

Letter to the British Baseball Federation Requesting an Extraordinary General Meeting

- *Executive summary*
- *Part I – The request for an EGM*
- *Part II – Grounds for loss of confidence and motion of removal*
- *Part III – Proposed motions and constitutional amendments*

Executive Summary

The undersigned Voting Members write to the British Baseball Federation (“BBF”) Board, pursuant to the BBF Constitution, to formally request that the Board convene an Extraordinary General Meeting (“EGM”).

The signatories are requesting an EGM because we have lost confidence in the leadership and administration of the Senior Affiliated Clubs League Commissioner and the associated committee members. This loss of confidence arises from a sustained pattern of behaviour and conduct that is inconsistent with the standards expected of BBF Officials. Said behaviour can be summarised as an inconsistent application of rules and sanctions, failures of due process and transparency, unequal communication of material competition decisions, failure to manage conflicts of interest, and violations of BBF policies. The matters set out in this document raise fundamental concerns about the fairness, integrity, transparency, and governance of the Senior Leagues, and about the ability of the current leadership to administer them in the interests of the BBF membership.

This EGM has been requested to allow Voting Members to consider the evidence, to propose a constitutional amendment to provide a mechanism for the direct removal of BBF Officials by the membership, and, if that amendment is approved, decide whether the Commissioner and named SLC members should remain in office. This EGM has also been requested to propose a constitutional amendment providing for an election following a Motion of Removal, ensuring that any interim Commissioner holds office with democratic legitimacy.

A motion to reform the BBF’s voting model will also be presented at the EGM. The proposed reform would provide a more balanced distribution of voting representation across the Federation, giving clubs of all sizes meaningful influence over the direction of the BBF and encouraging greater participation at General Meetings. This recognises that, since the current model was introduced, voting influence has become increasingly concentrated among clubs with the most favourable catchment areas, while clubs in less favourable areas have been less able to expand at the same rate and have consequently seen their relative representation diminish over time, with implications for the wider direction of the sport in the UK.

Voting on all motions will be conducted under the current voting model, rather than the proposed reform model, ensuring that **any changes** to the Federation’s governance **are approved under the rules in force when the EGM was called**.

Part I – The request for an EGM

Formal request

The undersigned Voting Members formally request that the Board of the British Baseball Federation (“BBF”; “the Federation”) convene an Extraordinary General Meeting (“EGM”) in accordance with the BBF Constitution.

This request is made because the signatories have lost confidence in the leadership and administration of the Senior Affiliated Clubs League by the Senior Affiliated Clubs League Commissioner (“SL Commissioner”) and members of the Senior Affiliated Clubs League Committee (“SLC”).

The basis for that loss of confidence is set out in the **Grounds for Loss of Confidence and Motion of Removal** later in this document. Those grounds concern a sustained pattern of decision-making and governance issues, including inconsistent application of rules and sanctions, failures of due process, inadequate transparency and communication, concerns regarding conflicts of interest and competitive integrity, disproportionate treatment of clubs and players, and conduct inconsistent with the standards expected of BBF Officials.

Why an EGM is required

The purpose of this request is not simply to ask the Board to reconsider individual league decisions. The signatories consider that the matters set out in this document raise broader questions about the governance, administration, and integrity of the Senior Leagues, and therefore require consideration by the Voting Members.

The EGM provides the appropriate forum for those concerns to be presented openly, for the Officials concerned to respond, and for Voting Members to consider the evidence and subsequently determine the appropriate course of action through a democratic vote.

What the EGM is being asked to decide:

The requested EGM will ask Voting Members to consider and vote on four principal matters:

1. A constitutional amendment to establish a mechanism for Voting Members to remove a BBF Official from office by resolution at a General Meeting.

2. A constitutional amendment requiring an interim election where an elected Official is removed by the Voting Members, or where an elected Official subject to a Motion of Removal set out in a request for an EGM is removed by the Board or resigns after that request has been submitted, so that the resulting vacancy is filled through a process deriving authority directly from the Voting Members.

3. A motion of removal of the SL Commissioner, Christian Carter, together with a binding mandate to the Board to remove the appointed members of the SLC, Joe O’Connell and Rhodri Theaker.

4. A constitutional amendment to reform the voting model for Affiliated Clubs, introducing a capped system intended to provide more balanced voting representation across the Federation while limiting the concentration of voting rights among the largest clubs.

What the request is intended to achieve:

The objective of this request is to enable the Federation's membership to address the concerns set out in this document through a transparent and democratic process, and to provide a clear constitutional mechanism for resolving a loss of confidence in an Official and associated committee members, where the membership considers that such a loss of confidence has occurred.

If the relevant motions are passed, the proposed interim election will allow the Senior Leagues to continue to be administered by an Official who derives their authority directly from the Voting Members, pending the next AGM.

The proposed voting reform is intended to address a distinct but related governance concern: ensuring that the Federation's democratic processes provide meaningful representation to clubs of different sizes while addressing the increasing concentration of voting influence among the largest clubs.

Part II – Grounds for loss of confidence and motion of removal

The grounds for loss of confidence and motion of removal arise from the **cumulative pattern of conduct, decision-making and administrative failures** set out in this Part.

Taken together, the matters detailed below raise serious concerns regarding the consistent and impartial application of rules; procedural fairness and due process; transparency and equal access to material information; management of actual or apparent conflicts of interest; competitive integrity; proportionality of sanctions; player welfare and autonomy; the standard of governance and administration of the Senior Leagues; and adherence to BBF policies.

The significance of these concerns is increased by their recurring nature. They concern different clubs, players, competitions, and seasons, but repeatedly demonstrate failure to engage the same fundamental principles of good governance: **fairness, consistency, transparency, accountability, integrity, and sound decision-making**. In several instances, the conduct described is also alleged to be inconsistent with the standards imposed upon BBF Officials by the BBF's Code of Conduct and published Federation policies, objectives, and performance targets.

The question posed by the Motion of Removal is therefore not whether Voting Members agree or disagree with each individual decision made by the Commissioner or SLC. Nor is it necessary for every Voting Member to reach the same conclusion on every individual incident. The question is whether the record demonstrates **a sufficiently serious and sustained pattern of governance failure** to justify the Voting Members' loss of confidence in the Officials responsible for the administration of the Senior Leagues.

For clarity, the grounds have been organised below by the principal governance concern they illustrate. Individual incidents may be relevant to more than one ground and are cross-referenced where appropriate. Detailed supporting evidence and relevant communications have been compiled and will be presented at the EGM to the furthest extent allowed by the time allocated. For the purposes of this document, the central allegations are set out clearly and concisely, drawing upon that body of evidence.

Based on these grounds, the signatories submit that **confidence in Christian Carter, as Senior Affiliated Clubs League Commissioner, and Joe O'Connell and Rhodri Theaker, as appointed members of the SLC, has been lost**, and that whether they should remain in office should therefore be determined by the Voting Members.

The table below provides the principal grounds relied upon in support of the Motion of Removal. It concisely identifies the conduct or failure alleged, the principal evidence relied upon, and the governance concern arising from it.

The individual grounds need not and should not be considered in isolation. Several of the incidents described engage more than one governance principle and, taken together, form the cumulative basis for loss of confidence in the Commissioner and the named members of the SLC.

The table is therefore a summary of the case rather than an exhaustive account of the evidence. The factual circumstances, supporting evidence and relevant BBF rules, policies and standards underlying each ground will be presented and elaborated on at the EGM, to the furthest extent that time allows.

Table of Grounds in Support of the Motion of Removal

Grounds / allegation	Conduct / failure alleged	Evidence and specifics	Relevant code / constitutional elements	Governance / significance / implications
1. Inconsistent and disproportionate sanctions	Materially different consequences were applied to clubs and players in comparable circumstances involving four forfeits.	Vetra and Richmond players were prevented from continuing to play, while players associated with other teams reaching four forfeits were permitted to continue; in one case the Commissioner expressly permitted players to continue at another level.	2026 Seniors Handbook; BBF Code of Conduct principles of fairness, integrity and equal treatment.	Consistency, fairness, proportionality and equal treatment.
2. Decisions made without due process or adequate procedural safeguards	Players were subjected to severe restrictions without individual notice, an allegation of misconduct, opportunity to make representations, or a communicated route of appeal. Sanctions were also imposed retrospectively and without a published Handbook basis.	Vetra and Richmond players received no direct notice or individual process. Their resulting exclusion is comparable to a season-long suspension. Two Vetra players who could not have participated before the fourth forfeit because they were studying overseas were nevertheless treated collectively.	2026 Seniors Handbook rostering provisions; principles of natural justice; BBF Code of Conduct standards of fairness and integrity.	Procedural fairness, natural justice, proportionality, accountability and legitimacy of disciplinary decision-making.

3. Failure to communicate material competition decisions transparently and equally	Material decisions and competition changes were not communicated equally, consistently or promptly to affected clubs and participants, compromising the integrity of the competition.	The NBL playoff qualification change was not equally communicated to all teams; some clubs ran their pre-season recruitment and played the first four games of the season under the originally communicated format. Other consequential decisions—including player bans, consequences of four forfeits and their effect on standings/playoff qualification—were not promptly published or codified.	Articles 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.5 and 3.11 of the contemporaneous BBF Code of Conduct*, including requirements to conduct BBF business honestly and ethically and report information accurately and honestly. <i>*subsequently reviewed, revised and reissued by the Board.</i>	Transparency, equal access to material information, competitive integrity, informed decision-making and confidence in league administration.
4. Conflicts of interest and decisions creating apparent or actual competitive advantage	Actual or apparent conflicts involving SLC members' own clubs were not adequately managed, while SLC decisions produced direct competitive consequences for those clubs.	Joe O'Connell, an SLC member and London Mets Chairman, played a significant role in changing the NBL playoff format, with the effect of advantaging his own club, and disadvantaging its direct competitors, who were not informed for 47 days. Richmond D3's playoff disqualification resulted in Kent Buccaneers, Christian Carter's current/former club, making the playoffs. Rhodri Theaker's Bristol team also benefited from Carter accepting late protest reports in 2024.	BBF Code of Conduct: integrity, honesty, transparency and fairness in decision-making; applicable conflict-of-interest principles/policy.	Actual/apparent conflicts of interest, impartiality, competitive integrity, procedural fairness, and member confidence in SLC decision-making.

5. Conduct inconsistent with the BBF Code of Conduct, including honesty, fairness, diligence and integrity	Misleading or unsupported representations were made, while decisions and communications failed standards of honesty, fairness, diligence and accurate reporting.	Carter stated that Vetra had “forfeited the season” almost immediately after informing Vetra that its remaining games were cancelled, despite Vetra never having said it was forfeiting its season. The Richmond enforcement notices also contain unsupported representations and false equivalence regarding the circumstances of the club’s 2025 and 2026 difficulties.	Code of Conduct: “Act with honesty, integrity and respect”; treat others fairly; core principles of “Integrity, honesty, transparency and fairness in conduct and decision-making.” Articles 3.1–3.5 and 3.11.	Integrity of office, accuracy of official communications, fairness, accountability and trust in BBF administration.
6. Disproportionate, collective, unsupported sanctions against players and clubs	Severe sanctions were imposed or threatened without a published rules basis or adequate consideration of individual responsibility, player welfare, autonomy or the financial consequences for clubs.	Players with no allegation or evidence of misconduct were collectively excluded; two Vetra players’ fully evidenced individual circumstances were not taken into account. Richmond D3 players were threatened with, and subsequently subjected to, playoff disqualification in connection with D2 fixture problems. Clubs were also threatened with unpublished fines of £2,000–£3,000, potentially sufficient to exhaust reserves or cause insolvency.	2026 Seniors Handbook; BBF Code of Conduct standards concerning fairness, responsibility, sound judgement, caution and diligence; BBF mission/development objectives concerning participation and opportunity.	Proportionality, rules-based administration, individual responsibility, player welfare and autonomy; risk of deterring participation and damaging club sustainability and development.

7. Poor governance and administrative failures, including prolonged failure to process disciplinary matters	Significant competition and disciplinary matters were not administered promptly or effectively, with administrative failures themselves subsequently affecting sporting outcomes.	Two disciplinary notices concerning Bristol AAA players from the 2025 playoffs remained unprocessed for 324 days and might not have been processed without another club querying them. The delay was then cited by the independent investigator as a reason not to suspend the Bristol players because of the resulting playoff disadvantage.	BBF disciplinary/enforcement processes; Code of Conduct expectations of responsibility, diligence, fairness and sound administration.	Administrative competence, timely justice, accountability and avoidance of situations in which administrative delay itself determines disciplinary or competitive outcomes.
8. Failure to recognise or manage the consequences of these decisions, including when concerns were raised by members	Failures by the SLC to acknowledge its own contribution to problems, respond constructively to concerns, mitigate foreseeable risks, or adequately reconsider decisions when their consequences became apparent.	No rain contingency plan existed for the 2025 playoffs; members seeking answers experienced delayed communication; the subsequent enforcement case against Richmond placed responsibility on the club without adequately acknowledging SLC decisions and administrative failures that materially contributed to the circumstances. Member criticism was met with defensiveness rather than substantive engagement.	BBF Code of Conduct requirements concerning responsibility, diligence, respect, fairness and sound judgement.	Accountability, responsiveness to members, institutional learning, risk management and confidence that Officials will recognise and remedy consequences of their decisions.

Part III – Proposed motions and constitutional amendments

The Voting Members requesting this EGM propose four motions. The first three are intended to operate together to provide a democratic mechanism through which the Voting Members may determine whether a previously elected Official(s) should remain in office following a loss of confidence, and, where an elected Official(s) is removed by the Voting Members, or removed by the Board or resigns in the circumstances specified, to ensure that the resulting vacancy is filled through an election by the Voting Members.

Motion 1 establishes the constitutional mechanism by which BBF Officials may be removed from office by a vote of the Voting Members at a General Meeting. The proposed amendment also establishes procedural safeguards governing such a motion, including notice of the grounds relied upon, an opportunity for the Official concerned to respond, an opportunity for Voting Members to ask questions and comment, and determination of the motion by secret ballot.

Motion 2 addresses the consequences of the removal or resignation of an elected Official(s). It provides that where an elected Official(s) is removed by the Voting Members at an EGM, or is removed by the Board or resigns after the submission of a Letter of Request for an EGM in the circumstances specified, the resulting vacancy/vacancies shall be filled through an election at that General Meeting rather than by Board co-option. The purpose is to ensure that an interim Official(s) in these circumstances derives their authority directly from the Voting Members and holds democratic legitimacy until the next AGM.

Motion 3 is contingent upon the passage of Motion 1. It asks the Voting Members to exercise the newly established removal power in respect of Christian Carter, as Senior Affiliated Clubs League Commissioner, and, pursuant to clause 7.12, to issue a binding mandate to the Board to remove Joe O'Connell and Rhodri Theaker as appointed members of the Senior Affiliated Clubs League Committee. The grounds relied upon in support of that Motion are those set out in Part II of this document.

Accordingly, if Motions 1, 2 and 3 are passed, an election for an interim Senior Affiliated Clubs League Commissioner will take place at the EGM, with the successful candidate serving until the position is next subject to election at the AGM.

Motion 4 addresses a separate but related question of BBF governance: whether the current voting model, which grants Affiliated Clubs additional voting power according to the number of teams they register **without any maximum limit**, requires reform in the interest of advancing the BBF's democratic processes in line with good governance.

Clubs in densely populated metropolitan areas naturally have greater opportunities to establish and register multiple teams than small and medium-sized clubs operating in less densely populated areas. Motion 4 would therefore:

- limit the extent to which population density and location grant some clubs disproportionate voting power;
- mitigate the risks posed by the concentration of voting power in large clubs, including outsized influence over Federation governance and administration; and
- encourage broader participation in the governance of the Federation by increasing meaningful representation for clubs of all sizes.

The proposed model retains a team-based allocation of voting rights, under which an Affiliated Club receives one (1) vote for each registered team, but introduces **a maximum entitlement of five (5) votes per club**. Voting Members other than Affiliated Clubs retain one (1) vote each.

For elections of the Youth and Senior Affiliated Clubs League Commissioners, the model preserves the separate electorates required by clause 5.7.

The motions are set out in full below and should be considered in the order presented.

Motion 1: Constitutional Amendment: Removal of BBF Officials by Voting Members at General Meetings

If approved, this EGM resolves: 'That the Constitution be amended by inserting new clauses 7.3 to 7.12, as follows':

7.3 A Board Official or Officials may also be removed from office by a Motion of Removal passed by the Voting Members at a General Meeting. All Voting Members otherwise entitled to vote under this Constitution are entitled to vote on a Motion of Removal, regardless of whether an Affiliated Club has registered Youth teams, Senior League teams, both or neither. A Motion of Removal may be brought whether or not any of the grounds set out in clause 7.1 apply.

7.4 A Motion of Removal under clause 7.3 must name the Official(s) concerned and their respective role(s), and must reference the grounds relied upon or, otherwise, the reasons for the loss of confidence. The Motion of Removal and the grounds or reasons for the loss of confidence must be included in the notice of the General Meeting. The Voting Members proposing the Motion of Removal may also issue a written statement in support of the motion for the purpose of providing additional context. This statement shall be included in the notice of the General Meeting or may, at the discretion of the Secretary, be distributed separately following the notice, provided that it is distributed to all Voting Members not less than seven (7) days before the General Meeting.

7.5 Notice of a General Meeting at which a motion under clause 7.3 (Motion of Removal) is to be considered shall be given to all Voting Members not less than fourteen (14) days before the date of the meeting, notwithstanding clause 6.6.

7.6 The Official(s) named in a Motion of Removal under clause 7.4 shall be entitled to receive the Motion of Removal and the grounds relied upon or reasons for the loss of confidence at the same time as the Voting Members and shall be entitled to submit a written response for circulation to Voting Members not less than seven (7) days before the meeting.

7.7 At the meeting, the Motion of Removal, the context for the Motion, and the grounds relied upon or reasons for the loss of confidence shall be presented to the Voting Members by a representative, or representatives, who are directly authorised by the Voting Members proposing the Motion of Removal, before the vote is taken. The Official(s) named in the Motion shall be given the opportunity to address the meeting in response, and an opportunity shall be provided to the Voting Members in attendance to ask questions and comment.

7.8 A Motion under clause 7.3 shall be carried by a simple majority of the total votes validly cast by Voting Members entitled to vote and represented at the General Meeting, in accordance with clause 6.28. Voting shall be conducted by secret ballot. The chair shall ensure that the method used for the ballot provides for the identity and voting entitlement of each Voting Member to be verified, preserves the secrecy of each vote, permits each Voting Member to cast no more than the number of votes to which they are entitled, and enables the result to be independently verified. The ballot shall be administered and tallied by the tally keepers appointed pursuant to clause 6.25, with the result reported to the General Meeting immediately. In the event of a tie (equality of votes), the Motion of Removal shall

not be carried. The result shall be published to all BBF members within seven (7) days, and shall be recorded in the General Meeting minutes.

7.9 Where a Motion under clause 7.3 concerns the office of the person otherwise entitled to chair the meeting, that person shall vacate the chair for the duration of that item and shall have no casting vote on the Motion. A chair for that item shall be proposed from the floor and appointed by a simple majority of the votes cast. Clauses 6.10 and 6.28 are modified accordingly for that item only.

7.10 Removal under clause 7.3 takes effect immediately upon declaration of the result and confirmation of the motion having passed. The position(s) of the Official(s) shall thereupon be vacant. In the case of the removal of an elected Official(s) by resolution under clause 7.3, an election shall be immediately held to elect an interim office holder, subject to and in accordance with clause 5.10A. If no eligible candidate has been duly nominated, or if no candidate is elected, the Board must co-opt an interim office holder within fourteen (14) days, unless the Motion of Removal stipulates a different deadline.

7.11 If the Official(s) named in the Motion of Removal resign at any point after the submission of a Letter of Request for an EGM by the Voting Members to the Board, or are removed by the Board during this period, the Board shall delegate a Board member to administer their portfolio of responsibilities until such a point as an election for an interim Official(s) has taken place at the requested EGM.

7.12 Where an elected Official who is removed under clause 7.3 chairs a committee, the Motion of Removal may also include a resolution issuing a binding mandate to the Board to remove from that committee any or all of its members. Any such resolution must identify the committee concerned and state whether the binding mandate applies to all members of that committee or to specified members.

Where such a resolution is carried as part of the Motion of Removal, the Board shall give effect to the mandate and remove the committee member(s) concerned from their committee positions. Such removal shall take effect immediately upon declaration of the result of the Motion of Removal, unless the resolution expressly provides for a different effective date.

The removal of an elected Official who chairs a committee shall not, by itself, remove other members of that committee. Removal of other members pursuant to this clause shall occur only where expressly mandated by the Voting Members in the Motion of Removal.

Motion 2: Constitutional Amendment: Election Following Removal by Resolution by Voting Members, Removal by the Board, or Resignation

Motion 2 is contingent upon the passage of Motion 1 (Constitutional Amendment: Removal of BBF Officials by Voting Members at General Meetings).

If Motion 2 is approved, this EGM resolves that:

‘Clause 5.10 of the Constitution shall be amended by inserting at its end:’

This power of co-option shall also be subject to clause 5.10A and shall not apply to a vacancy/vacancies arising from the removal of an Official(s) by the Voting Members at a General Meeting pursuant to clause 7.3, or from either the removal by the Board of any elected Official(s) subject to a Motion of Removal set out in a Letter of Request for an EGM by the Voting Members, or from the resignation of such Official(s) after the submission of that Letter of Request.

This EGM further resolves that:

‘Immediately following clause 5.10, the following clauses shall be inserted:’

5.10A. Vacancy arising from Motion of Removal by Voting Members at a General Meeting, or from either the removal by the Board of any elected Official(s) subject to a Motion of Removal set out in a Letter of Request for an EGM by the Voting Members, or from the resignation of such Official(s) after the submission of that Letter of Request.

5.10A.1. Notwithstanding clause 5.10 or any other provision of this Constitution permitting the Board to fill a vacancy by co-option or appointment, whenever an elected Official(s) is removed from office by resolution of the Voting Members, via a Motion of Removal at a General Meeting pursuant to clause 7.3, or where elected Official(s) subject to a Motion of Removal set out in a Letter of Request for an EGM by the Voting Members are removed by the Board or resign after the submission of that Letter of Request, the resulting vacancy/vacancies shall not be filled by co-option or appointment by the Board, with the exception that, with regard to the election required by clause 5.10A.2, where no eligible candidate has been duly nominated for the position(s), or no candidate is elected, responsibility for co-option shall revert to the Board.

5.10A.2. Upon the passing of such a resolution for removal under clause 7.3 (or where elected Official(s) subject to a Motion of Removal set out in a Letter of Request for an EGM by the Voting Members are removed by the Board or resign after the submission of that Letter of Request), an election shall take place at the same General Meeting. In the case of the passing of a resolution for removal, the election for the interim Official(s) shall take place immediately, as the next order of business at the Meeting. In the case of the Board removal or resignation of such Official(s) after the submission of the Letter of Request for an EGM, the election for the interim Official(s) shall take place at a point in the Meeting determined by the Voting Members who requested the EGM.

5.10A.3. Candidates for the vacancy/vacancies resulting from a successful Motion of Removal, or from the removal by the Board or resignation of elected Official(s) subject to a Motion of Removal as laid out in the Letter of Request for an EGM by the Voting Members,

must be nominated and seconded in accordance with clause 5.8 not less than five (5) days prior to the General Meeting notwithstanding any nomination deadline or notice requirement otherwise applicable under this Constitution, and must satisfy the eligibility requirements applicable to election to that/those Official role(s) under clauses 4.12 and 5.14.

5.10A.4. The election shall be conducted in accordance with clauses 6.23 to 6.30 and any other provisions of this Constitution governing the election of the relevant Official(s) by the Voting Members. Voting shall be administered by secret ballot.

5.10A.5. The person(s) elected pursuant to this clause shall take office immediately upon declaration of the result and shall serve as interim Official(s) until the next AGM, at which the position(s) shall be subject to election in accordance with the Constitution.

Motion 3: Removal of the Senior Affiliated Clubs League Commissioner and Issuance of Binding Mandate to the Board to Remove Specified Members of the Senior Leagues Committee

Motion 3 is contingent upon the passage of Motion 1 (Constitutional Amendment: Removal of BBF Officials by Voting Members at General Meetings).

If Motion 3 is approved, this EGM resolves that:

‘Under clause 7.3 and with immediate effect, Christian Carter be removed from the position of Senior Affiliated Clubs League Commissioner, having lost the confidence of the Voting Members; and pursuant to clause 7.12, a binding mandate be issued to the Board to remove Joe O’Connell and Rhodri Theaker from their positions as members of the Senior Leagues Committee, on the basis that they have also lost the confidence of the Voting Members.

Pursuant to clause 7.12, this binding mandate requires their immediate removal upon the passing of this Motion of Removal under clause 7.3.’

Motion 4: Constitutional Amendment and Reform of the Voting Model

Motion 4 is not contingent on any prior Motions.

If Motion 4 is approved, this EGM resolves that:

'Clauses 6.12 to 6.15 shall be deleted in their entirety and replaced with the following clauses 6.12 to 6.15, which define the allocation of votes to Voting Members, the determination of an Affiliated Club's voting entitlement by reference to its registered teams, the maximum number of votes an Affiliated Club may hold, the circumstances in which that voting entitlement may be reduced, and the publication and administration of voting rolls for elections of the Youth and Senior Affiliated Clubs League Commissioners.'

6.12. *Each Voting Member shall have one (1) vote, except that an Affiliated Club shall be entitled to one (1) additional vote for each additional team beyond the first team registered with the BBF by that Affiliated Club and having a valid registration status (a "registered team"), subject to a maximum voting entitlement defined by clause 6.13.*

The number and categories of registered teams attributable to each Affiliated Club shall be determined by reference to the BBF's official registration records as at the date on which notice of the General Meeting is issued.

6.13. *The maximum number of votes an Affiliated Club may hold or cast, in any voting scenario, shall be five (5).*

6.14. *For the purposes of applying clauses 6.12 and 6.13, the number of teams attributable to an Affiliated Club shall only be reduced where, prior to the date on which notice of the General Meeting is issued, the Club has formally withdrawn a team's registration in writing to the Secretary, or the team's registration status has been invalidated following completion of the applicable process prescribed under the BBF Rules, Regulations or governance policies. The grounds and procedures for such invalidation may be prescribed from time to time in those Rules, Regulations or policies.*

The commencement or completion of competitive play shall not, of itself, determine whether a team is a registered team for the purposes of this clause.

Voting entitlement for that General Meeting shall be fixed as at the date on which notice of the General Meeting is issued and shall not be affected by any subsequent registration, withdrawal, invalidation of registration status or other change occurring before or during the General Meeting.

6.15. *Pursuant to clause 5.7, the Secretary shall publish the respective voting rolls for elections for the Youth Affiliated Clubs League Commissioner and the Senior Affiliated Clubs League Commissioner in advance of the General Meeting, in order to make known each Affiliated Club's voting entitlement, in accordance with clause 6.12, in such elections. The Secretary shall administer elections for the respective Commissioners in accordance with clauses 5.7 and 6.12 and the voting rolls published pursuant to this clause.*