

Revised Root and Branch Review Committee

SUMMARY MINUTES OF MEETING 4

The fourth meeting of the revised group for the Root and Branch Review took place on Tuesday, 1st March 2011 in the RIAC Offices, 34 Dawson St, Dublin at 7:30pm

Attendance:

Original Review Committee Members:

Joe Corcoran
James Coleman
Ann Stevens
Angela Henehan
Dermott Quigley

Regional Representatives:

Region A: Paul Lyons
Region B: Noel Devlin, Roy Stewart
Region C: Katherine Keogh
Region D: Ray Heney
Region E: Frank O'Mahony, Nial Murphy

Convenor: Michael Irvine.

Apologies: Sean McHugh, Ger Healy, Ed Fitzgerald, Kevin Barrett

In attendance by Request: Cecil Sparks, RIAC, Richard Ensor, Auditor RIAC & IMF

Matters Discussed:

1. Minutes

Minutes of last meeting, having already been circulated, were approved, ditto summary minutes for publication on MI website.

2. Attendance of Cecil Sparks

J Corcoran introduced Cecil Sparks, Chairman RIAC. In doing so, he gave a brief background to the reasons for C Sparks attendance. C Sparks in turn introduced Richard Ensor, Auditor to both RIAC & IMF.

C Sparks confirmed that the RIAC still wished to proceed with both the "Independent MI" and the "Way Forward" processes, and noted that the "Independent MI" process had been underway, and that certain preliminary steps, including separation of accounts etc., were already in place. He also gave some details in regard to staffing and office arrangements, and distributed copies of the latest IMF accounts.

R Ensor answered some queries re the "Non-guarantee" structure of the IMF company, and confirmed that it was, at present, wholly owned by the RIAC.

C Sparks stated that the RIAC were genuine in their intentions, but would need to be satisfied that the nature, ownership and control of any new structure would be such as to ensure the long-term good of the sport.

There followed a discussion of issues between the C Sparks/R Ensor and the Committee members, including the possible transition control structure, some further detail re the accounts as presented, including in particular a request for some further information in relation to expenses, and an explanation was given of the insurance/commission structure.

The arrangements for confirmation of appointment of the additional Executive Council members were clarified.

C Sparks & R Ensor then left the meeting, they first being thanked for their attendance & co-operation.

3. Confirmation of Goals:

A brief discussion took place on the review process and the problems that brought it about - Comments included that there was a disconnect between the grass roots, the clubs and that the lack of involvement was the cause of

disillusionment, whether the approach should be to resolve the “bigger picture” of control first, or to examine the organisational structure, or to approach both strands separately, but at the same time. Mention was made of issues such as minimum club sizes, possibility of support for smaller clubs, whether some clubs technically existing as Companies or otherwise. All agreed C Sparks contribution significant.

Other opinions expressed included that the clarifications received tonight allowed committee to know where and how far it can go (which might not be as far as it might want to go), and that any document must satisfy all stakeholders. Most felt that there was a serious problem at the top level, but some did wonder whether the problem at the top was as serious as was being suggested, and that some “tweaking” might be sufficient, as most clubmen were more concerned with detail at event level. It was also noted some Clubs, including not just the more inactive Clubs, may not be properly legally constituted, for reasons such as being struck off Company Register, etc., and that this was an issue which should be addressed, particularly in relation to Affiliation agreements. It was also stated that the decision on precisely how clubs would be shareholders was important.

4. Conveners Question re Priorities

M Irvine posed a question as follows to all members re their feeling on priorities”

“Do members feel that we should start with big picture or smaller picture first, or approach both in tandem?”

Following individual response “round the table” to this question, M Irvine then noted that the majority seemed To favour an “in tandem” approach, if so, methodology for this must be decided Notes requirement to look after those paying for the sport, also need for report to be all-inclusive, covering issues such as structures, committees, sub-committees, Election methods, etc.,

5. General 1:

Agreed generally that a document would be required RIAC showing outline of ownership/governance/control, and that, as a start on this process, a draft should be produced as a discussion document. Eventually agreed that the 16 members would be form 4 sub-committees of 4, each to separate “one page” drafts in regard to ownership & organisation for consideration by full c/tee

Sub committees as follows:

- A: – R Stewart, N Devlin (convenor), A Stevens, D Quigley
- B: – N Murphy (convenor), F O’Mahony, R Heney, GHealy
- C: – K Barrett, K Keogh, E FitzGerald, J Coleman (convenor)
- D: – P Lyons, A Henehan (convenor), S McHugh, J Corcoran

6. AOB

None

Next Meeting:

Agreed to leave till after Easter to allow sub-committees time to prepare reports.

Louis Fitzgerald Hotel, Naas Road Dublin
7:30 pm
Tuesday 26 April 2011 (provisional, TBC)