

2017 ECF Finance Council Meeting - Bronze Member Responses

--- Voting Reform ---

Resp.	Abol. GF?	Budget?	Fee increases?	Option?	Opt 3 - DMR votes	Opt 3 - Categories?	Let the BMDR decide?	Sample comments
IR	Y							ask new players to play for the team, as it is likely that they are not ECF members. I am reluctant to charge them for playing (the £2.50 game fee) as pupils at the school do not pay for other sports. I have a number of boys who I would like to introduce to adult chess, perhaps playing a game or two on bottom board for the school team, but the game fee discourages me from asking them to play. I fully agree with the proposal to allow 3 games (I would prefer it to be 5 games) without payment.
RW		N	N	1				<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No strong views on game fee 2. Oppose the budget. Should not be budgeting for a deficit; seems morally wrong to disregard the instructions of the JRYT trust; waste if £8k per annum on the library which is not being used; I don't believe club players should be funding international chess, Home chess, the British championships or women's chess 3. Against increasing game fee - I suspect the vast majority of ECF members are only interested in getting their games graded 4. I am strongly in favour of option one.
PL	Y		Y					I only comment to agree that game fee should be abolished and agree that bronze fee should increase for seniors but no not see any advantage in reducing it for juniors... Increasing the adult membership fee while reducing the junior fee seems strange, but can probably be justified in the cause of encouraging youngsters to take up the game at the league level. The increase is not unreasonable.
HB	Y		Y	1				I am in favour of the abolition of game fees. We have had the situation where a player is "volunteered" to avoid us defaulting a board. This would avoid having to charge them for the privilege.
JH							Y	Thank you for your thorough assessment of the meeting options. Your commentary looks very valid and I would like you to vote on my behalf as you think fit, as my proxy.

Resp.	Abol. GF?	Budget?	Fee increases?	Option?	Opt 3 - DMR votes	Opt 3 - Categories?	Let the BMDR decide?	Sample comments
								<p>we agree with you that questions need to be asked on all the issues that you raise. However, we would not agree with a vote against the budget... On the specific issues that you mention. In general, we feel that activities which encourage the top junior players in the country are welcome, although the ECF has relatively scarce resources compared to those available to juniors in other countries where there is often significant government help and commercial sponsorship. It is no wonder that our juniors lag behind. We agree that the John Robinson Youth Chess Trust should not overstretch itself, but in an era of low interest rates, it would not be unreasonable to distribute some of the real capital gains which we assume have been achieved over inflation in recent years.</p> <p>On the budget for international chess, whilst it is good to see the best English GM's playing for the England Team, we feel that it would be nice if there was greater support for elite juniors and also that the GMs who play for England give something back to the next generation of chess players. Some of the best GMs are unwilling to train the next generation of juniors seeking titles.</p> <p>We fully agree with your comments on the National Chess Library but the ECF do need to ensure that any valuable items are safely stored.</p>
CG		A	Y					We are in favour of increasing the [membership] fees.
CG		A	Y					Same as for previous respondent.
BM								If someone is playing in a League without ECF membership I would suggest the ECF, sends an application form after a given number of games or emails a form, lets the club concerned know, and await the membership fee. We are mostly amateur players, and need support not punitive fines to make us join.

Resp.	Abol. GF?	Budget?	Fee increases?	Option?	Opt 3 - DMR votes	Opt 3 - Categories?	Let the BMDR decide?	Sample comments
RH	Y	?	Y	3		Y		<p>1. Agree to support, but I share your concern about future administrative costs, particularly if the ECF systems are not quite so automated as claimed!</p> <p>2. If the ECF is to continue to exist, then clearly a budget must be agreed, but I would support withholding agreement until satisfactory explanations have been provided about both the John Robinson Youth Trust and the National Chess Library.</p> <p>3. What a mess we're in re the junior bronze membership fee - it could only happen with the ECF! But agree to increases when, and only when, this has been clarified.</p> <p>4. I agree with your own thoughts. Having representatives for different membership categories DOES work - look no further than yourself!</p>
AC			Y					<p>My only comment is re membership prices. I dont see how a proposed reduction can be supported in light of the overall financial position. I think the adult membership fees should rise as suggested but juniors should stay the same.</p>
LR	Y	?	Y	1				<p>become members.</p> <p>I believe that the ECF should aim to stay within its means; i.e. not budget for a loss on an ongoing basis. I support you asking for more detail. But I think we either need to aim to raise more income (through sponsorship or membership fees - see below) or, sadly, reduce costs (efficiency savings but ultimately spending less money). The chess library seems to be something nobody wants really. I'd be inclined to auction off the books or give them to schools.</p> <p>I would enthusiastically support an increase in membership fee.</p> <p>I support option one on voting reform as the purest form of democracy, then option 2 as the second best and then option 3.</p>

Resp.	Abol. GF?	Budget?	Fee increases?	Option?	Opt 3 - DMR votes	Opt 3 - Categories?	Let the BMDR decide?	Sample comments	
MS				Y	1?			I strongly favour any increase in the value of individual member votes on issues. Dictatorships or leadership by enlightened committees work well if the aforesaid are on the right track. Is the ECF on the right track? I don't think so. It seems to me that they have lost contact with the grass roots and what is needed to stimulate growth in the clubs....especially any clubs some distance from the South East of the country. I feel sure that there are clubs scattered around the country that are thriving and expanding. These should be identified, contacted and promoted as role models.	
MS	Y	N	N	1				I very much agree with your voting inclination on all topics.	
TR		A	N	2					
BJ							Y		
ES	N								
AF	Y?								
AH	Y	N	?	3			Y		
ME							Y		
JS	Y?		Y	3			Y		
LW	Y		Y						
CW	Y?	N		3					
BC	N	N	Y	3					
SM	N		Y	A					
GM	N	N	N	3					Via PH
ST	N	N	N	3					Via PH
RM	N	N	N	3					Via PH
GN	N	N	N	3					Via PH
JM	N	N	N	3					Via PH
JF	N	N	N	3					Via PH
KW	N	N	N	3					Via PH
DA	N	N	N	3					Via PH
JW	N	N	N	3				Via PH	
GH		N?	N?						

Resp.	Abol. GF?	Budget?	Fee increases?	Option?	Opt 3 - DMR votes	Opt 3 - Categories?	Let the BMDR decide?	Sample comments
CT	Y		N?	3				BMDR.
RD	N		N				Y	
PI	Y							
DG	Y		N					
AF	Y	N	N	23	100	Y		
39	Y: 12	Y: 0	Y: 11	1: 4	Y: 0	Y: 2	6	
	N: 13	N: 15	N: 15	2: 1	N: 0	N: 0		
				3: 15				

Qs/Comments

- Why doesn't the proposal to abolish game fee include junior-only congresses?
- Number of respondents not keen on a reduction in the Junior Bronze rate. 1+?+1+1+1