

**Draft minutes of East Group Zoom Meeting of County  
Reps (CRs): 25 February 2021 at 17:00**

Meeting hosted by Andy Gregory (Norfolk)

*Present:* Colin Croucher (Chair East Group; Herts.),  
Andy Gregory (Norfolk), Mike Hudson (Cams. & Hunts.),  
Graeme Presswell (Beds.), Terry Sims (Essex), Chris Watson  
(representing Suffolk, deputising for Ken Jones); Joe Perry  
(purely to take minutes).

*Apologies:* None

*1) Introductions*

CC welcomed everyone. He began the meeting by calling for a short silence to remember Senior cricketers who had passed away during the close season. CC stressed that his main concern was to avoid unnecessary politics and concentrate on getting back to playing cricket, for which we should all be grateful. This view was supported generally. CC emphasised that the role of the Chair of the East Group should be to act as a link between the Management Committee (MC) and the counties in the East Group. There was some doubt over whether CC had been formally voted in as Regional Chair (RC), therefore CC was formally proposed by MH and seconded by TS and continued to Chair this meeting. CC stressed the need for encouragement of all counties to involve as many cricketers as possible and to play as much seniors cricket as possible.

*2) Minutes of National Committee Meeting; 3 February 2021*

CC took the meeting through the minutes asking if there were any questions on each section addressed. Regarding the Leicestershire email copied to the MC and all RCs, CC the tone was threatening. AG asked if the email was confidential; it was not marked as such. AG suggested that there should be independent oversight of the procedure for accepting or rejecting the charges against Clive Ricks. MH considered that although the outcome was a whitewash there was no point in trying to do anything about it and agreed with everyone that

we should now get on and play cricket.

CC reported that discussion of the letter from the Northern Group had been very long, but he felt that most issues were now resolved.

Regarding season 2020, AG said that MC should have had a contingency plan regarding the Covid restrictions instead of expecting every county and group to organise matches on their own; CC has asked the MC to make such plans for season 2021.

All counties have updated their website in accordance with Derrick Sheldon's upgrade.

Regarding GDPR, AG confirmed that legally, everyone should give their express written permission for their data to be used; all agreed that all organisations need a written policy. TS said that dates of birth especially should be protected more than is the case at present. Essex have introduced a password system on their Excel spreadsheets to restrict access to d.o.b. information.

The Leicestershire position on Constitutional matters was noted; CC reported that the MC will set up a working group to revise the Constitution.

### *3) Working Group (WG) report*

CC invited comments on the WG report, section by section

#### *a) Communication*

All counties reported they had fed views to Chris Swadkin.

CC said he does not know or need to know what each county said. AG said he agreed with recommendations of WG regarding communication, but would like more explanation of why MC take various actions, e.g. the decision to have five RGs instead of the four recommended by the WG. CC explained that this was done to achieve long-term stability instead of the previous tying of county groups to the O60s 1<sup>st</sup> XI playing groups. AG agreed that it was good to keep the same groups for playing purposes. TS asked about the need to copy emails to the RC; CC replied he does not want to see every email unless related to playing cricket. CW did not agree with moving meetings around the country, but CC felt personally comfortable with this recommendation.

#### *b) Organisation*

No comments

#### *c) Transparency*

All agreed with recommendation 2, concerning minutes.

*d) Stability*

GP would like more stability for geographic groups, to avoid changing every year. MH said Cambs. were now happy with the group stage which involves them in less travel; they too supported more stability. TS explained that Essex had had various problems with agreeing grounds with counties coming from long distances; he saw pros and cons to the stability proposals. CC agreed with TS – Herts would go anywhere to play. CW said Suffolk are also in favour of greater stability for groups. AG was happy with the new group structure but warned that counties need to think about how many groups there should be if they wanted stability.

AG asked about how easy it was to ‘meet opponents halfway’ when otherwise fixtures would involve travel of greater than 150 miles. GP agreed there were potential problems but most others felt it had worked well in the past. CC felt that halfway games should be arranged via the relevant CR. Regarding guidelines for travel, previously the 150-mile guidance has never been made mandatory; O50s comply because of explicit ECB guidelines on H&S.

*e) Professional approach*

CW agreed with the recommendations. TS felt Zoom meetings were OK, if paid for centrally and not by individual counties. AG outlined Zoom charges. MH supported idea of Zoom meetings, particularly because it would save travel expenses. GP agreed. MH proposed that the MC should look into this; CC agreed to pass this on.

**Action: CC**

*f) Constitution*

GP could not see why this was an issue. TS agreed that Constitutional matters should be parked now and then brought up again in the Autumn at the AGM. CC reported that the post of Vice-Chair nationally should be made part of the Constitution. All agreed that they were happy with formalising this procedure.

*g) Other matters*

AG suggested a careful and structured approach to changes to the Constitution, explaining what and why and that proposals should be circulated well in advance of an AGM. All agreed that discussions should take place *prior* to AGM, not at the

AGM itself. All counties felt that AGMs need to be brief and not full of contentious issues. Also, all were agreed that only reps should speak at an AGM.

*General discussion on WG report*

CC could not yet say when or how WG report would be discussed.

GP asked whether WG has indeed calmed down dissention;

CC could not say whether this has been achieved or not.

GP stressed need for MC to answer queries quickly, honestly and transparently.

4) *Disciplinary enquiry* CC could not make any comment at this stage. TS said Andrew Gallant had not had any discussions with TS regarding this, and that the enquiry has no connection to the business of Essex cricket.

5) *Any other business*

With regard to defibrillators, CC stressed need to check pads (which last two years and cost £50 each) and batteries (which last four years and cost £200 each). AG recommended training as many people as possible in their use. All were agreed that counties should move towards having one defibrillator per team.

CC raised the definition of grandfather rights – he felt this needed better explanation in the Constitution. TS said playing for a county for some long time period should be enough qualification. AG said O50s rules on eligibility should be followed. TS stressed importance of clarity in the rules. GP felt that current rules are far too detailed and the whole issue has been overexaggerated in its importance; it should not stop people playing cricket.

CC reported that RCs currently do not sit on the MC, despite the recommendations of the WG. There was discussion of whether East Group Chair should sit on MC and whether they should have voting rights; most thought they must attend but should not necessarily have voting rights.

The meeting ended at 18:35