

# Annual General Meeting Draft Minutes

UK-TUG

14:00, 16th November 2019  
Trinity College, Oxford

Members present: Dominic Branford (DB), David Carlisle (DC), Elliott Clifton (EC), Simon Dales (SD), Jonathan Fine (JF), Jay Hammond (JH), Peter Kirby (PK), Phil Molyneux (PM), Michael Stanford (MS), Nicola Talbot (NT), Howard Vie (HV), Joseph Wright (JW).

Apologies received: Malcolm Clark, Brent Longborough, Arthur Reutenauer.

## Chair of meeting

In the absence of a formal Chair, Dominic Branford agreed to take the chair for the duration of the meeting.

## 1 Minutes of the last meeting

The minutes of the last AGM were agreed as a true record by all members present, after correction of the list of incoming committee.

## 2 Secretary's report

JW summarised membership changes: there have been virtually no losses or new members.

### 2.1 Treasurer's report and accounts

John Peters has had to retire for Treasurer role, and a replacement has only just been appointed. A report is therefore is not available.

JW summarised the major financial operations over the last year, as far as he is aware of them: TUG membership, DVD distribution, AGM expenses.

The incoming committee should arrange a set of accounts.

### 3 Chair election

JW had received a total of 38 submissions

- 1 Abstention
- 1 Spoiled paper
- 21 for Jay Hammond
- 15 for Jonathan Fine

Jay Hammond is therefore elected up to the end of the 2021 AGM.

### 4 Committee election

JW had received nominations to elect

- Malcolm Clark
- Simon Dales
- Brent Longborough
- Arthur Reutenauer
- Jonathan Webley
- Joseph Wright

to the Committee for 2019–20.

### 5 Motions

The meeting agreed to take the motions out-of-order.

#### 5.1 Motions 6 and 7

Discussion started focussed on motion 6 then broadened to include motion 7.

DC started by summarising his case for dissolution: there has been no significant activity over many years, and committee have not acted. He also noted that turnout in voting on motions (electronically and at AGM) was below half of membership, suggesting a general lack of engagement. He also stated that it is evident that the group is unrepresentative of T<sub>E</sub>X users in the UK. He also noted the lack of spending. DC also outlined that he had originally suggested that Committee bring forward motions concerning winding up, but he had been concerned that the deadline would be reached and no such motions would be put to AGM.

JF spoke about a recent OxfordRUG (R group) meeting in Oxford, which attracted around 22 registrations for a sessions focussed on using Markdown as a front-end to L<sup>A</sup>T<sub>E</sub>X for thesis preparation. He also surveyed the number of T<sub>E</sub>X–L<sup>A</sup>T<sub>E</sub>X StackExchange users in Oxford based on public profiles. He also suggested that sending funds out of the UK was less desirable than sending them to *e.g.* LMS, IoP, *etc.* JF felt that there had not been sufficient notice for an irreversible decision. It was pointed out that minutes for the 2018 AGM discuss possible winding up of UK-TUG.

There was some discussion of where the best venue for looking at winding up was, and about specific interactions UK-TUG has had in the past with LMS.

The committee were asked how many projects have applied for funding in recent years. JW stated only one application had been made in the period he has acted as Secretary. JF queried how widely the funding call was distributed; JW reminded members that it has been present on the website for some years.

Discussion focussed on motion 7 was prefaced with a reminder that the Constitution requires any destination for funds be selected before or in parallel with a winding-up motion.

DC stated that he had picked the two groups in the motion for clear reasons: CTAN support from DANTE in particular helping all T<sub>E</sub>X users. He also felt members needed some idea of where funds would go. SD supported the idea that these groups are reasonable given their aims.

NT asked if UK-TUG is first a UK group or a T<sub>E</sub>X group: the question is one of emphasis and impacts on what constitutes a similar group. This led to discussion of the role of maths in bringing people to T<sub>E</sub>X: EC stated that although he has a maths background, it was design considerations that led him to choose T<sub>E</sub>X.

The meeting agreed to take motion 7 before motion 6 as a decision on the latter could be informed by the former.

**Motion 7:** 20 for, 8 against, 7 abstentions. **PASSED**

NT felt that UK-TG has been beneficial when functioning properly. JF suggested that motion 6 did not allow an orderly shut-down. This led to wider discussion of the balance between dissolution and continuation of the group, and what that might mean.

**Motion 6:** 9 for, 20 against, 7 abstentions. **REJECTED**

Meeting was adjourned from 15:15 to 15:30.

## 5.2 Motion 1

JW summarised the technical requirement for this motion.

**Motion 1:** 32 for, 0 against, 3 abstentions. **PASSED**

## 5.3 Motion 2

JF spoke against the motion, stating that members were not sufficiently informed to pass judgement.

**Motion 2:** 9 for, 24 against, 6 abstentions. **REJECTED**

## 5.4 Motions 3, 4 and 5

The AGM agreed to take these motions together.

JH stated that he is not necessarily seeking dissolution, but does want to allow an orderly process to both consider this and implement it if required. A plan is needed now if committee is to recommend UK-TUG continue.

MS asked what the experience of other groups has been. JW summarised the situation as he understands it at TUG and DANTE: numbers are higher than ours but are falling. He also noted that other European groups are small and face similar challenges to us.

**Motion 3:** 22 for, 6 against, 8 abstentions. **PASSED**

**Motion 4:** 24 for, 5 against, 7 abstentions. **PASSED**

JF noted that committee does not require a motion to force an SEGM. He also noted that members may force an SEGM at any point. He therefore suggested that the motion is not required.

Discussion centred on the need to trust the committee and to give them time to act. Counter-arguments were made in that most members are passive and this is an opportunity to force a trigger.

Chair noted that the motion does not in itself bind the incoming committee..

**Motion 5:** 24 for, 7 against, 5 abstentions. **PASSED**

## **6 Any other business**

### **6.1 Bounties**

NT suggested that UK-TUG could offer bounties for work on specific projects: she had seen this at the recent London RISCOS meeting. DANTE offer awards *after* work is done: this might be another model.

**ACTION:** Incoming committee to consider.

### **6.2 Discussion meetings**

MS asked if extra more open-ended discussion meetings might be held.

**ACTION:** Incoming committee to consider.

### **6.3 Newsletter**

JF asked if a monthly newsletter could be produced to go to members and on the group website. This could cover material from committee and from members.

**ACTION:** Incoming committee to consider.

### **6.4 Thanks**

The meeting noted John Peters' many years of service as Treasurer and all present thanked him for his service.

The meeting closed at 16:05.