

The Dons Trust
Minutes of Special General Meeting held at 7.30pm on
13 September, 2018
The Cherry Red Records Stadium, Back Bar

1. Introduction and apologies

Chair of the Trust, Mark Davis, opened the meeting and welcomed everyone. He noted apologies from Dons Trust Board (DTB) member Nigel Higgs, and Dons Trust (DT) members John Woodruff and Tudor Jennings.

Mark explained there were two main topics on the agenda; an update about the new stadium, and details of the Restricted Action to issue new shares in AFCW Plc. There would also be time for discussion, questions and answers. If required, a further meeting could be held if there was insufficient time for Q&A.

2. Approval of draft minutes of Special General Meeting held 26 April 2018

Mark had received one comment that the reference on page 4 to terraces should be to terraces or safe standing and confirmed he would amend this.

Dennis Lowndes noted that at the meeting he had brought up the subject of the freehold of the site of the new stadium and there was no reference to this in the minutes. Mark clarified that we would be getting the freehold of the site.

Mark asked for confirmation of the minutes and they were duly ratified.

3. Stadium update

In a PowerPoint presentation the Chief Executive of the Club, Erik Samuelson, provided a recap of where we are now along with a summary of the problems we were dealing with and proposed solutions. He provided a timetable, details of how the stadium would look, the consultation process and funding.

Where are we now

Erik advised that we have a strong advisory team helping us, made up of:

- Mott MacDonald - quantity surveyors who advise on costs
- Wilson Owens Owens - architects who have designed the stadium
- Momentum – structural engineers
- Hogan Lovells - lawyers
- Max Fordham – mechanical and electrical advisors
- BDO – auditors and tax advisors

Clearance of the site was almost complete. Environmental reports need to be completed for sign off by Merton Council. Once the sign-off is obtained the freehold will be transferred to us and building work can commence. Erik anticipates the land transfer will happen before the end of the year.

Problems & solutions

The culvert pipe (drain)

The existing culvert pipe runs right through the site and goes underneath the footprint of the new stadium. To enable the pipe to be accessible for any future repairs, it must be redirected to go under the proposed north/south pedestrian walkway. Before Galliard can redirect the culvert they need sign-off from Thames Water and this had taken longer than anticipated. The sign-off was finally received a couple of weeks ago but this had delayed Galliard starting the work. We cannot take the freehold of the land until the culvert work has been completed. This was being addressed by amending the agreements between the Club and Galliard so that the transfer can go through broadly in line with the original timetable and before the culvert work is complete. The lawyers are currently working on changing the agreements. Erik advised that, should we take over the site before the culvert work is complete and for whatever reason it never does get completed, we expose ourselves to financial risk. If we want to move forward with the construction we have to decide whether that is an acceptable risk. Erik advised that he would be recommending we take that risk.

Tender – Contractor

Erik reported that a decision had been made to do the tender in two phases. In June 2017 Andrew Scott Limited were appointed to complete the pre-construction work, to design and present a fixed build price. The price for this phase of work was fixed. The normal practice for a tender such as ours would be for the tender to go through a value engineering process, where we would look at ways to refine the design and make the costs more manageable. The contractor would then go back to the sub-contractors for them to refine their pricing and a final tender presented. At the end of August 2018 a provisional tender was received from Scotts. For the second phase, being the value engineering process, in order to introduce some different ideas and challenges and to make sure we get the best possible deal, the board had decided to work with a different contractor, who had now been identified. This would not have a major impact on the timetable and there would be no financial penalty.

The Design – Section 73 planning application

Erik reported that the planning permission provided for a creche in the north-south street, introduced at the request of the Greater London Authority (GLA). The London Borough of Merton (LBM) acknowledged that, in their opinion, there was no need for a creche and café but the GLA had wanted one as a means of animating the north-south street. With Galliard we had gone back to the GLA suggesting that it was not needed. There had been a change of staff at the GLA and the current staff accepted the arguments there was no need for a creche.

The stadium opening hours permitted under the original planning permission were such that, if we had a mid-week cup game that went to extra time and penalties, we would not have time to finish it unless we kicked off at 7pm.

We have now submitted a Section 73 variation to the planning permission to LBM, proposing to remove the creche / café and to revise the mid-week opening hours, along with a number of other minor amendments and changes requested by Galliard. This was likely to go to the November planning committee meeting.

Timetable

Erik advised that the stadium in its first phases would not look the same as the images that members have seen for the stadium once completed to its full capacity. We will be building the West Stand as a permanent stand and the rest will be temporary, relocatable stands.

The estimated time from start to completion of the construction was 13 months. We had been told it was feasible to still have a start date of January 2019, so we are still hopeful of completion during the 2019/2020 season. If not, it will be the start of the 2020/2021 season. Future consideration needs to be given to opening at the start of a season with a proper opening ceremony, versus a completed stadium and pitch not being used for three or four months and the subsequent loss of increased income.

Consultation

Erik went on to discuss the proposals for a consultation, making it clear that no irrevocable decisions had been made about how we will operate the new stadium. The main issues for consultation would be the following:

Design of the stadium / safe standing

Initial capacity will be between 9 – 10,000. There will be one main, permanent, West Stand and three temporary stands. Erik then showed some drawings of what the stadium would look like, together with the flats, retail store and revamped squash club.

If funds were plentiful then some things we could consider doing (not in order of priority) would be:

- completion of the West Stand;
- an upper concourse in the South Stand, where fans could congregate and socialise before the game;
- roofs for the areas behind the temporary stands;
- a mezzanine partial floor in the East Stand, and replace, where the creche would have gone, with a base for the Foundation (for which a grant might be available);
- some of the toilets and concessions would be temporary and we could consider making them permanent;
- fit out the upper level of the West Stand with more boxes and make the event space bigger;
- build a full permanent roof over more of the stands;
- safe standing or rail seating.

Current rules are that in the Championship and Premiership all clubs must have an all seater stadium. The Government is currently reviewing the evidence on this, so in future this rule may change. Safe standing was where there was a series of flip up seats, with a barrier in front of every row and these qualify as seats for some clubs to be in the UEFA competitions. In League One and Two we are allowed to have a terrace behind the goal. If at the new stadium we build a terrace, or have rail seating, and are therefore not an all seater stadium, the Football Stadium Improvement Fund (FSIF) would not allow us to transfer the £603k of grants we had on TCRRS to the new stadium. This would have to be repaid. We would also lose a further £201k of grants that we were entitled to.

Paper 1 – Draft minutes of 13 September SGM

The net cost of putting in a terrace or safe standing would be increased by £804k over and above any additional construction costs.

The other consideration was that a terrace or rail seating would require a much stronger concrete base which would add substantial building costs to the project as the south stand (the one which we would make a terrace) would need to be permanent and not temporary. Motts have advised that this could be in the region of £1m. Erik advised that the overall extra cost would therefore be in the region of £2m.

Dressing of the stadium.

How the stadium was going to look? How do we want the new stadium to reflect the heritage of the Club, e.g. statues, paintings, a founder's bar? Perhaps bricks transferred from our current stadium. Naming of bars.

Ticket pricing.

Facilities within the stadium

Catering options, what sort of mix of offer do we want? Types of beer and food.

However, Erik advised that on receipt of the final fixed tender and on the result of the funding there would be a limit to what we could do. In the consultation the Club would like to hear what fans want but the Club had to balance this with making the stadium as profitable as possible, enabling us to build a strong team. The consultation was likely to start in January 2019. As we do not need to make any decisions regarding the dressing of the stadium until June 2019 at the earliest, we have plenty of time to make those decisions.

Finance

Transfer of the land at Plough Lane will trigger the completion of the sale of The Cherry Red Records Stadium (TCRRS) to Chelsea. At that stage Chelsea will go from playing at TCRRS under licence from AFC Wimbledon, to us having a lease from Chelsea to continue to play at TCRRS. Under the agreement TCRRS should to all intents and purposes still look like our stadium but realistically at that point Chelsea's signage and influence will grow. AFC Wimbledon need to move out of TCRRS by the summer of 2020. The money we will get from Galliard is £14 million and this becomes available when we start the construction work.

We would prefer to spend the Galliard money first, then the Chelsea money. We have a facility letter for a bank loan in place, which will turn into a proper offer. However, we do not want to draw down on this and borrow money until we really need to, which will be the later part of 2019.

The acceptance form for the FSIF grant of £201k had now been submitted.

Crowd funding

The Club are proposing to raise money by issuing more shares in AFCW PLC. However, we would not go below 75% (and probably higher) ownership of the shares by the DT. This would ensure no decisions were made by anyone unless approved by the Dons Trust. The launch would probably be before the end of the year. The legal review of the draft documents for the crowd funding was underway and a decision will be made once that review was complete.

Q&A on stadium

Mike Richardson asked about the naming rights for the stadium. Erik advised that the Club was ready to launch this but the exact timing was yet to be decided. Erik considered that the income from naming rights should be used to run the Club rather than making a capital contribution towards the new stadium.

Mike asked whether there would be any restrictions on who could qualify for naming rights. Erik reminded members that in a previous survey the feedback had been no gambling, pornography, payday lenders or arms companies. Mike was concerned that a gambling firm might offer us £5m for a 10 year naming rights deal versus a charitable organisation only offering £100k for 10 years and questioned whether it was wise not to consider this. Erik agreed that a lot of sponsorship money in football does come from gambling but it was the members who had previously decided they did not want to partner with this type of company and reminded members that some decisions they make would have a financial consequence.

Walton Nangle asked whether the Club would be informing current shareholders about the sale of new shares before launching the sale to the public. Erik confirmed that this would need to be put to a vote of AFCW PLC shareholders. He added that the shares would be the same type as previously issued. There were two types of shares: the Ordinary shares, all of which are issued to the DT, and the A Ordinary shares. The plan was to issue A Ordinary shares, in an amount that would preserve the Dons Trust's control of over 75% the Club.

A member wanted clarification that we needed to vacate TCRRS by the summer of 2020. Erik confirmed that this was the case. He also asked whether the Club knew what amount we could expect to receive for the naming rights. Erik replied that, for negotiation reasons, it would not be prudent to reveal this.

Ian Pollock asked for clarification between safe standing and rail seating. Erik advised that rail seating is a seat that could bolt up so that you could stand in front of it and then lean on the barrier in front. When you are playing in Europe for example, the seat would have to be bolted down into a seating position. Erik differentiated this from a terrace which he considers standing safely.

Steve Adams advised that he was at the meeting at Wimbledon Brewery when the ethics of sponsorship was discussed and perhaps now would be the time to revisit this. He suggested a survey to the supporters containing a lot of other aspects as, in light of the financial implications, their opinions might have changed. His recollection of the meeting was that only half the room were against gambling and the other half were not sure. Erik advised that currently there was a very strong surge against gambling and whatever the tone of the meeting there had been a survey since.

Mark Davis clarified that the meeting at Wimbledon Brewery was as a discussion. The consultation that the Club promised to undertake was completed through an online survey. The DTB had reached its decision based on the online survey. Apart from pornography and weapons manufacture, there was a clear difference between gambling and alcohol. There was a stronger resistance to accepting gambling for the stadium naming rights and front of shirt sponsorship.

Paper 1 – Draft minutes of 13 September SGM

Mark acknowledged that a survey on gambling sponsorship was a possibility, as part of the consultation process. However, as the previous survey was conducted not that long ago, its findings remained valid and further consideration was needed as to whether it would be right to repeat it.

Geoff Seel said that when crowd funding was originally discussed we talked about community shares and the Government's Enterprise Investment Scheme (EIS) and asked why we were not now considering this. Erik advised that the rules had been changed and we were no longer eligible for EIS tax relief.

Peter Godfrey asked how much the Club was looking to raise under the crowd funding and what it would be used for. Erik advised that under the rules of crowd funding the maximum was eight million euros. Erik considered that the amount we could raise would depend on the purpose of the funding. If we needed to raise £1m to complete the stadium this would be more likely to succeed than if we needed to raise £2m to put terracing in. This was why the Club were consulting with the fans about priorities for how to spend the funding. Besides fans, the crowd funding company was seeking to access a broader range of investors, who would be attracted by the Club's history, story and adventure.

A member advised that the authorities were going to change the gambling laws next year. Erik said he was aware that this was around gambling machines but did not consider this was the same type of gambling company that would be interested in a naming rights deal.

Vaughan Robinson asked what rights would be offered to people under the crowd funding. Erik advised that this was still being decided but one idea was to pay out a bonus/dividend if we get promoted to the Championship and a bigger bonus if we get promoted to the Premiership. If the Club is successful, then we should share this success with the shareholders but there are other ways of rewarding shareholders too, such as discounted merchandise. These are all to be decided by the Club and DTB.

Colin Shergold asked about the possibility of giving more tickets to away supporters at bigger games. Erik advised that the stadium design was that 15% of capacity (around 1,400) of the East Stand would be given to the away side but for a less away supported side, if we had the demand, we could take back some of that capacity for our home crowd. The requirement was for 10% of the capacity of the stadium for a league game and 15% for a cup game to be given over to the away side.

Zbig Blonski asked what proportion of the capacity of the stadium was split between each stand. Erik advised that roughly the West Stand was within the 3,000 – 3,500 range. The North Stand was around 1,500 and the rest was roughly split, around 2,000 each.

Zbig also asked about the issue of raising money and the different options. He asked if we were under selling ourselves, particularly as we have such a powerful story to sell. Was there not a possibility of making a Hollywood movie out of our story, or a major sportswear brand buying rights. Erik responded that

Paper 1 – Draft minutes of 13 September SGM

the Club had thought about other options. Core naming rights are normally based on footfall. A film about the Club was already on the cards.

Vaughan asked what the approximate cost was of the three temporary stands versus the permanent West stand. Erik advised that he would have to come back on that but the significant cost was the West stand. He advised that if, you were going to use temporary stands for more than three years, it was generally better to buy them rather than rent them. The temporary stands could be sold when we install permanent versions.

Chris Wright observed that on the picture the West Stand seemed to be very shallow. Erik agreed it was tight, and that the architects and the project manager both said they have never seen a stadium built as tight, and noted that Galliard insisted they had given us sixty 63% of the land. Erik clarified that there would be roofs on the temporary stands but not on the concourse.

Steve Adams asked about posts to block views. Erik advised that it was still the aim not to have posts that block views.

Vaughan noted that the stadium was on the boundary between SW17 and SW19 and asked what postcode the stadium would have. Erik confirmed that he was pushing for an SW19 postcode.

The Club's Chief Operating Officer, Joe Palmer, advised that, in response to the fans wanting to know more about the progress of the new stadium, a stadium specific website was about to be launched which would show more detailed images of the progress. Joe gave a quick preview of the micro-site on screen. Whilst the site included information for existing fans it was also designed as a destination point for other people who live in the area and who want to understand what was happening. There was an option for businesses to show their interest in having events or using the hospitality at the new stadium. It will be continually updated. We are hoping to have a live CCTV webcam feed to monitor the building works. Joe wanted to minute his thanks to Carlo Rossi, who had been a tremendous help in setting up the micro-site.

4. Restricted Action for the sale of shares in AFCW PLC

Mark reiterated that we had heard from Erik that the Club would like to raise funding for the new stadium by issuing shares in AFCW PLC. However, the DTB needed the permission of the members of the DT to do that.

Mark advised that 15 years ago, when we financed the purchase of TCRRS, the Club issued shares in AFCW PLC. The DT used to own AFC Wimbledon Limited but a new company was set up called AFCW PLC as a holding company and a new subsidiary to own the stadium.

Two classes of shares were issued: Ordinary shares (all owned by the DT) and A Ordinary, which had been offered for sale. The two classes of shares have the same entitlement to dividends but the Ordinary shares have three times as many votes as the A Ordinary shares. At the time of the previous sale, in order to gain ownership of TCRRS, the DT was prepared to have their ownership

Paper 1 – Draft minutes of 13 September SGM

diluted down to 75% (plus one share) of the shares in AFCW PLC. The reason 75% was so significant was because it was the level of shareholding that gives the full control of AFCW PLC and therefore the Club. The DT could pass ordinary and special resolutions even if other shareholders voted against them.

Over time, the DT had put additional money into the Club and had strengthened AFCW PLC's balance sheet by converting that funding into share capital. The DT's shareholding in AFCW PLC now stood at over 90%. So, previously we had been content to own just 75% and our proposed crowd funding was not taking the control down to any lower than we had previously been happy with.

Mark reminded members that, some years after acquiring TCRRS, the Club had been approached by Darragh MacAnthony who wanted to buy the Club. We did not accept the offer but it highlighted that theoretically the DT could have sold the Club from under its members and the DTB did not feel that this was right. It was therefore decided to put in some protection – known as Restricted Actions – by ensuring that important decisions require a high level of members' votes. There are various categories of Restricted Actions, the most serious kind was a category A, which was obtained in 2015 when the sale of TCRRS to Chelsea was approved. The issue of new shares in AFCW PLC was a category B Restricted Action. In terms of approvals, at least 50% of members must vote and at least 75% of people who vote must vote in favour and the number of votes in favour must be at least 40% of the eligible membership. These are high levels of participation and approval. The vote will be launched shortly after this meeting, culminating in a Special General Meeting in early November.

The DTB encouraged members to vote in favour and to vote as early as possible. To assist in monitoring votes we encouraged members to vote electronically.

Mark explained that, even if members were not personally intending to subscribe for shares, it was crucial that they still vote yes in the Restricted Action so that other people can subscribe and help fund the new stadium. If the DT do not get the approval from the members then the Club would not be able to launch the crowd funding and raise the required funding for the new stadium.

Mark explained that once the DT had members' authorisation, AFCW PLC would launch the share issue. The DTB would be consulted on the terms of the issue. Mark reminded members that the DTB represented the majority of directors in AFCW PLC. Mark asked anyone who had family, who were members, to explain to them why it was important to vote.

Mark invited questions from the members.

Kevin Watson stated that the last time we did the share issue it cost a lot of money. He asked how much this new share issue was going to cost and that he thought only half the shares were sold last time. He asked whether there were any cheaper ways of doing it.

Mark replied that the biggest cost of the previous share issue was the cost associated with issuing a formal prospectus. As the rules have changed, the prospectus required for a crowd funding is less detailed and so would be cheaper. In addressing the question of issuing new shares versus old shares,

Paper 1 – Draft minutes of 13 September SGM

Mark advised that we are not selling existing shares that we own.

Erik confirmed that previously the significant costs were in producing the prospectus and paying the financial advisors. He advised that the overall cost in 2003 was in the region of £115k. This time there was a minimum fee of £30k and after that a small percentage for the first tranche of money raised and then a higher percentage as the money raised went up. It was in the crowd funding company's best interest to raise as much money as they could. Erik explained that the reason we are paying them was that they have the expertise to launch and promote the crowd funding. They also have access to a wide range of other investors beyond our AFC Wimbledon fan base which would be required.

A member asked whether the crowd funding company believed it was a good thing. Erik advised that the crowd funding company were very excited to help us with this launch and believed it would be successful.

Kerry Yeomanson wanted to know what the difference would be in the shares that he already owns with the shares he was about to buy. Mark advised that the intention was to offer A Ordinary shares, which were the same as the shares offered for sale in 2003 and carry exactly the same rights. The special dividends that Erik had previously mentioned would be paid to both the previously purchased and newly purchased shares.

Colin Gayle asked whether there was going to be a basic price per share, as the previous were penny shares. He also asked whether there would be a minimum purchase requirement. Mark advised that the nominal value of the shares issued last time was a penny but they were issued at 60 pence per share. He invited Erik to comment on what the issue price was likely to be this time.

Erik advised that the share price would be higher but that it had not been fixed yet. He advised that it was probable that people would be invited to put forward a certain amount of money rather than buy a specific number of shares. It would then turn into an X number of shares.

A question was raised about whether one holds a share certificate in AFCW PLC. It was agreed that previously paper share certificates were issued.

Mark invited those present for an informal show of hands on how, when the vote is launched, members would vote. He said that the DTB would be encouraging all members to vote in favour. The show of hands was that everyone bar one person would vote yes. The person not in favour said that he was inclined both for and against. Mark pointed out that a member only gets one vote.

Mark asked everyone to ensure that the DT, via our Membership Secretary, had the latest contact details of all members (and family members), particularly those who may have moved recently. The email address to advise changes was membership@thedonstrust.org.uk.

Mark advised that all members who receive DT communications via email would receive an email containing a link to the papers and a separate email with a link to Survey Monkey enabling them to vote online. He advised that some email

systems do not work well with Survey Monkey, so checking the spam and junk folders would be advisable.

5. Discussion with members and Any Other Business

Mark advised he had a few questions that the DT would like to get members' feedback on as well as questions from members and that there were a couple of questions that had come in via Webjam.

Checktrade Trophy

Mark sought views from members with regards to the Club being in the Checktrade Trophy. The rules of the competition had changed a few years ago to allow under-23 year old teams from Premiership and Category 1 Academies to participate. The EFL have encouraged clubs to talk to their fans about this competition and the DT are interested in what fans think about it.

Dennis Lowndes considered that the Checktrade trophy was a waste of time because the fans are not supporting it and it probably costs the club money. He thought we would do better to follow Sutton United and join the Scottish Cup.

Erik confirmed that the crowds are pretty low and that the Club does not make money from hosting a game. He confirmed that the EFL had said that, so long as a club did not rubbish the competition and encouraged fans to attend, if a club made a loss on a game then they would be given the shortfall back out of the EFL's central funds.

Carlo Rossi did not agree with under-23s being in the same competition as adult players, especially as most of the under-23s were not English players and the original idea was to help English youngsters gain experience. He did not consider that the EFL would ever acknowledge they had made a mistake and go back on it. So we are left with a competition that we do not want to be in. This was not the fault of players, managers or staff so it was best to get behind the team and try and make some money out of it as he was here to support our team and not the competition.

Mark asked for a show of hands on the options of:

- members who are happy with the competition and under 23s playing – *there was one person that agreed with this option*
- members who would not support the team in this competition – *around a quarter agreed with this option*
- members who are in the middle of the two previous options, i.e. who do not approve of it but are not going to boycott it and would come and support the team – *just over half agreed with this option*

Colette Mulchrone stated that she was in the camp who would not support this competition. She cited the overwhelming vote by Grimsby to not take part in the competition but it was voted for. She considered it was a Premier League problem as their clubs hoard all the young players.

Paper 1 – Draft minutes of 13 September SGM

Ross MacLagan said he would support the team if we were playing someone in a similar division but would not watch the under-23s of a Premiership or Championship side. On a show of hands, around 15-20% agreed with Ross.

Nick Draper was against the competition and asked of the Club and the DT where they saw the end game. Mark replied that there was no official DTB view.

DT Vice-Chair Matthew Breach advised that he was at the EFL meeting when the idea of this competition was being discussed. He considered that the lower clubs were taking Premier League money to enable them to solve one of their own problems and on a personal level he does not like the competition.

On a personal level, DTB member Jane Lonsdale advised that she did not like or support the competition and she did not like that the attendances were cited as one of the reasons it was a good thing to do.

Laurent Ghibaut considered that we do not know the effect of fatigue on the players and whether this had been discussed between Erik and the manager. Erik advised that there had been conversations with Neal about the Carabo Cup and Checkatrade Trophy and that the rules had been diluted to allow clubs to be able to comply with them. A goalkeeper could have or not have played in the previous game. There must be four outfield players who started the previous game or start the next one or a combination of four players who have played 40 senior games. Erik's opinion was that they have had to adapt the rules because clubs were worried about their players playing so many games. He suggested buying our next home game's programme as he explains his position on this.

Live streaming and beam-back

Carlo Rossi brought up the subject of the EFL live streaming, on Ifollow, our away game against Gillingham being a 3pm Saturday kick off. He compared this with a Tuesday night away game against Accrington Stanley which he would not be able to attend so being able to stream that game would be a good thing. He considers that a 3pm Saturday kick off was sacred and should not be streamed.

Erik reported that the Club did not know until Thursday that the game was being streamed so the Club were unable to promote it but in any event did not want to do so until all the tickets had been sold. He explained that there was a rule in this country that you cannot show a Saturday game live between 2.15pm and 5.15pm except if it is an international weekend. There was a proposition that the split of the money from these games will be changed in order to allow bigger clubs to take a higher proportion of the profit in order to justify a bigger share of the central funds going from the EFL to the lower leagues.

Joe clarified that the rules have been changed so that Saturday games can be streamed live during an international break. Last season only people who lived abroad could watch live streaming on Ifollow. This season the new rule was that domestic mid-week games could be live streamed, which would equate to about five games a season. Joe agreed that this was very much a Championship initiative. He explained that it was a one camera feed so the picture was static but the Championship clubs were putting in four or five camera feeds to make it a more saleable product. They are testing this between now and November to

Paper 1 – Draft minutes of 13 September SGM

gauge uptake. They will then decide whether to roll out increased camera feeds to the lower leagues. He suggested that it should be monitored closely with the other clubs in the lower leagues to see if it affects attendances.

Mark asked for a show of hands on no Saturday afternoon streaming. Around one third to 40% were in favour of an embargo whereas a small minority were in favour of having a choice.

Zbig Blonski mentioned that, last season, some games had been beamed back and that these were very successful. He was supportive of these when they are for away games at difficult places to get to. He asked whether we were going to do it again. Erik advised that the issue about beam-back was that you need the other club's permission, whereas with the streaming you can do it anyway. Portsmouth have asked our permission to beam back their game with us but they are going to sell all their tickets for TCRRS so we would look favourably on that scenario. The Club assesses it on individual games and whether all the tickets have been sold and would expect other clubs to view it the same way.

Other questions

Hazel Potter considered that at the end of last season and start of this season there was a lot of general discontent. She would like to see a united club, setting the standard and leading the way for a fans' club. She would like to see a wide-ranging annual survey, not just of DT members but of all fans, conducted online and on paper, to get the fans' views on everything, e.g. how the club was run, the bars and match day experience. Then, when we get the results of the survey, it should set the agenda for the following year. This would show that we are listening to fans and we are doing things the way the fans want them done.

Mark advised that the DT are intending to do a strategy consultation about what sort of club we want AFC Wimbledon to be and the points Hazel raised were food for thought. Matt was leading the strategy consultation and reminded members that we did a full strategy consultation in 2011 and represented the scenarios of the type of club we could have, where it should be located, how it should be owned, and that was the drive to stay fan-owned and move back to Wimbledon. Now we will look at it again in a similar scenario-based way asking "given that we are going back to Wimbledon, what do you want now?" This will drive how we behave. He also said we could run detailed surveys, whether wide ranging or specific and that he was looking for volunteers to assist with that.

As time was running out for the meeting, DTB member Cormac van der Hoeven suggested having a meeting in a pub in Wimbledon, during October, for any further questions that people did not have the opportunity to ask this evening. There was general support for this proposition.

Mark mentioned that the date for the Minithon was 14 October 2018 and that it would be at the training ground.

Mark thanked everyone for attending and for their input and in particular thanked Erik and Joe for their presentations.