

# North West Homing Union

**Ian Evans – Terry Phifer 26<sup>th</sup> Feb 2019 9.42hrs**

**Overview:**

NWHU informed that at the RPRA AGM the RPRA council decided that de-recognition of the NWHU is suspended till 1<sup>st</sup> January 2020.

That all NWHU rings to be eligible to race / shown under RPRA rules must be registered with the RPRA by the 1<sup>st</sup> April 2019.

**Ian Evans to Terry Phifer 26<sup>th</sup> Feb 2019 10.05hrs**

**Overview:**

Informing NWHU that the RPRA registration of NWHU rings to attract a levy of 30p per ring

**Terry Phifer – Ian Evans 26<sup>th</sup> Feb 2019**

Thankyou Ian for the update, I'll give you a bell later to discuss, could be later this afternoon I'm tied up in meeting.

Regards  
Terry

**Terry Phifer – Ian Evans 27<sup>th</sup> Feb 2019**

Ian

Sorry for not getting back yesterday it was late last night by the time I got settled. Again thankyou for your feedback, do I take it it's just NWHU rings that have to be registered and attract a levy or does this also apply to other non RPRA issued rings? Is there any guidance available on how this is to be achieved in the timescale or will you be publishing guidance? It would be helpful in case any of the members come back to the NWHU for more information. Just to clarify from a NWHU position the RPRA's demands for the ring registration requirements and levy while disappointing for the sake of the ordinary fancier and the sport is at the end of the day down to the RPRA's own internal judgement and management.

There will be another NWHU meeting towards the end of March it's spring meeting, I've emailed Julia for any information she can furnish me with regards the current configuration and constitution of the Confederation. **I'll give you a bell in the next couple of days to discuss negotiations between our respective organisations that I believe should continue for the well being of our dual members and the sport.**

Regards  
Terry

**I Evans – T Phifer 4/3/2019 12.54**

**Overview:**

Recognition of the correspondence between the CEO of the RPRA Mr I Evans and NWHU had been published on the NWHU website, the CEO of the RPRA had not given permission, there is no objections to publishing an overview of what's going on but not in full from the CEO of the RPRA who would be grateful if it could be removed and replaced with something more appropriate.

For the Fancier by the Fancier

# North West Homing Union

**T Phifer – I Evans 5/3/2019 5.16**

On 2019-03-05 05:16, TERRY PHIFER wrote:  
Ian

What a nightmare of a weekend we've getting some home improvement done, now heavy rain and a leak not a small one in one of the ground floor roofs doesn't make for a great couple of days off.

To the subject must admit I'm a bit disappointed with your comments regarding the publication of our respective communications I don't think I've ever hidden the fact that I was going to publish our communications. I have said that I believe that transparency for the fancy and my members is important. Looking over the notes they are a full reflection of what has been passed between our organisations, I don't find any of them disrespectful or inflammatory in any manner and believe our dialog has been open and positive, they are just a record of what has been communicated. If you would like to review the communications and offer overviews no problem. It's just I'm not comfortable altering other people wording / correspondence. However, your concern is noted and will be taken onboard in the future.

Regards

Terry Phifer \_\_

**Ian Evans – T Phifer 5/3/2019 9.28**

**Overview:**

Reviewed previous email an overview more than appropriate.

**I Evans – T Phifer 5/3/2019 9.29**

**Overview:**

RPRA CEO No permission to publish future emails on any open forum.

**D Bridges – T Phifer 5/3/2019 13.18**

**Overview:**

The following an overview of an email received from David Bridges (DB) President of the RPRA it's a difficult communication to provide an overview but hopefully the main points are covered and conveyed. DB had been following correspondence between NWHU & RPRA CEO and found it puzzling. It was DB that pointed out to the RPRA CEO that correspondence had been printed in full on the NWHU website and was out of order.

DB noted that the RPRA understanding was that the NWHU representatives had agreed to comply with RPRA request about boundaries. The RPRA did not agree that the NWHU could not control who their affiliated organisations could allow to join them and become members of the NWHU.

The RPRA noted that the other unions would support them, and the confederation may consider NWHU membership if it complied with RPRA requests.

DB noted that none of the above appeared in the meeting report sent to the RPRA CEO.

**For the Fancier by the Fancier**

## North West Homing Union

The NWHU seem to assume it will be able to join the confederation.

The ball is with the NWHU that should take responsibility for its actions over the years instead of blaming it all on the RPRA.

**T Phifer – D Bridges 8/3/2019 15.27**

David

With all due respect and please don't take this wrong way but if your puzzled by the communications that have been posted then I'm just plain confused by your email.

Clearly remember at Blackpool saying that notes and communications would be published, so the members and fancy know what's happening.

Going back to the Blackpool meeting I didn't not notice any of your good selves taking notes which did seem a little odd for such a meeting. The notes that where taken and collated by the NWHU attendees where actually submitted to the RPRA 3rd Feb 2019 via Ian Evans to give your selves an opportunity to provide feedback on, no such feedback was provided or has been since until your email. With no feedback the notes of the meeting were understood

as an accurate record of what had been discussed. If you review the Blackpool notes I believe they are clear with regards any future membership of existing NWHU clubs / feds and the level of control that a ruling union / association can realistically exercise to dictate the actual membership of clubs / federations. Please correct me if I'm wrong by directing me to your own rules that allow the RPRA direct control over clubs / federations actual individual membership? Is it not standard rules of clubs / federations that fly under the rules of a union to expect / insist their members also join the ruling union?

With regards confederation membership it should be clear again from the notes that provided it was more than just a talking shop which you assured me it was by your own remarks after attending one of the meeting.

My own option is that an organisation that allows all the home unions to work together on issues that impact the whole sport and effect our respective members duel or other wise is a positive and should be used to its utmost, why wouldn't you?

As for taking responsibility for the NWHU actions of the past and the ball being in the NWHU court. Believe that the NWHU in instigating communications and the meeting between our respective organisations to deal with issues and try finding a way to work together for the

benefit of our dual members and the fancy in general was a first step in trying

to look and build for the future and not dwell on the past.

It's hoped that future negotiations can continue in the same open and respectful manner demonstrated thus far.

Not a big fan of ping pong emails and find it a lot better to talk, what would be the best number to call you on please David and would you mind it being early evening.

Regards

Terry

**For the Fancier by the Fancier**

# North West Homing Union

**D Bridges – T Phifer 11/3/2019 11.29**

**Overview:**

David Bridges noted: thanks for the reply, no mention of the NWHU agreeing in principle to only take future members within the NWHU declared boundaries. It was understood that the NWHU representative had to report back to their committee but failed to declare decisions.

Confederation – DB would like to see the NWHU join and realised that boundaries had changed over the years and would hope the RPRA and confederation could be willing to find these acceptable.

**T Phifer – D Bridges 11/3/2019 11.40**

**Thanks for getting back David I'll give you a call if that's ok, sure there is common ground on which we can move forward.**

Regards

Terry

**T Phifer – D Bridges 13/3/2019 5.44**

David

I'll give you a call Thursday evening if that's still ok for you.

regards

Terry

**D Bridges – T Phifer 13/3/2019 7.46**

**Overview:**

Fine with that arrangement.

**Please Note:** the following is a note regards a telephone call between my self Terry Phifer and David Bridges

I had a talk with David Bridges President of the RPRA: It was a good open and frank discussion with David, initially it was in response to an email I received from him, mainly about the NWHU listing full communications between the NWHU & RPRA. We covered a number of subjects and areas. Both of us expressed our concerns at the current challenges facing both unions and the sport in general. We also discussed negotiations and I must admit I expressed my disappointment that I believe the RPRA council had been informed that these had failed when to us in the NWHU they were still on-going. It was hoped that the RPRA and NWHU could continue negotiations after the RPRA representatives had reported back to council at their AGM. The NWHU after its management committee meeting in early February had been prepared to reach agreement on a number of items and issues but understood that the RPRA representatives needed time to report back to their council and act on their deliberations. I was more than a bit bemused and disappointed for the sport and our joint members at their reaction. It was however good to talk to David who has a difficult job on his hands as we all have at present now, I'm sure we'll talk again over the coming weeks / months for the benefit of our members and the sport.

**For the Fancier by the Fancier**