

**1. To record those present and accept apologies for absence.**

**Present:** Chris Crossland (CC), Peter Lewis (PL), Mike Wigley (MW), Paul Salmons (PS), Martin Foley (MF), John Ward (JW), Ged Lennox (GL), Chris Boulton (CB), John Sabine (JS)

**Apologies:** none (all members present)

**2. Appointment of General Secretary (CC)**

CC confirmed the thrust of his short paper, and proposed that we should advertise for a replacement Secretary as soon as possible. Agreed that Arrivee publication dates made it inappropriate, so this should be publicised on appropriate forums and by direct email to the membership list in order to reach the greatest audience.

PS suggested that potential candidates might be concerned that the current job description was too extensive and find it off-putting: it was clarified that this had last been revised by the remuneration committee, but that it could be amended as needed in agreement with a possible appointee, and that in any case some responsibilities could be fulfilled by Delegates rather than personally by the Secretary.

**Action:** **JS** and **CC** to agree the text of an advert, to be circulated within a week if possible and in any case in time to get responses for discussion at the Board Meeting on March 23;  
**MW** to administer email circulation.

**3. Proposal to establish IT Director post (CC)**

In accordance with his short paper, CC noted that the last Board Meeting had proposed establishing yet another sub-committee on IT matters, but suggested that such a sub-committee was likely to be ineffective and it was more appropriate to seek a candidate for appointment as IT Director, recognising the need for expert knowledge and strategic input.

Agreed that such an appointment was needed, and that we should advertise for candidates ideally at the same time as the Secretary.

(Noted that recent IT problems confirmed the need for someone to take overall responsibility for IT delivery and strategy. While changes to the backup process and server setup meant that recovery from any similar problems in the future should be quicker, this confirmed the fact we are wholly reliant on volunteers and it might be necessary to seek paid support or consultancy to ensure resilience.)

GL asked whether such an appointment would affect the development of the new website: following discussion (noted under item 6) we agreed that while we must not pre-empt the appointment of a new Director by presenting them with a fait accompli, we should not postpone commissioning the work significantly beyond the next Board meeting.

While we need to recognise that a new IT Director would both need time to become au fait with the current situation, and might have a preferred candidate for web development work, we should make it clear that they would need to take account of work already in progress.

Noted that in the event of no suitable candidate volunteering, we might need to seek paid-for 3rd-party consultancy. As this would involve advice on procurement decisions, firms which have already been approached around the website work would not be appropriate.

**Action:** **JS** and **CC** to agree the text of an advert;  
**PL** to arrange for this to be examined by a local expert.  
Circulation with advert for Secretary if possible, noting that PL is on holiday next week.

#### **4. Policy on refund of entry fees and on assisting organisers in resolving Paypal disputes (MF)**

This question has arisen because a rider, having decided not to start an event, had started a Paypal dispute in order to recover his entry fee.

(Noted that the particular dispute has been resolved, earlier today, following the organiser and others making statements on social media, and the involvement of officials from the rider's cycling club.)

The broader question of how we should both clarify our policy that entry fees are not refundable, and support organisers, remains: the sums in question are generally negligible, the occurrences rare (as far as we are aware, it has happened no more than five times in the past two years), but it may lead to an organiser's Paypal account being locked so that they have no access to event funds. We may be able to reimburse organisers if riders are successful in reclaiming entry fees, or to provide short-term funding if an organiser's account has been locked: details and conditions would need to be agreed.

Sanctions against individual riders are not likely to have teeth, especially against non-members (and the question of a blacklist raises uncomfortable questions); nonetheless, the fact we can refuse to validate rides or organisers can refuse to accept entries from particular individuals may be a useful lever to prompt swift resolution of a situation.

In the longer term, if we were to process payments centrally, this might help to clarify the role of AUK and the position of our terms and conditions around entry to events: the combined transaction volume might also mean that we could use a conventional payments processor rather than relying on Paypal. It would, though,

require a well-defined scheme for distributing payments to individual organisers, which might impose an unacceptable administrative burden.

**Action:** **PL** to draft a proposal including a policy for the reimbursement of reversed payments and making short-term funding available if an organiser's account is locked.

## 5. **Route validation software: update (PL)**

Order has been placed with the developer today (10 Feb) for the core functions defined as necessary after consultations with DIY orgs and JW. This is expected to need further tweaks once the DIY organisers have had the opportunity to use the initial release, but these should be minor

Noted that JW has drafted a guide to Mandatory Route DIYs which is now available to riders on Aukweb: PL welcomed it, subject to minor revisions especially around the management and submission of GPS files.

**Action:** **PL** to suggest revisions to the guide to Mandatory Routes;  
**JW** to circulate revised version to DIY organisers for comment.

## 6. **Website development: update (PL/GL)**

(Discussed largely together with item 3)

GL has met with FireAnt, a web development company whose work he is familiar with. They have produced a project outline which has something in common with that previously received from Invent Partners: he and CC believe that the similarities in approach and price are such that the two documents effectively validate each other, so we are left with two realistic candidates.

FireAnt would intend to ensure that the backend database is relatively tightly integrated with the front, rather than going down two separate development paths. They have suggested running the new database in parallel with the old (with a 'mother-daughter' relationship replicating content and populating new entries), then doing a gradual swap of functions in October in order to manage the migration process.

PL asked about FireAnt's choice of CMS: they have suggested WordPress, which is open source and widely distributed, in contrast to Invent's use of their own CMS, which remains proprietary albeit that source code would be available.

Noted that although a new IT Director would have to acknowledge that some work was already in progress, they might have a preferred choice of web developer and while we want to ensure speedy development of the new site, this must not pre-empt any new appointment. A few weeks' delay is less important than getting the project right.

CB asked if an evaluation/recommendation of the two current project proposals could be produced for the next Board meeting. Although it was suggested that this might be helpful for a newly appointed IT Director, it was felt they should be

able to form their own judgment rather than being presented with a lay evaluation. Nonetheless, a summary outlining the chief points of each company's approach and allowing a quick comparison would remain helpful for other Board members.

**Action:** **GL** to circulate the document received from FireAnt **and** to prepare a short overview of the Invent and FireAnt approaches. Noted that a decision cannot be expected until a new IT Director has had the opportunity to make a recommendation

**7. Any other urgent business**

None

**8. Close**

Meeting closed 9pm