

Minutes of the Meeting of the Governance Board of Fencing New Zealand Incorporated	
DATE	1 March 2026
START/FINISH	7.00 – 09.53 pm
LOCATION	Teams
CHAIR	David Elder
ATTENDEES	David Elder (President FeNZ), Jules Congalton (Treasurer), Liam James (Fencing Central), Amanda Hopkins (Secretary), Peter Butler (Fencing North), Alex Dong (Fencing South), Hamish (Fencing Mid South), Grant Tweedle (Independent Board Member), Kate Brill (Independent Board Member)
APOLOGIES	Nil

	ITEM	INFORMATION AND RESOLUTIONS	OWNER	ACTION
1.	Quorum	Quorum confirmed (7 voting members present; quorum requirement 5). Advised that meeting was being recorded for accuracy of Minutes	David	
2.	Conflicts of interest	No conflicts	David	
3.	Minutes of previous meeting	Minutes of meeting 7 December 2025 – taken as read Moved David – Seconded Liam Carried unanimously. Matters Arising: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Correction noted under Tournament Profit Share wording to align with 2022 Board decision (25% / 75% split; FeNZ underwrite provision as previously agreed). 	David	Administrator
4.	Senior Champs – Nigeria	<p style="text-align: center;">Discussion Summary</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Board discussed participation in the Senior Championships in Nigeria. • Consideration given to athlete safety, travel logistics, insurance coverage, and risk management requirements. • Financial implications reviewed, including athlete funding, Federation exposure, and contingency planning. • Noted previous risk assessment documentation and the need to ensure alignment with NZOC / international event requirements. • Clarified nomination/selection process and communication obligations to athletes. <p style="text-align: center;">The Board agreed that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Board agreed to proceed subject to completion and approval of an updated risk assessment. • Participation is conditional on athletes meeting all nomination and eligibility requirements. 		

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Final confirmation of attendance will be dependent on verified insurance coverage and safety assurances. 		
5.	Commission Review	<p style="text-align: center;">Discussion Summary</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Peter confirmed feedback was received from Grant and Heather, but drafting progress was limited due to capacity. Board agreed the Commission Structure document won't be finalised before the AGM and should allow input from the incoming Board. Grant invited wider Board views on his amendments, recommending a staged sign-off approach and noting the underlying constraint of limited paid resource in a volunteer organisation. Discussion focused on the proposed "Development Director" role: agreement the title is confusing, with debate over scope (strategic/corporate vs grassroots) and concern about adopting a CEO-style model too early. Members supported incremental, practical improvements, treating the document as a living document and progressing agreed parts rather than delaying for perfection. Treasurer suggested separating the "how we currently operate" description from proposed changes to prevent the document holding up other priorities. Amanda emphasised the need for stronger high-performance coordination but cautioned about cost and over-engineering. Overall: document seen as valuable, further refinement needed, and final sign-off should occur post-AGM with the new President and Secretary General. <p>Motion 5.1 That the board supports the direction of travel of the Commission Structure document, with the final draft incorporating amendments tabled and to be presented at the first Board meeting post-AGM for sign-off.</p> <p>Moved: Peter Butler Seconded: President Carried unanimously</p> <p>Actions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Final Draft to be Completed & presented at the first Board meeting post-AGM for sign-off 	Peter	Peter/Simone
6.	FENZ International Calendar & Guidelines	<p style="text-align: center;">Discussion Summary</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Grant presented an "A3" framework alongside Simone's international calendar to show all key requirements for overseas events (support arrangements, U18 expectations, accommodation, agreements, refereeing, fees, and risk management). Purpose was to gain Board alignment on the approach so operational guidelines can be updated (some are outdated, e.g., support ratios). Amanda noted each event has different operational and safety/admin requirements depending on the host. Australia was discussed as a common "first step" overseas event, with mixed views on nomination fees and how much FeNZ should centrally 		

		<p>manage (especially for Australian Nationals).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communication/value proposition was highlighted: fencers need to see what FeNZ provides if moving toward more managed team support. • Referee obligations and penalties were noted; AFF/Oceania/Commonwealth requirements are still unclear. • Funding an Australian Seniors team manager via nomination fees was discussed but deferred for more work and athlete input. <p>6.1 Resolution</p> <p>That the Board:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Endorses the overall framework for the FeNZ International Calendar & Guidelines as a foundation for further operational policy development and implementation; • Invites the working group (Amanda Hopkins, Simone, Kate, Grant) to continue developing the framework and update related operational policies/guidelines as time permits; • Confirms that until the Overseas Athletes Pathway group/commission is established, the Secretary General and National Development Director will continue to lead and coordinate day-to-day management and administration of FeNZ overseas programmes; and • Invites Heather Clayton to clarify AFF, Oceania, and Commonwealth Fencing referee provision requirements and provide advice to the Board on how FeNZ should respond. <p>Moved: Grant Tweedle Seconded: Amanda Hopkins Carried unanimously</p>		
7.	Youth Olympics	<p>Discussion Summary:</p> <p>Nomination Process Clarification & Communication Update</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grant noted that FeNZ had published Youth Olympic selection criteria stating that nominations had closed last year. He clarified that what had actually closed was an Expression of Interest (EOI) process, not formal nominations. • Under the published selection criteria, eligible athletes are still able to apply via the NZOC pathway, meaning nominations have not technically closed. • Amanda advised that since the initial publication, a long list has been submitted to NZOC. As no formal EOI was called for long list purposes, selectors identified and forwarded athletes considered capable of meeting the selection criteria. • It was confirmed that at least one athlete has been placed on the long list and has also initiated contact with NZOC. • Confusion remains regarding whether athletes can nominate directly 		

		<p>to NZOC or must go through FeNZ, as NZOC referred an athlete back to the Federation despite apparent wording allowing individual application.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Board acknowledged inconsistency between published wording and actual process, and agreed clarification is required to avoid confusion or potential challenge. <p>Actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clarify nomination pathway with NZOC. Website wording to be updated to distinguish EOI from formal nomination stage 		<p>Secretary</p> <p>Secretary</p>
8.	Ranking System	<p>Discussion Summary</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Liam advised limited progress on the ranking system due to focus on Nigeria matters. The Athletes' Commission has now circulated the ranking paper. Liam expects to resume work on the ranking review shortly. <p>Actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Liam to continue progressing the ranking system review. 		
9.	Other Business	<p>9.1 Club Membership</p> <p>Discussion Summary</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Peter raised the need to progress club membership registration under the new constitution and support clubs/schools through the transition. For school clubs, the group agreed it should be kept simple by using a school endorsement/confirmation letter rather than complex forms. It was noted club structures vary (school clubs vs independent clubs using school facilities), so guidance may need to be flexible and handled case-by-case. Questions were raised about requirements for different entity types (incorporated societies vs limited companies/sole traders) and gaps/ambiguities in the constitution/templates that may need tidying over time. Coach registration/safeguarding and quality control were flagged as future policy work, not something to resolve at this meeting. <p>Actions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Peter Butler to work with Judith to draft a pro-forma school endorsement letter for school clubs, reflecting the simplified confirmation approach discussed. <p>9.2 The meeting moved in committee to discuss a confidential matter.</p>		<p>Peter</p>