

The initial approach had been to proceed with publishing the documents which were prepared by DB, with feedback from some of the Committee members, which was what had been previously agreed by the Committee at the last RCM. Reference was made to prior related discussions and correspondence, including contributions from AC, whereas Peter Duben, Jill Olsen, and Robert Dufton, all of which were noted as constructive and without negative response. Alongside this though, the option of charitable status has been raised by some members and it has been viewed favourably in certain discussions. However, it has been recognised that this status introduces additional complexities, and that this was not the option previously formulated or agreed by the Committee. At this point that Committee will also have to take into consideration the above suggestion. At this point, the Committee's general view is that the subject would benefit from a more focused consideration and in consequence GH therefore suggested that a smaller subgroup be convened to explore the options in greater detail and bring a clear recommendation back to the full Committee. This could potentially be done in a more informal setting, such as a smaller in person meeting or even a Zoom discussion, rather than requiring a full Committee session at this stage.(GH)

It was also suggested that some external input could be helpful, with Nick (friend of GH) offering to speak with LFR in order to provide his professional experience on the matter along with some additional perspective; this whole suggestion would sit alongside the subcommittee's internal discussions, rather than replacing them.

The importance of timing was also highlighted, and if in the end a charitable structure were to be pursued, it was acknowledged that this would extend the timeline significantly, and would

need to be clearly and transparently communicated to the wider membership. For the time being, the intention remains to work towards clarity ahead of the next AGM, where possible.

Action to be taken: GH will lead the initiative to coordinate a smaller working group comprising GW, BH, and CBP to further develop the proposal and bring it back to Committee in due course for further discussions and thus clearer decision-making.

Couch to 5K Programme Proposal: Adam Jones the LFR Coaching Coordinator outlined a proposed Couch to 5K initiative, identifying a clear opportunity to support newer runners in transitioning into regular participation within the Club. The intention is to create a structured beginner pathway that builds confidence and consistency, while also strengthening retention and integration into Club life. A key point of discussion at this stage has been the choice of location, with two primary options considered: Hyde Park (HP) and Victoria Park (VP).

Hyde Park (HP): Several positive considerations have been raised in relation to HP. On the reservations side, the distance between the LV sports centre and the Circle location was noted, although it was acknowledged that this could potentially be worked around. It was also highlighted that there is currently no clearly defined "official" 5K Club route at this location following completion of a beginner programme, which could present a gap in progression; coach availability was also identified as a factor to be confirmed.

On the positive side, HP offers a strong social draw, including the option of a Saturday brunch at The Thistle, whereas its more central location was also seen as advantageous in terms of accessibility for a wider pool of prospective participants. In addition, it was suggested that introducing a structured programme here could help further revitalise engagement at the HP location.

Victoria Park (VP): At VP, reservations included the distance between the community centre and brunch locations, as well as the lack of changing facilities. It was also noted that, compared to HP, VP may be less immediately accessible for entirely new members, particularly those based more centrally. However, there were also clear positives. The regular Circle already takes place adjacent to the community centre, which offers a stronger sense of integration and sessions could be perfectly aligned with existing Club run timings. VP also benefits from an established standard 5K route, making progression more straightforward. In addition, there is clear enthusiasm from coaches already based in the area to deliver a programme of this kind, which strengthens its feasibility. The option of using Mile End Parkrun as a celebratory milestone for completing the programme was also highlighted as an attractive feature.

Coaching structure and delivery: It was noted that, in practical terms, each session would ideally require a minimum of two Club officials present, and that this could be delivered either by two coaches or by one coach supported by a Club volunteer. AJ also highlighted

existing interest from coaches in the east of the city (including Pawel, Ranjit, Martin Vu, Sarah F, and others), which may support delivery and sustainability of the programme across locations.

Programme scale and volunteering: given that this would be the first iteration of the programme, it was suggested that participant numbers should be capped at approximately 20–25 individuals, as this would allow for closer oversight, an easier adaptation of the programme if required, and manageable demand on coaching and volunteer capacity.

It was also suggested that consideration could be given to enabling non-coach Club members to contribute as volunteers, potentially earning additional volunteering recognition points (for example towards LM places), provided their role remains appropriate to the session structure (e.g. accompanying as support or "tail running" while running).

As next steps AJ invited feedback from the Committee and indicated that he would be happy to provide further detail or clarification as required ahead of final agreement on structure, location, and delivery model.

North Devon Weekend Races Proposal: Christopher Craig proposed the introduction of a modest per-head subsidy for members attending the North Devon trip, and potentially other recognised LFR UK-based running trips in due course. On the basis that the North Devon trip is a long-standing fixture in the Club calendar and is firmly rooted in running activity, closely aligned with the Club's core purpose, CC suggested that a small contribution per participant could help to enhance the overall experience of the trip. As an illustrative example, a contribution of £10 per person across approximately 30 attendees would amount to around £300 in total and such a sum could be used flexibly to support shared group costs, activities, transport, or other collective elements of the trip.

While the principle of supporting participation and representation at established Club events was welcomed, the Committee requested greater clarity and precision regarding the intended use and structure of the subsidy. In particular, it was felt that further detail is required on how the funds would be administered and what they would specifically cover. The Committee indicated that, if the intention is to support unwaged members, this could be explored and clearly defined; however, for wider eligibility, a more structured and transparent framework would be needed to ensure appropriate use of Club funds.

Action to be taken: GH to respond to Christopher Craig seeking clarification and further detail on the proposed subsidy structure, purpose, and implementation.

DEI Regular Monthly Update

The regular DEI update connects this time naturally with recent discussions arising around the GBR event, as well as wider considerations relating to the Club's diversity and inclusion

strategy and, in particular, the way in which selection processes were applied for this year's GBR event.

It was acknowledged that there has been considerable discussion among the female members of the Club, with some expressing concern that aspects of the selection process felt inequitable. In particular, sentiments were shared on the relative Whatsapp chat suggesting that the outcome had not fully reflected fairness in practice, and there was even mention of a proposed collective female boycott of the GBR event. This was recognised as a sign of the strength of feeling within parts of the membership and the importance of addressing the issue constructively.

GH reported having had a detailed and constructive discussion with Andrew Corti regarding the selection and allocation process, where it was fully explained that one of the key determinants in team selection was the requirement for volunteer drivers, with those stepping forward in this capacity receiving entries as part of the logistical structure of the event. It was noted that, among those who volunteered, only one woman came forward as a driver, with the 20 remainder of driver volunteers,being male.This in turn influenced the overall composition of teams, as each team requires 11 participants. As a result, team balancing led to a configuration in which one mixed team includes 5 women and 6 men, while the remaining teams are male. It was acknowledged that, although there had been a reasonable number of female applicants for participation, the interaction between volunteering roles and team formation had a significant impact on final outcomes.

A broader reflection followed on how best to move forward in a more constructive and practical way. There was agreement on the importance of maintaining a clear focus on encouraging diversity and inclusion within the Club, while also recognising the operational complexity faced by GBR organisers. It was emphasised that this requires a shared effort between members and event organisers, with mutual understanding of constraints on both sides.

It was observed that, in practice, the application of the rules may not have sufficiently accounted for the distributional impact of driver allocation, particularly where a large proportion of drivers were male. A suggestion was made that consideration could be given in future to ensuring that driver participation does not automatically guarantee entry, in order to avoid unintended imbalance.

At the same time, it was also recognised that if the logistical requirements of the event depend on a minimum number of drivers, and if insufficient female volunteers come forward for those roles, then team composition will inevitably need to reflect operational realities. This undoubtedly creates a tension between inclusivity objectives and practical delivery requirements.

It was further noted that the complexity of organising an event involving approximately 44 runners, alongside transport and logistical coordination, is not always fully visible to participants. Regardless of the experience of organisers, the Committee recognised the significant effort involved and reiterated that such events are entirely dependent on volunteer contribution and in that context, it was felt important that criticism of the process should be balanced with recognition of the operational pressures involved.

In terms of next steps, it was proposed that this matter be placed as a first agenda item at the next Committee meeting, with a view to developing clearer principles and guidance going forward. A further update and set of recommendations could then be brought to the next RCM.

Finally, it was suggested that although selection criteria had been published in advance, including reference to driver prioritisation, this may benefit from being more explicitly highlighted in future communications. A brief clarification of how team places are allocated was proposed as a useful step to improve transparency.

It was also noted that the Women's Run of the Month and women's coaching sessions had been successful in terms of engagement, with 14 women signed up, which was seen as a positive indicator of participation.

A final agenda item was proposed for the future meeting to review what has worked well and what has not over the past year, as part of a broader reflective "wash-up" of Club processes and events.