

Dave,

This is going to be an essay unfortunately. It seems to me that the debate might be well served by taking a couple of steps back then going forward. In Queensland at least, there appears to be as much misinformation as there is information and maybe, as Racer has, others might make useful contributions. Once all the pieces are posted and understood, I will try and draw it all together. Please note, I say 'understood' not accepted.

Here is part one.

### **“Control” and “say”**

There is an underlying current in your post which pervades many peoples minds in the various Governance debates, karting and otherwise and I will call it a de facto “control” issue. Some clubs, in the Qld debate and more than one state in the national debate, have indicated an acceptance of a skilled Board but a reticence to losing what “say” they will have. I will expand on it below, but I suggest your comments concerning the air box that has been “introduced without consultation and is just another waste of money” and the clubman exhaust and the tyre pooling rules you give as other examples, support my view that **karters have no effective say now**. I believe though, that **karters stand to have significantly more voice in a best management practice model but not if clubs are voters**. And I think that will apply to the AKA as well as the AKAQ. Once more, I will expand on that later, (I did say this was going to be an essay) suffice to suggest now in answer to your filling the committees concern, I expect that if karters are more involved, they will step up for the required jobs.

### **Present regime**

Looking at the process of karting management, I think most of us, in Qld at least, would accept that **with a few small exceptions**, the state organisation gives us no grief and problems like the above flow down from the national level. When the rule making process is a two way street, I have often wondered how. I.e. The rules and regulations are theoretically developed by one state or another, circulated to other states, disseminated to clubs for comment, clubs tell their state their view, our state votes for or against the motion at the NKC accordingly. But if three states don't want it and four do, you've got it.

Now bear with me, but that assumes that all states do what Qld does and disseminates National Office material. It assumes too, that clubs continue the process to their members. All that is a big ask and I know for a fact (because the club complained to me) that on one huge issue, one state didn't tell at least one of it's clubs that it's consideration and vote was required. And as Racer has already brought it into the picture, if you consider it on a proportional karter basis, (which I will get to later) 4000 karters can be defeated by 2000 ! NSW and QLD who represent over half the karters only have 2 of 7 votes on the NKC.

So how exactly, do I get to have a say on any issue under the present regime ?

I have two alternatives:

- I write to my club which passes on my letter to the state which then passes it on to the national office; and/or,
- I attend my club's meeting and ask it to write to the state office and pass this on to the national office.

But unless I have been to a club meeting previous to that, I won't even have heard that there is a proposal for the introduction of an air box. Consequently, it is often the case that the first time you hear about the new rule or an amendment of an existing rule, is after it occurs.

Does someone have an argument that you do have an effective say in how any of this is conducted and therefore some control ?

### **What do you have any say in or control of ?**

If you have attended a club meeting when your club was considering the nominations for the AKAQ Executive position elections, you have a say in how the club votes on the nominations at the AGM in electing those executives to the management committee. Under the constitution, you authorise them to manage the affairs of the state between council meetings. Implicitly then, you trust them to look after your interests until the council meets again.

There are two excellent examples of the way that works. First up, the JMax debacle, the introduction of a new class by the NKC without the states being previously informed. (As was the introduction of ARC into clubman in 1998)

In a very short space of time, because there was very little time in which to act, the then AKAQ President, Ralph Van Doorn, said to me this is against the rules and we have to do something about it. Within a week, we had our AGM and Graeme Drew became President. I gave him advice and the Executive instructed me to take the necessary action which was a constitutional appeal to AMSAC. NSW joined us on that.

At the next council meeting, the executive informed the delegates what they had done and the delegates endorsed the action. Ultimately, the NKC made the rules necessary to introduce the class properly. (Although I still wonder whether all clubs in all states were asked whether in fact they wanted to see a new class introduced.)

A second example is the attempt by CAMS to take over Karting in 2005. This was sprung at an informal meeting of CAMS and the NKC but neither the Queensland nor the New South Wales delegates could attend. Apparently, after some discussion, the NKC delegates in attendance were asked to convene a meeting on the spot and approve the CAMS proposal even though NSW and QLD weren't there and were never told there was going to be a formal meeting. The AKA afterwards even tried to argue that five delegates could hold a meeting and do this without the other two even being notified. Extraordinary.

Again because there was no time, I was instructed by the Queensland and NSW Executives to do something about it. The proposal was then defeated under threat of legal action a few days later at a properly convened NKC meeting.

As this all occurred within the space of 10 days, the clubs and Karters didn't hear about it until it was over, you didn't get to have a say. The Executive, who your club votes to elect, after you have had the chance to voice your opinion as to how your club will vote, has obviously acted in the clubs'/karters' best interests and done what it was elected to do. Even though you only have a voice at a club meeting, you implicitly trust the elected Officials of the State to do the right thing by you. This is another thing I will come back to this when I get to Karter's -v- Clubs as voters.

I gather you don't like Ralph van Doorn but I can assure you, if he was the AKA President at the time of the JMax case or the CAMS takeover, neither of those issues would have got off the ground because he would have refused to allow the necessary motions to be put to the NKC as the constitutional requirements for doing business had not been followed.

The reason we have rules is twofold. It simplifies process and it enables your elected representatives to do your bidding. If you follow the rules, you will, by and large, get a fair result. If you don't, you just create more mess for someone else to clean up and you diminish even further the say and control you do have because your representatives have even less influence.

Absent the fibre of the likes of Ralph, Graeme Drew, Richard Erdmann and Bob Gallagher, you would have no say or control whatsoever.

That is a good place to end part one. Karters, and clubs should have no concerns they are giving up more control because they have almost none anyway. Once a best practice committee system is introduced, they will get a lot more say.

Graeme Hancock