

BRITISH INSTITUTE OF VERBATIM REPORTERS

Company Registration No. 23811

128th ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING

Held on:

Saturday, 8th May, 2010

Held in:

The Lismore Room
City Inn Hotel
1 Brunswick Square
Brindleyplace
Birmingham B1 2HW

Council Members:

Jean Lukins (President), Ann Lloyd, Sheryll Holley, Helen Edwards, Susan Humphries

Present:

Paul Brincau, Helen Edwards, Georgina Ford, Pat Frith, Jean Gough, Sheryll Holley, Susan Humphries, Ann Lloyd, Jean Lukins, Jill Mason, Jane Norman, Robyn Nott, Ian Roberts, Mary Sorene, Kath Sykes, Carole Tasker, Sue Wiltshire

THE PRESIDENT: Ladies and gentlemen, a warm welcome to the 128th AGM of the British Institute of Verbatim Reporters. First of all, I will call upon the Secretary to read the notice to open the meeting.

MARY SORENE: "Notice is hereby given that the Annual General Meeting of this Institute will be held on Saturday 8th May, 2010 at 1.45pm (preceded by workshops at 11.00am and lunch) in the Lismore Room, City Inn Hotel, 1 Brunswick Square, Brindleyplace, Birmingham for the purposes of considering and if thought fit passing resolutions as to the ordinary business of the Company relating to the Council Members, accountant and accounts. To receive and adopt the Report and Accounts, to elect members to serve on the Council for the year 2010/2011, to elect a President for the present year 2010/2011, to pass Special Resolutions 1 to 12 as detailed below, to appoint an Accountant for the ensuing year 2010/2011 and to appoint the date of the next Annual General Meeting and any other business." That was dated 14th April 2010.

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you, Mary. Do we have any known apologies for absence today?

MARY SORENE: I will read out the list I have, which has already been passed to Jean.

Victoria Davies, Carol Evans, Rita Fox, Michael Ives, Pauline Miller, Joanne Naughton, Mavis Ross, Ian Sinclair, Margaret Wort, Janet Callison, Harry Davidson, Elizabeth Davies, Sara Dyott, Katie Dyson, Sandra Evans, Kath Land, Linda Nicholls, Neil Scott, Cynthia Sherry, Audrey Shirley, Jackie Silk, Cheryl Slater, Michele Sowerby, Carolyn Stewart, Jenny Webster, Miriam Weisinger, Julie Whitaker, Franny Barrett, Betty Willett, Dianne Tapper, Nicki Leahy, Norma White, Emma White, Michael Laidlaw, Julie Smith, Hilary Maclean, Amanda Bavin, Roger Bell, Nicki Misso, Iris Butcher, Mirella Fox, Lindsay Bickers, Melanie Ball, Pam Woolgar, Ann Archbold, Didi Burden, Stephanie Stamp, Sharon Scott, Anne Mills, Leah Willersdorf, Roslyn Fuller, Joan Webb, Claire Hill, Karen Young, Carina Raglione and Marie Brown.

THE PRESIDENT: Does anybody know of any other member who is absent who was not on that long list? No?

Now we move on to the minutes of the last Annual General Meeting. You will already have received copies from Mary. We have a few spare copies. Would anybody like to see one? (Copies circulated) If anybody who is here now who attended last year has any comments, or if you would like to glance through and ask any questions, we will try to answer them. (Pause)

Okay. Is everybody happy with the minutes or do you want a minute or

two more? (Pause)

Is everybody content to agree them? Good. I will sign them as a correct record. The meeting has agreed this was a correct record. (Minutes signed)

I was not in fact at last year's meeting. Shall I date it, Mary?

MARY SORENE: Yes, please. 8th May.

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you, Mary.

We now move on to my address, which I have been trying to complete recently. It is not too long, I hope. I have entitled it "Finding a Voice". I learned one or two things on my first day in court. It was definitely in Wood Green, N22. "Oh, no. You cannot interrupt," I was advised. "What if I cannot hear them?" "Well, you could interrupt a bit." I do not like interrupting much, so I have developed a few tricks to get the volume up or the speed down. Perhaps we can share those later, like the short forms.

Why am I telling you about that? Well, you can guess, I am sure. In the old days, in the NCRA, the American reporters' group, they liked to talk about the "silent witness". We sit there, say nothing, and produce a record, as if by magic. They kind of do not notice us. But I wonder if it is time they should. Who are "they"? In my view, they are the ones who use our services. It is pretty obvious. They are the Court Service, the TV channels, schools, Parliament. They get a service they do not always understand well. Or, if they do not get the service they thought they were getting, the contract that the contracting parties talked about gets torn up because the product is not very good, or it is late. Or, the contract continues because it is a good service.

Those fulfilling these contracts - and really, every job we take on is a contract or part of a larger one - are sometimes left in the middle. A game of ping pong goes on over our heads. Sometimes the jobs go; we move on to the next one. That is, until we are offered a transcript job at 40 pence a folio, and then we start to hear that digital audio is being sent far away for transcription.

I must say, I have been alarmed to note the speed of change this year with regard to digital recording. Everywhere I look, digital rules the day. I feel like good King Canute, sinking in a sea of digitised signals. It is hard to keep up.

We have continued to monitor the changes in verbatim reporting contracts where it affects our members. We have been concerned to note the increase in popularity of digital recording as a means of providing official and indeed other types of records, as well as the inevitable demands on us to transcribe often difficult material very quickly. We note with sadness the loss of loggers from many crown courts.

We could think about responding to this using our website. I hope we can agree some explanatory content to put on the website which points out the dangers of relying on unmonitored, or indeed any form of digital recording on its own, in the hope of obtaining an accurate record, as well as the dangers of outsourcing transcription to the inexperienced and, dare I say it, the inept.

There are some nice gaps in the market though, in the wake of the digital tide. I recently took over a job close to my home where a temp had taken a week to type up and organise a day's human resources hearing. They were very relieved to see me, I can tell you! This must also mean we are very cost-effective, if I can do in two days, at most, what this lovely lady took five days to complete.

I believe we should be much more proactive in making sure our voice is heard clearly. We should collect information, even if it is hearsay. Sometimes that's the first way we hear about it. So, if you spot a news report or an online media report, please share it with us.

That brings me to the website, of which more later. We have designed into the website a news feature on the front page. We need breaking news. We should pay more attention to news about our work. I found a short website report about the loss of loggers from a court in the North of England. The senior judge was very unhappy about the retirement of the police officers, who I think had already retired once, who had turned their hands to keeping the court log. They would be very much missed, she said.

But this didn't involve the loss of a shorthand writer. The shorthand writer had already gone, many years before. It is indeed several years since I have worked in court. I may never go back, unless I am asked to cover a hearing as a one-off. But should we listen to that judge's disquiet? Should we make a fuss about it? Even if we make a fuss, who will listen to us? And will we ever have enough shorthand writers to cover all these jobs again?

This turn of events puts the spotlight on court clerks. They do not welcome the responsible job of switching on and off the day's recordings. They are covering long lists and probably more than one court. A trades union representing court clerks is on the record as supporting the loggers, but I do not think they have ever come out in support of shorthand writers who have lost their jobs, or who are already in danger of losing them. But the trades unions might support us. Maybe we need to find out a little more about the views of such people. We must find the decision makers.

The court contracts have been renewed in the past two years without further competition. The tape contracts have changed hands quite recently. Perfectly competent firms with perfectly competent shorthand writers and

transcribers do not get contracts because they leave out vital pieces of information that they were never asked to supply in the first place. I, of course, know nothing about that. I have never been a party to a contract; I just listen.

How do we voice our concerns in the tendering process? Are we stuck with it? I have been racking my brains. Any suggestions are welcome. I wonder if we should provide some guidance for contractors? My guess is that some of the tendering firms need reminders to use shorthand writers and give them the space to do their work, far more so than the companies demanding the services.

Perhaps we should look for funding for high-level, round-table discussions with a consequent report under Chatham House rules. We could invite barristers, solicitors, the judiciary, the law reporters, TV captioning companies, representatives of the deaf community, and hopefully thereby gain some focused publicity. Meetings like that would examine existing and future provision of records in official and in community settings. I am certain that we are underrepresented in these arguments. Indeed, I do not believe that those demanding the provision of these services, including Government departments, have enough contact with the suppliers of the skills needed to provide them.

I was wondering whether to ask my MP in Hammersmith, who is a barrister, to table some questions in the Commons for reply by the Ministry of Justice. The timing is bad, as we do not seem to have a government as I speak! There will hardly be any days this year to ask any questions. We may have a second election, but we can try next year perhaps. Perhaps I will ask my MP if he knows a peer who could ask probing questions for us.

There's one comment I also want to make about contracts, which, of course, I know nothing about, as I said earlier. I can do without the excitement. There seems to be a lack of focus, guidance and forward planning on the part of the people who would like to use our services. I find that hard to deal with, and it can be upsetting. The effect is unfortunate because it can mean that we do not plan ahead.

How do we know what's going to happen in the future? How do we know what to study? How do we know where to move to? How do we know who to employ? It is difficult to make business plans or invest in the training of shorthand writers in a contract culture, and now we are in a recession.

I also sometimes wonder why I do not hear much complaint from the Bar or solicitors about loss of records, loss of digital records, poor-quality transcripts from digital. I remember reading a couple of years ago about complaints from Scotland and the strange rendition of Scottish accents. I do not understand why what goes on in Scottish courts cannot be recorded and transcribed in Scotland.

Our profession faces so much change. I can think of many problems we

need to overcome. First, the belief has set in that hearings can be transcribed quickly and accurately from a recording sometimes made on the other side of the planet! Secondly, our customers need to be reminded of the advantage of using an independent and professional service.

Thirdly, part of that explanation must include the notion that very fast turnaround times may not always be possible at a price that equates with, for example, DAT transcripts. Some organisations, some customers, may regard these products as "good enough".

What can we offer that is better or different? How do we explain that difference? How valuable is accuracy over speed of delivery? Can we separate the two and give an honest answer to questions about cost?

We can allow time and resources for reporter training and to keep our skills all nice and polished. I wrote a somewhat light-hearted piece about CPD, continuing professional development. I was only kidding; it is a serious matter. At the moment, we do not have the resources as an institute to monitor the standards of those working in the profession who qualified some time ago. We can all keep up with developments if we try, and indeed we do.

The best encouragement we can provide now is to use the new website as a resource tool for you to use with the links and contacts and information. We cannot do much more than that at present, apart from occasional seminars, including those presented during the 2009 and this AGM. Our efforts pale into insignificance against the NCRA's efforts twice a year.

However, I wondered if we could set up a mentoring scheme for those who would like help with specific professional matters? If anyone would like to help develop this idea with us, please get in touch.

One apparently powerful argument against us in favour of digital recordings is its relative cost-effectiveness, so the Council is always interested to learn of defects in digital recordings of court cases - particularly in the criminal sphere where defects may lead to appeals and retrials, which inevitably impact upon the public purse.

I am now going to shift gear slightly back towards the Council. We have a new Council member this year, Susan Humphries, who practises mainly in the North of England. Many of you know her well. We have also welcomed Helen Edwards and recently Karen Young as Council members this year, and we have Ann, and we also have Sheryll, who has joined us from the beginning of the year. Ann is a long-standing member of the Council, like me.

However, we started the year rather thin on the ground. We have managed to kind of jog along and we have managed to be quorate for most of the meetings, and we have tidied up after an inquorate meeting, but we have

got here.

We have had to think about amending the Mem and Arts, the Memorandum and Articles of Association. We are hoping to reduce the Council from 15 to 12. We will be voting on that in a minute. When we had, I think, 450 members, a Council of 15 was reasonable. Now it is really pointless. We have retained the AGM quorum at 15. Betty felt happier with a larger number and, as she said, "After all, why bother to turn out if you only need a few members to make up a quorum?"

The new Companies Act 2006 has helped us out in respect to meetings where we probably this year would not have had a quorum. Now we are a bit safer as we can meet virtually. So, we can have four Council members on four continents, although that might be a bit odd. We could decide where the meeting was taking place, say in London, and we could note that three of us were linked up by Skype and the fourth was at the end of a mobile phone. This is all now perfectly lawful. As long as we all listen carefully to each other, this should work a treat.

I think it is Article 9 in the proposed amendments. We discussed it at our last meeting. One or two of us weren't happy about the wording. In fact the wording is lifted verbatim from the Companies Act guidance. It is not very good, and it is not very grammatical, but if we pass it we might be able to make it more grammatical before next year. We would like the opportunity to use it during the year because it is very difficult to keep going with relatively few members on the Council.

Now, to carry on the theme of linking up, for the first time ever, as far as we can tell, we have moved our AGM out of London this year to Birmingham, as you know. We have continued our theme of a social gathering with the usual formal business and discussion. We hope you have enjoyed Andrew's talk and the exercises this morning. We had the benefit of his training last year. Andrew lives, I believe, in the same community as Sheryll, and she suggested him to us.

We do not have the resources to expand the event today beyond one day. Nevertheless, we hope our AGM is enjoyable and useful. Apart from anything else, we do not meet up very often. Apparently I have Skype on this new computer, so I might start to use it to see the people I am chatting to, and to take part in Council meetings.

We have revised our Qualified Realtime Reporter examination, after a lapse of 13 years, to acknowledge realtime skills. This examination is available to all realtime writers, whether or not they are members of BIVR.

We are continuing links with AVSTTR as they strive to define the qualification standards for STTRs. Our QRR examination was reprised partly to

help those working with deaf people. A pass at 98% accuracy is one of AVSTTR's requirements. This is to ensure consistent standards for STTRs while the Signature exams are being sorted out. Both Jean and Georgina are here today, and Jean has agreed to take our minutes. If you have questions about Signature or STTRs, please do ask them later.

The Council did decide early last year that the QRR exam would be open to all. We decided to charge a higher entrance fee to those who are not members of BIVR or AVSTTR. We are seeing a steady flow of candidates. The exam lasts five minutes with speeds varying from 150 to 180, and back down to 150. Five minutes sounds easy. Believe you me, it is not. So far, nine writers have passed, some with very high marks.

Claire Hill, whom some of you may know, achieved 100% in the March 2010 exam. Mary duly marked 100% on Claire's certificate. I think there are others who have achieved 99 and 99.5%, but, as President, I decided to present Claire with a small medal to mark that achievement. Claire is not here today to collect her medal, but I am sure we can find a suitable occasion to hand it to her.

It is possible that we will increase the speeds of these exams to a sort of level 2 at 170 to 190, and down again. To pass the existing exam, we think writers need a baseline speed of 200. We can look at increasing the speeds if there is a demand.

BIVR is considering supporting and/or setting up, allied to the QRR exam, a kind of "moving into realtime" course for CAT writers who wish to become realtime qualified. I think we are going to look at that next year and work out whether we could do one or two days, or something more formal. Also, I think, we would like to offer short top-up or motivation courses for QRR exam candidates. As they say, watch this space.

As several BIVR directors are Fellows of the IPS, the Incorporated Phonographic Society, we can organise speed examinations. The most popular speeds are 160 and 180. We can make them as hard or easy as you wish ranging from literary material at 200 to a summing-up at 160. I think it is about time we described the material on the application form and the certificate, but it is always a work-in-progress with exams. Then you could pass a parliamentary passage at 220. I think someone in the audience today is aiming for 250 in an IPS medal exam! Our group have worked closely over the years and I hope we can continue to be the best of friends. Please contact Mary if you want more details of speed exams. The cost is very reasonable.

We continue to welcome applicants from former Association members. This year, Pam Crooknorth, Sandra Evans, Helen Davies and Kath Land have joined us. The door is always open. We ideally need just to see a certificate or practising card from the Association with your application.

Sadly, Ann Hill, whom many of you knew through her work in the Midlands, left us last September after a long and brave fight against ill-health. Many of you attended her humanist funeral, followed by what I have been told was a warm-hearted get-together of her closest people, especially her partner, and her many friends from court reporting.

I recall working with Ann some years ago at Croydon Magistrates, in a betting office application. I was for William Hill and Ann was for Ladbrokes. We had a very nice lunch! Ann is lovely. We worked together much later in Manchester and I remember her with much affection.

Looking to the future, we now welcome student members. We have two: one from the Midlands who is learning Palantype, and another young lady from Ireland who is training at Bray College. I am certain we must encourage new blood as we are an ageing profession. We have agreed as a Council to provide access to the BIVR website for student members.

Talking of the website, we have commissioned a new website from New Era Internet, a firm of web developers based in Croydon. The new site will provide resources for all our members. There will be information for members of the public and colleges. A lot of universities we have discovered have links in to our site. One of the reasons we launched the website a few years ago was to save money and time responding to general enquiries and student enquiries. This decision turned out to be very wise.

The FAQs that we wrote then, and indeed almost all of the material on the site you can access now, will be included in the new site. It is taken longer than I thought it would to decide on the opening pages and the drop-down boxes. We're nearly there. I have signed off the front page and the overall design and it is now being coded. I have five page banners in the computer here which I can show you later. It is time for a decision about which one do you like.

The company MD was not keen on design by committee, but I think we're getting towards the end of the major work. I am hoping this will be uploaded in a later version and then we would welcome comments. So, we will let you know when we have a temporary address for the new website. If you want to review the website, just contact Mary, and let us know.

The reporter search section in the new website is being slightly differently divided. It will have location of reporter, type of work offered and a search by name. If you want to retain your name in the list or to add your name to the list, please, again, let Mary know. Then we will contact those listed now to ask them if they wish to continue on board, and if any details need changing. Brief descriptions of the type of work offered, such as speech to text or depositions, will be included in the website.

BIVR has always been very keen on using the website to help individual reporters find work. This was supported by Robyn, who is here today and who worked to great effect on the existing site. The reporters' own section will be accessed by logging in.

All the menus on the public pages can be accessed from the reporters' pages, but not the other way round. So, you can flip back and forth if you want to get to the public page, if you are logged in, but nobody can see what you are doing. It is secret when you are in the reporter section.

The extra menus I have chosen are BIVR News, which will include newsletters and meetings, and Resources, where we can put links and resources. We are trying to make the site as useful as we can. The tough bit, which we are coming to, will be adding in the booking forms and the payment gateways.

One exciting idea was to have a BIVR history section. We do have an archive section on the existing site, but we did think it was pretty interesting, so we are going to pull it on to the public pages and we will have to decide about that pretty soon. Some of the descriptive content needs updating and amending a little bit. The members' area resources options will include the manual, which can be downloaded.

We are using up-to-the-minute techniques to optimise the website on the Internet to make it effective as a window for students and the public to see into the profession. They need to find us easily. We have modified access to the site to enable those seeking and offering work to use the site effectively, which I have explained a bit already.

We have reviewed our literature for prospective entrants to the profession. We have an old publication called the Record, which we are also going to put in the archive section of the site.

We are thinking of creating a separate Facebook page. NSRA is on Facebook. It is a useful social networking tool. We can control it, we hope, and shut out what we do not like. It can perhaps bring us to public notice. Do check out the NSRA American site and see what you think about it. It is likely at the same time that we will mothball our blog. It hasn't proved popular. We will probably archive it and concentrate on Facebook. Again, we haven't finally decided.

To close, I must give my special thanks to my fellow Council members for the way they have tirelessly turned up to meetings, including those held on Saturdays, and kept us on our toes. Thanks are due to Betty, Sheryll, Ann, Susan, Shelley and Helen, and now Karen. It was good to see Betty from time to

time. She is away in France today. Sadly, her husband Len died during the year.

I am very grateful to our tireless secretary Mary, who is here today with Raymond, in charge of the camera. Mary has continued to work without complaint despite travelling to another continent to train official reporters! Her knowledge and expertise is important to our group. Without her expertise and efficiency, the Institute probably could not operate. She has been an invaluable help to me this year as it has been my first year as President.

I also thank Mr Kypri, our accountant, as well as Marlow Renton and Chris Huggins of New Era Internet, who have provided valuable assistance with our new website, quite apart from recoding it for us.

I hope you have enjoyed your day today. Thank you for listening. I hope it was not too long. Please pipe up with any questions and ideas.

MARY SORENE: Can I just have a pause in the proceedings? They can only leave the food out until three o'clock. Does anybody want to go and get anything?

THE PRESIDENT: We will take a break.

MARY SORENE: Under health and safety, they won't leave food out there any longer.

(Short pause)

MARY SORENE: Thanks everybody. It was any questions.

GEORGINA FORD: This might be an AOB actually, but I was thinking, in terms of materials for examinations, would it be an idea to have maybe a group between AVSTTR and BIVR to look at types of materials we could use that would be appropriate for court reporting and speech to text?

THE PRESIDENT: Yes. That's a very, very good idea. Absolutely. We will look at that in our first meeting, I am sure, and Sheryll can maybe come back to you with some ideas. Absolutely. Thank you for that. Any others?

PAUL BRINCAU: First of all, may I congratulate you on a very useful speech. Obviously a lot of thought was put into it. I have a lot of points, but I am not going to raise them all. One of the interesting ones was actually something which I nearly brought up in matters arising, but we never got to it because we went straight into your speech. It is about encouraging new blood.

I brought it up at the last meeting about some ways to perhaps encourage

new blood. I suggested last time writing to each individual member closer to the AGM, first of all, to get members to attend, and then see how we can encourage new writers, because I am sure a lot of the younger ones haven't even heard of the British Institute.

Somebody said earlier that there aren't many new trainees now being pushed through. I do not know whether that's correct or not, but, if there are trainees and firms training new blood to the profession, maybe we should make them aware of the Institute and what it can do for them.

Something else that I found slightly worrying is that, in the last three or four days, I spoke to a writer, and when I said to her or him, "Oh, aren't you coming to the meeting?" they said, "Well, I am only interested in being a member so I can get a certain type of work which I couldn't get unless I was a member of the Institute." And maybe we could have some more courses, or some more encouragement for people to be members of the Institute.

THE PRESIDENT: I agree, Paul. It is difficult to be systematic though, because people are spread around. They work away from London. They're on realtime jobs, write-outs. It is hard to contact them. Not every firm trains. Mary is doing training. There is the college in Bray. Merrill trains. Individuals train, like Georgina. It is very, very mixed. There's no one approach. We maybe need a variety of approaches or events. I think it is a case of going to people, because they are clearly not going to come to us.

So, with our relatively small resources, maybe we could come up with some ideas to go to the people. One thing I didn't mention is that I have been on a committee this year with RNID, which is looking at supply and demand of work to help deaf people, and they have been given by the Co-op I think it is £63,000 to run some roadshows. I think there are going to be four in England, one in Scotland and one in Wales, and we are trying to get on board with that. STT work is different and interesting and demanding, but it is a step in the right direction.

PAUL BRINCAU: That would be useful. You mentioned people and firms who are training new writers. Mary is one of them. I remember, when I was training - and I trained in the Air Force, so out of the civilian environment - but once we came to the end of our course, the first thing our instructor did was got us to sit the Institute exam. Can firms who are training new people do the same? And, if not, why do not they?

ROBYN NOTT: I can tell you why.

PAUL BRINCAU: Tell us. It's interesting to know.

ROBYN NOTT: The problem is that one of the firms that we all know, who

train a lot of very good reporters, they would not want them to know about the Institute because we would tell them that they are being grossly underpaid and overworked, so they are not really fans of BIVR. As a firm, they wouldn't be interested in their trainees having any contact with us at all. They like to keep them in the dark.

THE PRESIDENT: If we are on the same page on that, I have seen transcript depositions signed out "LiveNote Accredited". They have their own accreditation. But what is LiveNote accreditation in a US court?

GEORGINA FORD: It is actually an official one in America. It is actually an official certification that they have.

THE PRESIDENT: Really?

GEORGINA FORD: I do not know if it is recognised by NCRA or not, because they have their own, but it is certainly something that...

ROBYN NOTT: There's no problem with the quality of their work - some of them are very good - but they are not interested in allying with us because we would say, "Well, you shouldn't be working doing a realtime job for that kind of money", and that kind of thing. It's obviously not what the firm want them to know.

PAUL BRINCAU: Is there any way that we can get the information to them apart from through their firms? You know, like in a newspaper, have an article somewhere, or put it on the Internet.

THE PRESIDENT: Why not?

ANN LLOYD: We need to emphasise that BIVR has almost like a quality mark to it, so that it becomes recognised further afield, so to speak.

PAUL BRINCAU: Which we did at one point.

THE PRESIDENT: I think it is a long uphill struggle. That's a very good idea though, to publish something like that; plus we have the website. It's just we have to be careful with the resources we have. We cannot just have a scattergun approach. It's like in the election that's just gone by, you need to know who your supporters are and knock them up. I do not mean physically! I mean, "You ought to vote!"

ROBYN NOTT: Sometimes it is the firms who are not our supporters. That's the problem.

PAUL BRINCAU: Yes. I remember from my time working for a particular

firm. I think I mentioned this once at one of the AGMs, which was on the same subject. They never encouraged their writers to join the Institute.

ROBYN NOTT: No.

THE PRESIDENT: I think we will probably brainstorm that and start to do specific things, to see what reaction we get. Sheryll?

SHERYLL HOLLEY: One of the thoughts that I had was actually pitching, and getting a small group of people - pen writers, Stenographers, Palantypists - to do almost like a roadshow around colleges. They could go in under the careers section and just do a small presentation of what we do.

PAUL BRINCAU: Absolutely brilliant.

SHERYLL HOLLEY: To actually demonstrate it in a presentation, and to hook people in to the interest, and say, "You can make a living out of this. This provides X, a good wage", so that you get people interested and you get the actual career advert out there.

PAUL BRINCAU: And roadshows do work. I do some work for other firms and for the Rugby Football Union. That's how they promote themselves, by having roadshows, and the success they get is fantastic. And it is all linked to Madam President's speech. That's why I said, because you mentioned earlier that there were enquiries from universities. Now, we all get enquiries. You know, when we do our job, we get approached saying, "How long does it take you to learn this?"

ANN LLOYD: We need to get the information out.

PAUL BRINCAU: People are interested in it. And really, we need to catch them at the university stage, because the people who ask me are people who are on full-time employment. I say to them, "It's going to take you two years. I got paid while learning because I was in the air force, but to do it yourself you have to take two years out."

So, if we catch them at the stage where they are still at university or they are still at school, through roadshows, that's the only way we can do it. Somebody said to me, "Have you ever thought of getting on the Council?" Actually, I do not know about the Council, but I would help with roadshows.

THE PRESIDENT: Okay. Right. I will make a note of that!

PAUL BRINCAU: If somebody can find universities who have enough people interested, I will quite happily join with other writers, and two or three of us can go out.

THE PRESIDENT: Some universities already have links in. I think it is Liverpool and John Moores. Lots of universities link into the site.

PAUL BRINCAU: We need to liaise. Even if there's not enough from one university, if there are three universities in the area, or so many, we can perhaps amalgamate the enquiries and do it that way. I think it is so important to have membership, because that's what drives the Institute. And the more members you have, the more strong you become.

We can even go back to the days when we couldn't work in a court without a card. I remember – and we are not going all that far back - people used to ask me for my card. If I didn't have my card in a court, they would have to say, "Sorry..."

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you for that, Paul. We will be phoning you.

PAUL BRINCAU: Thank you very much.

THE PRESIDENT: Has anybody else anything before we move on?

JANE NORMAN: I think if you could identify where people can obtain training, if there was something on BIVR about where people can actually obtain training, you would start getting the interest of people who want to go into the profession. They need to know where they can access the training.

MARY SORENE: It is already on the website.

JANE NORMAN: Is it?

THE PRESIDENT: It probably needs reviewing. I have a friend whose daughter trained. They are from here and she trained in the States. People will travel to learn. There's also Stenograph University. There are computer-based programmes. We need to widen that to be more comprehensive, and maybe put, I do not know, a newsflash on the front of the website saying, "New course opening in six weeks", just to keep pushing it. But, yes. I agree with you, Jane. That would be brilliant. Thank you for that.

SHERYLL HOLLEY: Can I raise another point? It's more of a question. Can you go to university or train as pen writers now? Are they still training people as pen writers? When I did college, I was taught Teeline, but that's got limited speed, and it only gets up to about 100 words a minute or 120. But, as far as Pitman, can you still train in Pitman, do you know? Does anybody know?

THE PRESIDENT: We will look. We will find out. My instinct is Pitman, like Teeline - they like Pitman 2000.

PAUL BRINCAU: For secretarial-type work, not court work where you need the speed, because the machine obviously is more efficient now. I mean, pen shorthand is beautiful. I wish I could still do it, and produce transcripts at the same speed as the machine does, because I would still be doing Pitman shorthand, but for the efficiency point of view and quick transcripts. And to learn Pitman takes you the same time, if not longer than to learn the machine, because it is more complicated; it is more intricate.

THE PRESIDENT: Yes. It's possible there may be people out there who have high-ish Pitman speeds who maybe are unemployed. A course could be devised for them. It's a case of finding them, proving the demand, and proving virtually that they would get work. But it is something we can look at.

SHERYLL HOLLEY: Just thinking of an advantage, I learned to type on a QWERTY keyboard when I was in school. If I was taught Pitman from school age, it is something you would always use because you are always taking notes, so you would always use it. People say, "Speech to text is going to be null and void because voice is going to come in." Well...

MARY SORENE: Not true!

SHERYLL HOLLEY: I would have thought the same argument would be used for pen shorthand, but actually it can still be used, and it is very valuable.

PAUL BRINCAU: Oh, yes. There are places where the machine doesn't fit, and you could be walking round on the scene of a crime and you need a pen and paper - which, as you know, I had to do.

SHERYLL HOLLEY: Yes.

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you, Paul. Can we move on, Mary?

PAUL BRINCAU: Mary, Madam Chair. Just one more point, sorry! It's about the digital recording, which you mentioned, because that's very important. That's actually what's eating into our work and basically setting us back to the old days of the tape recorder.

How efficient is it, I mean, when you think about documents that we use in producing transcripts? And even then sometimes, especially I know people who have done a certain type of work, like medical work. You know, when you work for the GMC, for example, or for committees or regulatory committees, it is very complicated, and sometimes we find it difficult, even with documents. And yet we're talking now about digital, and stuff being sent to New Zealand to people who - with no disrespect, you know - they've got an accent to cope with, apart from the fact that they have no documents and no knowledge of the work they're

doing.

THE PRESIDENT: Yes. There are several things, quickly. One is that the user of that service may have been misled by having a story spun to them about "how efficient our transcribers are". We all know how hard it is. You would need to be very skilled to do that kind of work, and they're not paid much, I'm sure.

PAUL BRINCAU: No.

THE PRESIDENT: And then I have heard several things about regulatory contracts where work is being produced that's kind of upsetting the person who commissioned it, if you like. But maybe they do not know what to do. Maybe they are under terrible financial pressure. Maybe they do not know where to go. I just do not know.

PAUL BRINCAU: The Institute!

THE PRESIDENT: They have to choose.

PAUL BRINCAU: That's what we are there for.

THE PRESIDENT: If we say, "Please use somebody very expensive", they are not going to listen.

ANN LLOYD: We need to put to them why it is important to use somebody qualified.

PAUL BRINCAU: It's money. We were talking earlier about putting our names on the list. May I just say that, in the last four weeks, I have had four people contacting me to do jobs for them. In fact I couldn't do four of them, but two of them I made an effort to do, because I thought otherwise people might think, "Why are we contacting these people if we cannot get them to do the work?" So, I went and worked weekends to get the transcripts out, but I thought at least it kept a couple of people who enquired happy, so people know where to look.

ANN LLOYD: That's the importance of the website, because more and more people are using that as a tool to find us.

PAUL BRINCAU: Yes. It seems as if it is being used a little bit more. Thank you.

THE PRESIDENT: Good. Thank you. I think we do need to move on now to Mary.

MARY SORENE: The Treasurer's Report. We have some copies of the Report and Accounts, if anybody doesn't have a copy with them or wants to have another look. (Copies circulated) This was sent out earlier, but, if anybody has any questions on it, if I can answer them, I will. Otherwise I need you to adopt and agree them. Are there any questions on the accounts that I can answer?

THE PRESIDENT: We included on the back sheet the detailed profit and loss account. We were asked by a member to provide it. We do not normally, but we have, so you can see what we are spending.

MARY SORENE: Mr Kypri tells me, historically, this doesn't usually go out to the membership. It is a matter of choice whether we do give it out, but it definitely doesn't go to Companies House because we no longer have full accounts. Being a small company, we do not have to send full audited accounts. He obviously sends them over, and this particular page at the back doesn't go to Companies House, so that's why it was never included from him.

I did have a query from somebody asking why we use the word "turnover". It is a business term, because we are effectively a business, and it is just an accounting term that is used.

Are there any other questions? Otherwise we could sign them off. No? I am not encouraging questions! Okay? Can we have a show of hands. (Carried)

THE PRESIDENT: So the accounts are agreed.

We are moving on to the election to Council. Now, we have had three nominations for vacancies on the Council, and therefore no election is necessary. So, we welcome Helen Edwards, Susan Humphries and Karen Young to the Council. Karen is based in the south-east of England. She is not here today, unfortunately.

Moving on from elections to Council, we move to the election of President for the following year 2010-2011. Now, the Secretary, Mary, has some voting papers. We have also received several proxy votes, and Mary will explain, I think.

MARY SORENE: People who cannot be here today sent in their proxy votes. They have to have come to me by Thursday for me to issue them to anybody, but they have all got my name on them and I've got six votes, as well as my own. So, if you see several hands going up, that's why.

Here are the voting slips for the President. Do you want to say who they are?

THE PRESIDENT: Yes. The presidential nominees or candidates this

year are Sheryll Holley here and Ann Lloyd. A note here says that only full members may vote.

MARY SORENE: I think only full members are here. One student member who was coming hasn't arrived, so it is not a problem.

THE PRESIDENT: Please vote for one, not two! May we have tellers? Do we need two tellers, Mary? Robyn is collecting the slips. (Votes were cast, collected and counted)

THE PRESIDENT: We have had a number of votes for Sheryll to be president next year. However, the overwhelming majority of votes are for Ann. Therefore, I declare that Ann is our president for next year.

SHERYLL HOLLEY: Phew!

THE PRESIDENT: Now, this is the tough bit. Sorry, we have 12 special resolutions, so I think we need to hand out resolution papers. Do you have them already? If you would like a minute to just read through and decide if you want to vote yes or no. I was proposing to move through them from 1 to 12, and then, after a decent pause, ask for a show of hands, for first, and second against, so we can get some idea of whether they are passed. We have a paper here to show the amendments, which might give people an idea of what we are amending. (Copies circulated)

The first resolution concerns the putting up of the annual subscription. The rest relate to the Mem and Arts. I think it is straightforward. We would like the opportunity to raise a little more money from January 2011, as we have spent not a huge amount, but some, on the website, and we have increasing demands on our finances.

Both Mary and I have done exercises working out on an annual percentage and inflation basis what the current annual subscription would be based on 1997 figures and we were coming out with kind of £55, £60, £65 to £70, so we're still relatively competitive. So, there's not much I can say about that, except to ask are you in favour of putting up the subscription fee. It's either yea or nay. A show of hands, please. (Show of hands in favour)

PAUL BRINCAU: The figure proposed is £45?

MARY SORENE: I made a mistake in the e-mail I sent out to members.

PAUL BRINCAU: You could have put it up to £50 then!

THE PRESIDENT: Okay. Resolution 1 is passed.

MARY SORENE: I should just record that I had one proxy vote against, but the majority is for, so that is passed.

PAUL BRINCAU: Can I ask a question? Is that sufficient? You put it up by £5, but I thought, Madam President, you said that maybe...

THE PRESIDENT: We had several versions of this actually. We thought at first to have it just to £45, and then we thought 45 or 50 or 55, which we then thought was a bit silly to choose. I thought 50, and we have looked at different figures.

PAUL BRINCAU: But what would be sufficient to satisfy the needs of the Institute?

THE PRESIDENT: I think we need to do budgets and come back to you. We cannot just pluck a figure.

PAUL BRINCAU: But if you are going to take a motion to put up the sub?

JANE NORMAN: Why do not you raise it £5 a year?

MARY SORENE: That was mooted. I can say that it didn't find favour, because it was felt that, frankly, members would not pay their subs. You know, they would lapse, if we said, "Let's put it up £5 a year for the next three years," but the consensus came back we should just put it up £5 this year.

THE PRESIDENT: We do have a problem of lapsing members and members who pay very late. Our fear was that the figures for the membership would go down yet again and more people would not pay.

JILL MASON: Do it on a sliding scale, so if you pay on time it is 45, and if you pay late it is 50.

THE PRESIDENT: That's a very good idea.

MARY SORENE: We can bear that in mind, but it has to be agreed in time to give notice to go out to membership.

PAUL BRINCAU: I disagree with that, Madam Chairman. This isn't a lottery. We are an institute. We set rules, and if we want our subs to be 45, they're 45, whether you pay them on 1st January or 1st December. If we need money, and this institute needs money to function, with all due respect to my colleagues, £45 or £50 is probably what you pay in tax in the first two hours of the day. It's not a lot of money when you consider other professionals like doctors pay £500, £600, £700 a year, and some writers earn nearly as much as GPs.

THE PRESIDENT: Yes. I take the principle on board. We have looked at the principle, but I think we are going to be reviewing it. Yes. And I think Jill was trying to be helpful to suggest getting people to pay earlier. It may be that something along those lines could be looked at as some kind of gentle incentive that we may use, as professionals, or something like that.

PAUL BRINCAU: It's a professional body and, as such, if subs are due at a certain time, we should pay them. Some of us have direct debits and standing orders; we do not have to be prompted. Maybe others should follow suit.

ANN LLOYD: Well, they should, Paul. But the difference is, if you are a doctor, you have no choice; you have to be a member. You see, our members have a choice, so we have to consider that.

THE PRESIDENT: It's since we have had the choice, things have slipped.

PAUL BRINCAU: I am disappointed actually, if there are some of my colleagues who do behave like that.

ANN LLOYD: Absolutely, yes.

THE PRESIDENT: Shall we move on to Resolution 2, to change the wording in the Memorandum and Articles of Association from "The Companies Act 1985" to "The Companies Act 2006" wherever it appears. Is anybody against that proposal? Passed nem con.

Resolution 3, to reword Article 5 so that it reads: "Upon compliance with Articles 3 to 8", which will be on page 4, "the Council shall issue to every member: (a) a copy of the Memorandum and Articles of Association (which may be downloaded from the BIVR website on the Internet); and (b) an appropriate certificate of admission."

This has been around for some time. We wanted to make it clear that people can legitimately download the Mem and Arts, and I think thereby save us quite a lot of money in sending them out.

But we do feel that we still have to issue an appropriate certificate of admission. Certificate of admission is the first certificate, but that has to be done in kind rather than from the Internet at the moment. So, again, is anybody opposed to this resolution? No? That's passed nem con.

Resolution 4, to re-word Article 9 so that it reads: "Persons who are not members of the Institute shall not be entitled to refer to themselves or hold themselves out to third parties to be 'Fellows', 'full Members', or 'Associate Members' and shall not be entitled to use the letters FBIVR, MBIVR or ABIVR."

Is anybody against that? No? That's passed nem con.

Resolution 5, to add a new article after the current Article number 9 and re-number subsequent paragraphs: "Members whose membership has lapsed through non-payment of their subscription shall not be entitled to refer to themselves or hold themselves out to third parties to be 'Fellows' or 'full Members' or 'Associate Members', and shall not be entitled to use the letters FBIVR, MBIVR or ABIVR."

Does anybody have any questions about that or are you content to pass that? Or, put another way, is anybody against that or does anyone have any questions?

PAUL BRINCAU: It actually goes back to what we were just saying, doesn't it? If they do not pay on time, as soon as they do not pay, their membership has expired.

THE PRESIDENT: Members are given chances to pay on 1st January, at the end of January and at the end of February, and we frequently do not chase people.

MARY SORENE: I do chase them, but they do not pay.

THE PRESIDENT: Not in a terminating kind of way. But we have had an example last year, or we have found examples, where people have a kind of template with their name, then MBIVR, and they are absolutely lapsed members. They do not check it and they do not pay.

ANN LLOYD: But they are still putting it on transcripts, so it is to clarify that. Whether it gives us more teeth, I do not know.

PAUL BRINCAU: It does because, if they do that, then they must be contravening some rule or regulation.

ANN LLOYD: It must be fraud.

ROBYN NOTT: Putting it on the bottom of a deposition for an American to say they are qualified and they are members, and they are not, is wrong.

PAUL BRINCAU: Certainly, the transcripts we do now, we sign them. At TA Reed anyway, we all have our names at the bottom. If you are not a member of the Institute and you do use the "Member" or "FBIVR", or whatever, you are committing fraud, and we should inform the people who have any authority over that transcript or where they work that these people shouldn't be using those initials.

ANN LLOYD: It has happened and they have been informed.

PAUL BRINCAU: That's fine, then. At least we are doing what we need to do.

THE PRESIDENT: Is anybody opposed to Resolution 5? No. That is passed nem con.

Moving on to Resolution 6, to amend the current Article 18 to read "twelve" instead of "fifteen" so that it reads: "The Institute shall be governed by a Council of up to twelve Fellows and full Members, in any combination."

It has been 15. It's simply too many. We only have maybe 110 functioning members. It's pointless to have such a large Council, so it is just a tidying amendment, but if anybody wants to leave it at 15, we could. Is anybody opposed in principle to the change? No. Resolution 6 is passed then. Thank you.

Resolution 7, to remove the current Article 20 (as it is superfluous) and re-number the following articles accordingly. "At the conclusion of his term of office the outgoing President shall hold the post of immediate past President during the following year".

I think that means we found two articles which effectively mean the same thing, and we called immediate past President something else?

MARY SORENE: We are now calling them vice-president, but we didn't amend it properly last year.

THE PRESIDENT: So this is Article 20 then, at the moment, the immediate past president. We are basically saying we do not want that, so we are dropping it off. Then we are papering over and we are just re-numbering it, so it is a tidying amendment.

So is anybody opposed to it? No? Passed nem con.

Moving to Resolution 8, to amend the current Article 50 to reduce the quorum at Council meetings to four: to say: "The Council shall meet as often as necessary for the efficient conduct of the business of the Institute. Four members at such meeting shall constitute a quorum."

We already have a quorum of four. It's to do with the absolute numbers of the Council. Is it just fewer than 12?

MARY SORENE: It is page 12.

THE PRESIDENT: "Where Council members number 12 or fewer, the number shall be four." We have reduced the Council to 12 in number, so we thought that was an amendment that was logical. Is anybody opposed to it? No? Okay, brilliant. Approved nem con.

Resolution 9. I will read this and then say just a couple of words about it. "To add a new article after the current Article 50 and re-number the articles accordingly: 'In determining whether Council members are participating in a Council meeting, it is irrelevant where any Council member is or how they communicate with each other. If Council members are not in the same place they may decide that the meeting is to be treated as taking place wherever any of them is.'"

This was lifted by me directly from guidance to the new Companies Act. As I said, it is not great grammar, but it is useful because it means we can meet in a loose kind of way, as long as we all know who we are and what we are talking about, and it means that we do not have to travel in the winter. Betty can stay at home and join in the meeting, et cetera.

I mean, you can have meetings by text as long as the minutes are correct or carefully done. It just loosens things up, but may be a bit much. What do people feel about it?

ROBYN NOTT: I think that's an excellent idea because then we could have councils from everywhere. Perhaps even some from Manchester, if they do not have to travel down to London. Jane?

JANE NORMAN: Not even in Manchester!

PAUL BRINCAU: At the same time, from the way it is worded, it could mean that you and I could talk on Tuesday, and you and Mary could talk on Wednesday, and then I assume there's voting and so forth, when you have Council meetings, isn't there? Perhaps I am being petty. We all know what it means, but I mention it just for the sake of argument.

MARY SORENE: That might be what Jean means by the wording might not be quite as good as it could be.

ROBYN NOTT: It only refers to the place; it doesn't refer to the time. It doesn't say you have to set a time, just that you have to be in a lot of places. You must be at the same time in lots of different places.

PAUL BRINCAU: It does mean maybe you cannot vote on certain aspects. I do not know, I have never sat on a Council meeting, but you must have certain subjects you have to vote on.

THE PRESIDENT: Unless it is implicit in the words "Council meeting"?

JANE NORMAN: Don't you have a time and place? Obviously not a place, but you have a time and a date.

PAUL BRINCAU: Why not add the time and the date in there. People can vote on the amendment. If people agree, you can insert it now. You do not have to re-write it.

THE PRESIDENT: Where would we insert it? Any thoughts?

PAUL BRINCAU: "In the same place and at the same time, they may decide that the meeting..."

ROBYN NOTT: I think it is fine as it is.

ANN LLOYD: It is implicit in "the meeting".

MARY SORENE: I think the strict rules of these resolutions are that you vote on the resolution as it is printed here. We would have to amend it next year to add extra words. That's the rules.

PAUL BRINCAU: Is it the rules? Well, I propose an amendment, if somebody is going to second it, that the rule be amended, because it is ambiguous.

THE PRESIDENT: Okay. We would have to then not pass it, or take a vote on it.

ROBYN NOTT: Take a vote. Who is in favour of the resolution as it stands? (Show of hands)

MARY SORENE: A show of hands, plus Mary votes her six proxy votes!

THE PRESIDENT: Was somebody counting?

MARY SORENE: I saw virtually everybody's hands up.

THE PRESIDENT: The majority in favour. But we promise we will review it, and if we can improve it, we will, I am sure. Thank you all.

Resolution 10. We discovered we didn't have a casting vote clause, so to add a new article after the current Article 50 and re-number the following articles accordingly. "If the number of votes for and against a proposal are equal" (it should be "is" probably) "the Chairman or other Council member chairing the

meeting has a casting vote."

This is another one actually I am beginning to wonder why I did this, but I lifted it from the Companies Act guidance. Again, it is ungrammatical. Is anybody against it? No? Passed nem con.

Resolution 11, to amend the current Article 56 by the inclusion of the words "and full Members" after the words "Fellows" so that it reads, "The Council shall appoint a panel of Fellows and full Members of the Institute to be examiners (one of whom shall be the chief examiner) to examine candidates for the current year; and approve an examination syllabus and standards as shall be revised from time to time."

This is to tidy up matters because we discovered, some time ago, and we have been thinking about this, that in fact only Fellows may examine members, and we have declining numbers of Fellows. We simply have to do this, otherwise we cannot really examine people. I suspect we have been examining in ignorance of this for some time, but it needed tidying up, I thought. So is anybody against that one? No? Passed. Good.

Resolution 12, to add a new article after the current Article 56, that sets out which section it is in the Mem and Arts. "An entrance fee as determined by the Council shall be payable upon first admission to membership. An examination fee as determined by the Council shall be payable for any examination for Associate membership, full Membership or Fellowship of the Institute, and for any additional professional examinations as may be established by the Council from time to time."

This allows us to, in this case, charge for first admission. It may not be very much. Earlier on, we were looking at issuing certificates on first admission. This simply allows us to raise money by charging for examinations, which can be very expensive.

Is anybody against resolution 12? No? Thank you very much. That's passed nem con. We have finished them.

MARY SORENE: That's the special resolutions.

We need to continue now with the appointment of our accountant. Mr Kypri, who trades as Alliance Accountancy, has indicated he is willing to continue as our accountant. He is a certified accountant. He produced the accounts you see here and have already.

Would anybody like to propose Mr Kypri as our accountant for 2010, for this year?

PAUL BRINCAU: I propose.

ROBYN NOTT: I will second.

MARY SORENE: Do you agree?

THE PRESIDENT: (Show of hands) That is agreed.

Now then, we need to set a date, or a couple of dates, or a range at the moment, for the next AGM, or to suggest ideas for the next AGM. It has to be within 18 months of today's date, bearing in mind that Ann, as the new President, might have an idea of how many months it might be. I have been here for 12 months. We can have people on board for president up to 18 months. It's kind of between Ann and those of you in the room as to whether you want to leave it to us.

ANN LLOYD: I am quite flexible, but I think 12 months is probably a good time as a term for presidency. So, if we say May next year, at about the same time.

ROBYN NOTT: Early May.

ANN LLOYD: Yes.

THE PRESIDENT: The Olympics are the year after.

PAUL BRINCAU: They are 2012. The World Cup...

ROBYN NOTT: Early May is quite a good time.

THE PRESIDENT: It's after Easter and before the bank holiday. May 2011. Saturdays are 7th, 14th, 21st, 28th.

JILL MASON: Forget the end week. That's bank holiday and/or half term.

THE PRESIDENT: The 1st May is a Sunday. I would guess the 2nd is the bank holiday and the 30th will be the bank holiday. So, I would guess we have the 7th or the 14th, or something like that.

ANN LLOYD: Can we say the 7th?

THE PRESIDENT: Yes. Unless something conspires against us, then it will be the 7th May next year. And I do not know whether we will be back in London. We might stay here.

ANN LLOYD: We quite enjoyed our roadshow. Brighton would be very

convenient for me! Anybody else?

PAUL BRINCAU: Sounds good to me.

ANN LLOYD: Scotland? We may carry on going North. Who knows?

SHERYLL HOLLEY: Aberdeen.

PAUL BRINCAU: Manchester.

THE PRESIDENT: So, that is our formal business over. In conclusion, thank you very much, ladies and gentlemen.

PAUL BRINCAU: Can I just reiterate a vote of thanks to Mary for her very useful and tireless work on behalf of the members.

THE PRESIDENT: And I think that means that no more minutes need to be taken, Jean. Thank you very much.

ANN LLOYD: A big thanks to Jean for taking the minutes.

ROBYN NOTT: Thank you, Jean, for your excellent work! And thank you, Jean, for being President. You did a very good job. (Applause)

(The meeting closed at 3.52pm)