



Introduction

This document is provided by the APLU in support and explanation of their proposal to the General Assembly 2020 for the item (under the headings of Constitution/Membership) on Day1 of the WL GA 2020 (Sunday 18 October 2020) which is:

"There is a proposal from the Asia Pacific Lacrosse Union (APLU) supported by New Zealand Lacrosse to change the membership structure such that members report through CF rather than direct to World Lacrosse (WL). The CFs would be the members of WL.

This proposal is not supported by the WL Board or the GWG but needs to be considered by members at the General Assembly. "

Main Rationale for Proposing a change in Membership Criteria / Structure

There is no link at present between becoming a member of WL and being a member of the relevant CF. CFs are expected to run qualification and other tournaments, develop the game and administer the region. Yet NGBs can become members of WL with no affiliation with a CF.

The result of this proposal is that NGBs will still become members of WL but it provides the CF with a layer of administrative control in the region. This will be achieved by formalising the NGB entry to their respective CF and their role within it.

It is proposed that NGBs (existing and new on entry) report to and are required to become a member of their geographically inclusive CF – *before or at the same time as they join WL.*

The NGB concentration upon entry and within CF membership should be to develop to a level where they can progress to Full Membership (and hence voting rights) within their CF – this development will be supported by WL & CF working together.

There would be two (2) levels of voting consideration between WL/CF/NGB. Basically:

1. The GA/NGB responsibility and voting is for decisions on statutes (e.g. constitution), elections, approving budget and financial statements. Every eligible NGB has a direct vote to WL. (CFs may ultimately each have their own vote too). The CF can assist in setting up town hall meetings to facilitate the discussion of the pros/cons of motions by NGBs in a regional and convenient setting.
2. The CF/NGB responsibility and voting is for legislation, strategic planning, decision making that includes amendments to rules and by-laws and any administrative matters. This maybe lead by the CF Directors or with a 'Council' composed of a CF Director plus NGB representatives. Every Eligible NGB has a direct vote to CF who then has a representative vote to WL.

When any matter of WL membership voting occurs then the preliminary vote is held within the CF - in this way the extremes of member experience, numbers and maturity can be determined within the particular scenario of their CF (e.g. travel distances/time/cost/culture);

This will require close cooperation between WL and CF to ensure the background behind any proposal is well understood. The CF will then be able to help their NGB with the cultural, developmental as well as the time zone differences that occur in many regions.

Once that determination is reached then the CF would take the number of votes for their Full Member NGBs to WL and vote them all together as required and previously agreed. The aim is to streamline the vote rather than usurp the NGB authority.



The regional NGBs would have an option to elect their trusted representatives to be CF reps working under a CF Director as chair (perhaps call that a 'Council'?). Those people do not need to be the CF Directors, but surely should work collaboratively with the CF in discussion, proposing and deciding upon changes.

Hence the WL voting member would be the CF on behalf of their members, not the members directly. It is not proposed to remove the NGB voting at the GA, merely to streamline the overall governance of lacrosse worldwide.

Benefits resulting

The benefits arising from this approach include:

1. A clear path of entry for new NGBs into WL via their CF (currently not specified in any way);
2. Progressive resolution of a matter by voting for a consolidated outcome within a CF environment;
3. Avoidance of a potential haggling and time consuming resolution by WL with all NGBs on any one matter (e.g. at a GA with currently 67 NGBs and planned later 100 by end 2023);
4. The avoidance of world travel with containment within the CF territory (e.g. at regional events meetings rather than at a GA typically held at a WC event);
5. Members earn the **right** to become WL members by initial local CF development and participation;
6. Members must have solid infrastructure to sustain growth within countries, therefore it is important to build internal growth;
7. CFs work with WL's development committees and management to maximise the outcomes and most effectively spread the WL capabilities across the globe.

Modelling from an existing and successful sport

The APLU has looked at the success and diversity of Rugby Union worldwide. A game played by men and women, young and old age groups with a long history outside of the Olympics. A game with a variety of rules (e.g. 15s and 7s). This includes the Olympic variant of 7s as well as a World Cups in 15s and 7s.

Rugby Union also has the same issue as Lacrosse with a few very strong countries that have the player numbers and finances to compete at all levels, while the many smaller countries have to choose their discipline and tournaments.

The largest sport in the world – FIFA – makes membership of a confederation a prerequisite to FIFA membership. The FIFA Council works in the way the APLU is proposing, namely a committee that represents all CFs and is the main decision-making body. The FIFA Congress (like the WL GA) is still held for changes to the statutes, accepting new nations and elections.

Current status

The WL Executive via GWG and direct CF meetings has been trying to define the entry and progression points for new members. Historically they enter via WL but the path to regional CF membership, and its terms and conditions, are not defined.

Both the WL and CFs agree that is a vital path needing formal and precise definition. But it remains a work-in-progress.

Hence there is nothing in place that would structurally preclude members at the 2020 GA considering and adopting this WL/CF/NGB structure as proposed by the APLU.

Submitted by: Mike Slattery, APLU President.