

Hellevoetsluis
Monday 12th February 2018

Dear Hockey Friends,

We had a very well attended WGMA Board Meeting on Tuesday 6th February in Amsterdam at which all members of the WGMA executive committee were present plus three of our five vice presidents and a specially invited consultant.

The views from Australia, Japan and South Africa were presented at the board meeting and we were later joined by representatives from the working groups and delegates from the Netherlands, Scotland, Wales and LX.

I am glad to report that everyone left in a very positive mood. WMH was, of course, approved in principle at our EGM in Glasgow and we now are anxious to work within the time line that was set as our target. This means that we must get the final approval of our members at our Congress in Barcelona in June.

To achieve this we need our members to be able to see clearly how WGMA is incorporated in the new organisation and be reassured that they have a role to play in the further development of Masters and Grand Masters hockey.

The consensus of opinion within WGMA (Board and members) is outlined below and it is important that we address these points as the first main item of the agenda at our next meeting.

- 1. WGMA and IMHA in their current form should be reflected as two divisions within the initial Events structure of WMH - both have run successful tournaments and bring their expertise to the new organisation. Acknowledgement of this success should be visible in the new structure and there should be no immediate change to Masters and Grand Masters age divisions.*
- 2. For the reassurance of the members of both associations, there should be representatives from the current management of WGMA and IMHA on the first board of WMH. Again this demonstrates continuity and evolution rather than dramatic change. After the initial period - perhaps two years - there should continue to be representatives on the board from any subsequent tournament divisions by age groups or gender.*
- 3. IMHA and WGMA should jointly propose the personnel that they recommend to members as the first board. It is hoped that members would follow these recommendations but other nominees could, of course, be proposed.*

4. *The current network of delegates to both WGMA and IMHA must see a role for themselves in a continuing relationship with WMH.
This means that there should be two delegates representing each member nation, each representing one of the two age divisions (Masters and Grand Masters) in which that nation may be competing.
Should there be further division of the age groups, there should be a delegate to represent each tournament division.
At present we allow a delegate and an observer at Congress, perhaps in future there could be two (or later three) delegates per country but only one national vote to ensure coordination within each nation?*

NB If the structure outlined above can be agreed for the initial two years of WMH and if the representation of members is as per the delegate suggestion above, then members should be confident that they will have an ongoing influence in any proposed changes in the future and will support WMH.

We have taken legal advice on the existing Memorandum & Articles and it was quite accurately described as a cut-and-paste job which we should not support in its current form. We have asked our lawyers to prepare a new custom-built version which is more appropriate for an independent volunteer organisation which will operate as a company limited by guarantee and one which will incorporate all that our members feel to be important for the success of this joint venture (as above).

We are trying to establish the date on which this new document will be available for circulation and will share this with you as we are well aware that time is of the essence.

Wim van Noortwijk

President WGMA