

Transcript

December 13, 2024, 8:58PM

AM **Alan MacDonald** 0:03

And they are both better than the status quo, which is clearly unfair. But they do deliver different league tables occasionally. And importantly, they reflect different views of what a league should be about. And you know how final league position should be derived. If you take our solution, it views the league as the aggregated result.

Of every club's performance in four matches and in those four matches because of the adjustment of league points, you effectively compete.

Only once against the other 17 clubs.

The solution delivers a fair match day result which is directly correlated to the individual performances on the day.

The aggregated unadjusted match points could be distorted.

But because the by the twin club assignment, but that's not a problem if you are focusing on league position being determined by adjusted league points, and if you'd have any tiebreaker.

Because of two clubs finishing on the same league points, I'd suggest that that's been based on head to head results. I think our approach is absolutely straightforward. It's it's, it's basically gives you a straightforward result on the day and gives you a straightforward lead position and we think it intuitively matches the generally accepted view that the league should reflect match based results.

And if you take the alternative, which is abolishing league points and only focusing on adjusted match points for league position effectively, what that's doing is viewing the league as the aggregated result, as Mick suggested, really it's the aggregated result of 72 individual competitions.

+44***57** 1:49
None.

AM **Alan MacDonald** 1:57

Between up to 18 athletes over the entire season.

That doesn't deliver you fair match day results.


Mixed compromise would, but it's kind of a compromise, one in parallel, which has been ignored over the season.


That, Alan said, moves the league fundamentally away from match based results and that alters the spirit of the league quite substantially. It's not that it's unfair, but it is very abstract.


And for one reason why I would say that is that, you know, I think we're all in a position as team managers where only a minority of our athletes.


Typically compete in the same events across all four matches, so this sort of theoretical individual competition between 18 doesn't really exist. What does exist is format and we go out to do our best in all four of those.

Fair Match day results and fairly position based on those results. That's how I feel about it. As I say, I understand that this does take a bit of thinking about, but I would prefer either that we vote.

 **+44*****57** 2:56
Text out, by the way.

 **Alan MacDonald** 3:11
To I would certainly prefer that we vote to change the current system and that we vote between the two alternatives today. But if people feel that they think. Circulate the material and have them do so, and that's all I had.

 **+44*****57** 3:24
Can't get can't get anything.

 **Nicola Barberis Negra** 3:29
Thank you, Alan. Before Stuart, just one second, I'll pass it on to you in a second and then it's Mr and standing second, we have a few comments on the chart, which I think are pretty much well aligned to say that that this is too technical or there's a lot of things to consider and maybe there's not a place tonight to vote for that. I'm just summarising different comments, if that's OK. I'm not going to all of them, but there are two or three person that have made that comment.
And I'll pass it on to Stuart.
You are and and then you stand standing. What's next and.
You are? Yeah. Cool. There you are.

SF **Stuart Flack** 4:07

Alright. Yeah, thanks. Thanks. Yeah, so.

I feel pretty strongly about this, so it's disappointing because I missed the ageem last year unfortunately, but the the season before last Epsom and Eww, Harriers were effectively relegated as a result direct result of the current scoring system and I don't think we need to and I appreciate some people finding this quite hard to follow, but I think the crux of it is.

If you are paired with a team that's much weaker than you, then it is fundamentally unfair in subsequent matches when deciding how well you do against other teams. Is actually affected by the fact that your happen to be paired with or team rather than a stronger team, and I say we we basically had one fixture where there's lots of similar teams. We ended up losing about, I think 2 1/2 match points in one match. And that was comfortably the difference between us staying up and getting relegated. So very pleased we were promoted back to Division One this year, but I'd rather not have the same thing happen again. So I think the last suggest because I appreciate this is very complicated and it's very hard to choose between.

AM **Alan MacDonald** 5:09

Yeah.

SF **Stuart Flack** 5:26

22 new scoring systems, but I think it would be helpful to at least vote on the fact that the current scoring system is unfair, and then maybe follow up with exactly. What scoring system we adopt, I have to say personally I'll be happy with either of the two approaches. I don't feel that strongly because.

But what I do feel strongly about is the current scoring system is is unfair and it affects the league positions and promotion and relegations and there's definitely a way around it so.

Thank you.

 **Nicola Barberis Negra** 6:05

Thank you. Then it's the next one is put your hand down. That'll be great. And then you miser, understanding in his next.

Yeah, that, yes.

MS **Mr N Standing** 6:15

Yeah, I'm completely. Yeah, sorry. I completely agree with Stuart.

From bracknell's perspective, we've.

Kind of.

On the other end of the stick been benefiting from quite a few years of being paired with stronger clubs. I think ultimately.

System of pairing clubs is inherently unfair so, but I don't think it's necessarily the point system to sort that. Whether it's unfair or not, I think there's probably needs to be more structural changes with how the league is run in a division based situation, but I don't think tonight's the correct forum for that.

 **Nicola Barberis Negra** 7:02

Thank you.

MS **Mr N Standing** 7:02

And so.

 **Nicola Barberis Negra** 7:04

Thank you. Then any doubt followed by Josh.

DC **Doug Christie** 7:09

OK. And I I think I'll be disagreeing with what's been said so far. Firstly, procedurally, we can't do it like this. We can't bounce a big issue like this on a on an AOB with no papers just prepared, sent out in advance. It's too complex, too much to ask. It's either got preferably put back to next year, you missed your chance for this year. It's got to be put back to next year in my view. Secondly.

I'm in the middle way to that would be to do it on paper.

Over a period of time, but I would say the right procedure is in a meeting and therefore the chance have been secondly, I don't think it's unfair at all the the the problem you're you're starting from a position that, oh, I've lost points or I've gained points. But in fact the second match and the third match and the fourth match, you're only against four other teams. You should be against the team. That's the top or the bottom. There happens to be there and you have to be running against the soon as you start.

Scoring points against them. Then you've either lost out because they're the best team in the league, or they're about or you've gained artificially because they're the worst team. So it's not a perfect system at them.

I mean there there was a, you know, there can be slight criticisms on it, particularly if you land up paired to a team when it's their home match. But you know the reality is I think it's been looked at from the wrong end of the telescope here. If you do anything along the line suggested, you'll be disadvantaged if you're paired with a strong team and you'll be advantage if you're paired with a weaker team. Now I see people.

You know, might be shaking their head, but maybe that's because you're going to take a lot longer to persuade me.

Just bouncing me with documents that are flicked up and down on the screen quickly. I I don't see that at all. You you're saying we're losing points, but you're not. You're not losing points. You're not gaining points because you've got to disregard that team because otherwise you're competing against them more than once. That's what I say.



Nicola Barberis Negra 9:10

Thank you. And so you're Josh and then Stu again.



Josh Hawkins - Brighton 9:16

Yeah. Hi guys. So actually I wanna agree with Doug firstly there like I think he made some good points about that. So last season we were paired with hopefully his Wimbledon who ended up scoring 520 points in Division One and ourselves. Brighton and Hove got 19 league points coming third overall. So effectively we were the much stronger team with that pair against a very weaker team in that division. But this did not negatively impact us as each time for them they weren't there. And so we had to ignore them. However, if we were to score against them like you are saying in your system, how is that fairly themselves? So they they came last as it was.

But now they would have to face the one of the stronger teams in that league 'cause it was last year, every single time, but they would have then even been more negatively affected. However, we weren't negatively affected from then, as the lowest we came in a match was second and they didn't stop us from winning a match. The

matches we didn't win. We didn't win because the teams were better than us and we weren't able to beat them ourselves.



Nicola Barberis Negra 10:14

Thank you, Josh, that that, that's.



Josh Hawkins - Brighton 10:14

But yeah, I'd just like to say that I think that, yeah, I agree that the system hasn't doesn't have its like excellence in every way. But there are there aren't as many floors that people are making out. It's the simple matter is if you can score more than other teams you will. It's not an excuse of this team's weak. So therefore other people are scoring, you're still score against them. Other teams you either have to beat them in the match to get more points or you don't. It's as simple as that really. I think the system as it is.

It works like you say, and I think it's too late to make them changes now. You can't be bouncing around like Doug's saying with these new changes.



Nicola Barberis Negra 10:49

Thank you, Josh.

That you're OK. Can you just put your hand down and any steward and.

Alan and Paul.



Stuart Flack 10:59

Yeah, so, so I don't want to keep going round in circles. So I think the point we're trying to make and clearly not explaining very well so far is that who you are paired with.

Affects the result of matches in two to four under the current system and who you are paired with should not affect the result of that match. That is what we're trying to say, and I think there are alternative scoring methods which remove that and are fundamentally fairer.

But I appreciate it's not easy to get your head around that when it's bouncing around.

But I think.

It if, if, if we could explain it properly, I think everybody that has end up being paired with somebody.

That seems you're competing against are getting three points. If you if you're. Again. If you're paired with a team that's finishing bottom of the league.

You you are competing on the day.

Against clubs that are getting a bonus 4050 points and you can't, you know, if you as an average team, you're not gonna catch that on a team that is of similar ability to you and you shouldn't be losing points in subsequent matches purely as a result of who you are paired with.

Sorry, sorry. I won't talk again.



Nicola Barberis Negra 12:28

Thanks, Stuart. Allan, Holly and then Allison, Ted, Josh, keep your your hand is still up. Can you put it down unless you're gonna and then say, Stuart, please, do you mind your hand down? So I'll, I'll, I'll back to to you.



Alan MacDonald 12:44

Yeah, just firstly to say I'm in to Doug, I I totally agree about bouncing into a decision and it being very tricky to do that. We did try to submit the proposal very soon after the the the date was circulated and so forth. We we did submit it some time ago and we would like to have circulated material for people to have seen it sooner. I would agree that taking some time to to consider it properly now.

Is the right way to go. I would not agree with not making any change for the next season, and I would certainly agree with what Stuart just said. It isn't that we are making changes that take away the.

Affair system for all clubs. The current system is simply not fair and if you review the material you get the chance to review the material properly. Both the material mix submitted.

And that we submitted shows the same thing that you get a dramatically better result in a match and then you would if you are twinned with a strong club then a club that gets an identical results to you but is it's twinned with a weak club. That's simply a fact and it can be demonstrated very clearly with reference to existing, you know actual results.

Time and again.

And as Stewart says, that can affect promotions and relegations.

Effectively, you should only. You should. You do need to adjust for the twin club, but you should only adjust either the match points or the league points, not both. I too

would be happy to accept either solution. I think our solution is far more intuitive and more straightforward because it gives that straightforward match day result that is fair as well as.

A fairly position over the season, but that's to be considered.

But I've been strongly suggest that the current situation does not.

To give fair results over the season, the combination of adjustments of both points does not do that. Thank you.



Nicola Barberis Negra 15:12

So sorry I was mute and talking to myself in my room. Only you're next then Allison and.



Holly BBHAC 15:20

I completely agree with Alan. Like something needs to be done because we were a team that were negatively impacted by the artificial inflation of other people's results. Our match pair is being relegated, but I also don't think that we're potentially in a position to make that decision today. So I think we kind of just rather than going round in circles need to just decide, are we going to make a decision on this today because it's getting quite late.

And just go from there rather than keep going back and forth over, I think this I think that.

Thank you.



Alan MacDonald 15:51

Yeah.



Nicola Barberis Negra 15:53

Thank. Thank you, Holly, Allison and South of A/C. And then maybe we can decide with this. But Alison people quest.



Alan MacDonald 15:53

Can we agree?



Alison Parker 16:00

Yeah, I I agree with Holly. I think I don't think we can make a decision as to what

points scoring we go into tonight. But I think we need to make a decision as to whether we're going to change it or not. I know we've missed out on promotion for two years running because of the way that the the league points are done and the match points are done. So I would definitely vote for for a change in the way it's done. But I think more detail needs to be circulated.

And I don't think it's too late in the day to change it, because at the end of the day this is the AGM and if we're not going to make changes here, when are we going to make changes so?

I think we should have some form of vote tonight.



Nicola Barberis Negra 16:41

Thank you. I was on the software basically.

And we can't hear you.

You're unmuted, but we can't hear you.

If it's your headset or something, we can see you talking, but we can't hear.



Southwark AC 17:03

Hopefully that's better.



Nicola Barberis Negra 17:04

Yep.



Southwark AC 17:06

Yeah. Sorry. I'll keep it quick. My name is Alistair, by the way. I wasn't able to change it on teams.

I agree seems to be going in circles, partly because of a lot of the arguments that are being made are anecdotal and.

Surely this is something that has a correct answer and if anyone who has a mathematical or statistical qualifications is able to run, maybe a simulation on this or. In some way go through the logic.

I feel like this is a problem that does have a fair correct solution that maybe we just need someone to go and and work out for us.

I'd be interested in hearing the result of that working out potentially before voting.



Nicola Barberis Negra 18:02

Sorry again. Talk to myself. Thanks Alistair. And Nick, you are next.



Mick.Bromilow 18:09

I just wanted to say that I am an applied mathematician. I worked at the University for 40 years, including seven years as head of maths and stats, so I do know a little bit of what I'm talking about.



+44***57** 18:19

The.



Mick.Bromilow 18:27

I know it's often very hard to get across, but.

I would if I could find the system that would involve league points, which was fair to all clubs.

I'd be quite happy to put it forward, but I can't see a system where involving lead points gets a fair outcome for all the clubs involved.

Which is why I suggested that the league should only be based on the accumulated adjusted points.

Because that gives you a measure of the strength of each team against each other team over the four matches.

That's my lot.



Nicola Barberis Negra 19:15

But thank you, Nick. And I don't think we've any more handout. So and then just check the chat if there's anything else say here because.

New things.

Are the comment that say should they vote be whether we should consider or change the scoring and consider which solution is preferred as Alan gets to Alan and that again there are a few more comments, I'll say the decision will be.

Voted tonight.

Hello, Keith. Where we gonna take it from here? I think I think we have a lot of comments and opinion on this.

Including people feeling not comfortable in both internal because of the need for a

little more investigation on these options. So I don't know where we want to go from here.

 **Keith Scofield** 20:12

Yeah, no idea either, mate. I mean, unfortunately, you know, we did vote for 18 club leagues a couple of years back, and Mick did warn us on the fact that if we're voting for that, it would impact the scoring. So I'm not sure what we do.

Ray, have you got anything? I mean, not sure. Obviously this is you know, the things that have been presented are you know, it's sorry to see.

That the clubs have been affected by this, but the only way I can see out of it is we go back to what we previously had and that's the the 14 club divisions with five matches or whatever it was the previous time.

But anyway, that's we'll have to debate it, I guess.

With the management committee or something.

 **+44*****57** 21:03

Can you hear me now?

 **Keith Scofield** 21:04

Yep.

 **Nicola Barberis Negra** 21:04

Yeah.

 **+44*****57** 21:06

I I would back up what Mick just said and you just said.

There's a a bit of, you know, I don't think we can make a final decision. I think if we had a vote, we'd want change and and that would be my gut feeling from what's been said. But I think if Victoria is happy to have a.

Management meeting, be it online.

Between the management committee that it, we ought to.

I did the the arguments for and against and I I actually like mixed proposal which is accumulated points.

Remain so that you have your six down to one for all the matches. Then you actually have the league points different so that you're only scoring league against each club

once.

And I will be slay a top team. Are always gonna get the extra point.

Always top of the league, the bottom team are gonna get nothing so.

I'm saying is.

That that would be my recommendation is datamik.

Happy that the alternative is to do the vote now and go and and I would second.

Second proposal that we vote for the accumulated points to go back to what they would have been with six clubs in the match and that the league tables be based on the.

Only has.

54321 in the first match and then 54321 in the other.

By the way.

 **Keith Scofield** 23:00

Right, right. What about if we have a vote to see if we make a change tonight or not?

 **+44*****57** 23:00

If we don't.

So we can vote for the change.

 **Nicola Barberis Negra** 23:09

But.

 **+44*****57** 23:11

Then and then sit down with Mick to decide what the change is, but then you know we we would then need another vote to say which way we would change, would we? The whole if we do the whole accumulated. So it's 8 tables are still six points down to one. Obviously that's still going to be unfair in in a reverse way.

So I that's why I mix looked at it and he said.

I'll see a fair, fair way, but the best way at the moment is to.


Having.

Bated scores matches and the.

Tables so that they're only against each club once, and I agree with that.

 **Keith Scofield** 24:01

But what I'm saying is, do we want to vote to see do we make those changes vote to make those changes or we wait for next year or or or is everyone saying?

 **+44*****57** 24:12

I'm suggesting we have a management committee.

And Management committee and and if if mix obviously the.

 **Keith Scofield** 24:17

OK, OK. Fair enough.

 **+44*****57** 24:26

Came up with come up with formulas started many years ago and I think he's quite capable of leading us.

 **Nicola Barberis Negra** 24:38

I think.

 **+44*****57** 24:38

And and if put it so that if.

 **Mick.Bromilow** 24:39

Can I just comment there, Ray, I think if we do have a management committee, we should invite the two Allen's to join us because I don't think we should have a debate without the people who are proposing an alternative system being present.

 **Keith Scofield** 24:53

Yep, fine my mate.

 **+44*****57** 24:54

Apps.

 **Nicola Barberis Negra** 24:54

It's been sorry, but there are some comments on the chart for you people that would prefer the law to be put to the cloud and not led to be to meet you alone. So maybe that's what we can vote tonight. If the proposals to go out once we agree on the

proposal, the proposal should go out to the club to be voted on e-mail.
Or if the committee should look into that, obviously with the support of Allan and the meeting of so coming, coming to present, maybe the the document, maybe that could be developed. I'm just pulling it out there.

Oh, sorry kid, sorry.

 **Keith Scofield** 25:32

To to see if we are making changes or we wait till next year, but yes.

 **Nicola Barberis Negra** 25:38

Sorry, sorry, kid. Bye. Shut up.

 **Keith Scofield** 25:39

No, that's fine. I think there's personally, I agree that there's a lot, a lot to take in and without someone said without scrolling up and down someone else's screen, it's very, very difficult to take in.

I agree with one of the message here. I don't think it's a committee should agree this. I think it's more that it should be go to the you know like I said back when we voted for 18 clubs in Division One and two you know some people didn't want it but.

Others voted for it, and when we will, you know, that's the way we've got to. We've got to go. We've got to go with what is voted for and put forward and whether that's for or against we we we vote with that. So I think we.

We also may be, you know, need to make sure that things are just tightened on the AGM process.

 **+44*****57** 26:41

Well.

Enough at the vote go from there.

 **Keith Scofield** 26:49

What? Sorry. What? What? I suggested we vote to make the change this year or wait.

 **+44*****57** 26:55

Yes, that's correct.

B **Brian** 26:55

A minute. We have to be careful here not to go against AGM protocols. It's not a formal motion. You shouldn't be doing aobs in agms. Anyway. We can't. We can't decide I'm dead against.

AM **Alan MacDonald** 27:07

No, no, I disagree. I disagree on the basis of what was discussed right at the beginning by Alan and backed up by Ray that the scoring system is not part of the rules of the league and therefore you don't actually need a formal motion to change the rule.

PY **Phil York** 27:20

What?

AM **Alan MacDonald** 27:28

And overwhelmingly.

B **Brian** 27:28

I don't, I don't agree clearly, it's fundamental to the league. Ray made it very clear the league is for the clubs. I think we take all the information away. The management committee make a recommendation. We have to hold an EGM.

AM **Alan MacDonald** 27:43

I agree with that.

B **Brian** 27:45

We can't do any other logical way of I along with others have been to enough agms and agms over the years to know that it's the only correct way forward.

AM **Alan MacDonald** 27:54

Yeah, I would agree with that.

KS **Keith Scofield** 27:56

Fair enough.

B **Brian** 27:56

I propose that we we have to close this meeting now. It's up as 9:00 at night.

We have to say the management committee debates it first, but it has to go back to the clubs as in a form of an EGM, it can't be done over e-mail. It's too big, too big.

AM **Alan MacDonald** 28:09

Yeah.

KS **Keith Scofield** 28:09

Yeah, I agree.

OK, we'll, we'll, we'll we'll go away as management committee and then do an EGM.

Take it back to the clubs.

 **Nicola Barberis Negra** 28:22

Yeah, sounds good.

KS