

Individual Feedback from Club Affiliation: Member Consultation

Feedback was requested on the following questions:

1. What do you think about the concept of a primary 'competition' club, which is typically fixed (for the season?)
2. Do you agree that this should be applied to compete level (including ranking events) with more flexibility applied for recreational level events?
3. Do you agree that clubs should have a say in who represents them in competitions?
4. Are there any other benefits that a stronger system of Club Representation could bring to fencing?
5. Are there any other disadvantages that a stronger system of Club Representation could bring to fencing?

Summarised feedback to Question 1

Majority of respondents were in agreement that the 'primary competition' club should be fixed, with some stating that this addresses issues faced by competition organisers and issues of club separation in poules.

"I think it is more in line with other sports, will keep competitions more consistent, and avoid people changing club affiliation to alter poule draws."

However, some concerns were raised about the inflexibility and potential administrative burden of this proposal. These comments will be addressed through the process of the new transfer system, which will allow participants to change club, with the approval of the clubs involved managed through the Sport80 Platform.

Summarised feedback to Question 2

Many respondents believed that the new system should be applied across the board for Ranking and Non-Ranking Events (including recreational events).

By introducing the new system for all membership types, club admins are able to gain an accurate picture of their membership, with the ability to remove members who are no longer fencing, or contribute to the club (E.g. have not paid for their club membership).

Some respondents asked questions around regional affiliation and how regional events may be impacted by the new system. To confirm, the process for regional affiliation/changes are not included in this new system – this is for club affiliation only.

To change region, members should continue to contact BF via [this form](#)

Summarised feedback to Question 3

A large proportion of the respondents agreed that clubs should have a say who represents them in competitions. Respondents were in agreement that giving clubs greater ownership of who can represent them has benefits to the club as they can track who has paid their membership/subscriptions.

However, some respondents stated that an approval process could increase the administration required by clubs, with the majority of clubs being run by volunteers.

BF will look to implement a system that supports clubs with these tasks.

Summarised feedback to Question 4

Many respondents felt that the proposal had wider benefits for the wider fencing community, including:

- A stronger club feel and being part of a team
- Increased focus on Referee training- "Clubs will train their members to a specific standard which will then assist the regions in building their referee cadre"
- Idea that this proposal could reduce the administration for competition organisers and ranking co-ordinators
- Increased respect for coaches and the strength of the club, shows loyalty to clubs

Summarised feedback to Question 5

Respondents who felt that there were disadvantages to this system focused on the impact of this on smaller clubs (with a seen emphasis on favouring larger clubs) and the issue of creating team rankings.

Some respondents raised queries over when the change of club could happen in the year, and for what reason.

BF will consider when in the year would work best for transfers of club, and understand that some flexibility will be required for certain circumstances e.g. relocating

A respondent felt that this proposal made it feel "wrong to feel you can belong with (feel affiliated to) more than one club"