

From Martin Maynard

27th November 2022

Appeal request as requested by Cathey Clark, concise reasons why you wish to appeal and making reference to any infringement of the RAYNET Rules.

Membership Transfers

It's difficult to know where to begin with this response as it so clearly weighed against me by how this complaint was handled. The introduction document prepared by Greg Mossop starts off with a series of statements designed to help those evaluating the case but in fact, they are **misleading and factually incorrect**. It's unclear whether this is because Greg has not checked facts or has relied upon others to do that or whether Alec Wood has misled him. The Sefton and Liverpool constitutions have not been included, so I think those reading the complaint **will take Greg's introduction as fact when, it is fundamentally wrong**.

Had I been allowed to review the responses from Alec and Greg before it was considered these fundamental points could have been clarified. Greg's agenda in denying me to respond to Alec's rebuttal and then inserting his own view speaks volumes. It beggars belief that Alec's response and Greg's notes were circulated to CoM unchallenged and that I had to make a Subject Access Request to gain sight of Alec's response to the complaint! Has anyone in RAYNET CoM any understanding of dispute resolution, I wonder? **What has it come to that is that a county group is now controlled by a Charitable Trust whose deliberations have to be redacted from members' view? In my time, County meetings were open to all and minutes were circulated to all. Where is this allowed in the RAYNET articles of association?**

I will try to be concise and hope whoever reads this will take a little time to examine the issues a little deeper.

Greg Mossop's Introduction undermines my case from the start my, reflecting an incorrect position regarding the requirements for transfer and states that this is the principle issue.

Then he makes statements that appear as if he is talking from an authoritative informed position when he has the wrong end of the stick!

Greg refers to the articles of association and sights clauses 10 and 3.6 as a justification to interfere in and reverse memberships prior to an EGM called by an officer of Liverpool RAYNET. Had those membership transfers been allowed, a different perspective on the outcome of the future of Sefton and Liverpool may have been different at the membership's discretion. Who can tell? The actions basically removed the propositions from being discussed. Why did Greg do this? Well, it seems that Alec Wood, who is at odds with my views on the development of RAYNET, contacted him to claim that the transfer 'was non-compliant with the constitutions of both groups'! This is not so.

- 1) On the 2nd January 2016 Stu Nutt circulated the draft constitution of Sefton, a document supplied by my predecessor Mike G8RXB. This constitution, attached, was adopted. It makes no reference to the transfer of members from different groups. Sefton never changed away from that position!
- 2) The constitution for Liverpool is not available, and it is reasonable to assume that it also adopted a similar constitution in its history.
- 3) Clause 3.6 referred to in Gregs preamble, is in the 2017 default group constitution, but there is no evidence to suggest that Liverpool ever updated theirs to include this clause, and in any case, at the time of the transfers, Liverpool did not have a group controller to object!
- 4) Nothing in the RAYNET rules (June 2017) says the county controller has any authority to assume the role of controller of a group in disrepair; they are merely there to assist.
- 5) Notwithstanding the Liverpool situation with regard to the absence of a coordinator two officers Phil Foukes and Lee Bowland discussed the proposed transfers. Given rule 1.2c in RAYNET rules states that the Group Controller is answerable to members of the Group and Phil Foukes emailed the group members, none of whom objected, I think that even if it could be shown that Liverpool had adopted the 2017 default constitution, the terms of the transfer would have been met.
- 6) The request 'to clarify that the National Articles of Association have primacy over Group Constitutions and take steps to ensure that appropriate consent is sought from a member, and controllers in future.' Is irrelevant in this case and why should they have primacy anyway? Its up to the groups to draft their constitutions and can look to a model constitution available at the time should they desire. And in any case, what would be the purpose of allowing a controller to overrule a transfer to another group happy to receive a member?

Greg correctly states, *'He said at that time he was considering transferring to Liverpool group, my recollection was though that I counselled against this until he knew he had the support of the Liverpool members.'* This is correct, and the opinion was sought from Liverpool members, and there were no objections two weeks prior to the transfers.

Given that I had a telephone conversation with Greg about the transfers, I am puzzled that he did not simply have the courtesy of calling me or Phil Foukes the Liverpool registrations officer, to clarify the position.

It seems that Greg and Alec's actions were to preempt any possibility of my voice being heard at the Liverpool EGM or the Merseyside AGM that was held a week later!

=====

Phil Foulkes <phil@g7oea.co.uk>

Sun, 18 Sept,
15:02

to me

Hi Liverpool RAYNET members

We have recently received applications from three Sefton members to join Liverpool. Tony Holroyd G6PFZ, Martin Maynard G8CIX and Norm Drury G4SCO. Tony recently retired from Red Cross only to find himself called back to look after one of the Red Cross comms vehicles in Preston; Martin was formally the county controller and the instigator of the MEARL repeater system and Norm, who is a long-standing Southport member and Land Rover enthusiast.

We haven't had any meetings this year, so I am proposing to hold a zoom meeting on the **04/10/2022**, which will be an EGM to confirm our officer roles. Martin is interested in taking on the controller role and I would like to resume the deputy role, **but only if our members agree.** (To that end, please let me know if you would like to stand for any of the officer positions.) Martin would like to organise some social and radio activities and re-establish our connections with the local resilience officers.

Please share any thoughts on the above and let's see if we can get Liverpool RAYNET reactivated as an effective unit.

Regards

Phil,
G7OEA

=====

Greg further states that 'there were concerns over the willingness of the other members involved to be transferred'. Where did these concerns emanate from The members concerned all had emails and telephone / personal visit. Each of the members to be transferred gave their implicate approval and this was confirmed to me and the officers of Liverpool three weeks prior.

As follows:

=====

31 Aug 2022,
19:16

Norman Drury <norcad84@norcad84.plus.com>
to me, norcad84, Phil, Lee

Hi Martin,
I have no objection to my Raynet membership being transferred to Liverpool, as you suggested.

Yours,
Norm. G4SCO

----- Original message -----

From: Martin Maynard <martinmaynard@gmail.com>
Date: 31/08/2022 17:09 (GMT+00:00)
To: Norman Drury <norcad84@norcad84.plus.com>
Cc: Phil Foulkes <phil@g7oea.co.uk>, Lee Boylan <m6oau@hotmail.com>
Subject: RAYNET Liverpool / Merseyside

Hi Norman

It was good to see you yesterday. As I mentioned, I am looking to see what can be done to get some sort of life back into RAYNET. It is getting old and tired and, frankly, is not locally fit for purpose in its principle objective of supporting the local resilience officers with communication support. Merseyside, or should I say Lancashire? had RAYNET groups in each of the boroughs, but as the membership declined, we no longer are able to support those councils. What I am proposing is that we all join Liverpool, which could be regarded as a single Merseyside group in the North with Wirral in the South. At the moment, Liverpool has a treasurer, Lee Boylan and a registrations officer Phil Foukes (both copied in) but no active controller or deputy. As I am now able to resume operational status, you will recall I stood down after my wife Sarah had a stroke, **I am proposing, subject to member approval,** to fill the Controller role with Phil as my deputy. My intention is to focus on our

MEARL repeaters, maintaining the kit we have in the council offices and quarterly meetings focusing on radio topics of interest to those amateurs who enjoy getting signals in and out of difficult locations. Of course, we will also support the user service events as we have in the past.

If you are happy to have your membership assigned to the Liverpool group, could you confirm this by replying 'to all'.

Regards

It was quite clearly stated that Liverpool members approval would be sought in any move for me to take on the role of the controller with an invitation for others to stand should they choose.

It is true that the constitutions require a person to be in the Group for one year before standing for election *No person shall be eligible to stand for the Committee who has not been a member of the Group for at least one year.* However, the constitutions also state that *Any amendments to the Group's Constitution shall be by two-thirds supporting vote of those present at an Annual General Meeting or Extraordinary General Meeting.* **This would be a matter for Liverpool members to decide not Alec Wood or Greg Mossip.**

Revised submission of documents.

It was only shortly after the submission was made that was I made aware that it was Greg Mossop that had, in fact, reversed my membership and blocked Norman and Tonys. Was Greg acting complicity with Alec Wood or had he been misled by Alec Wood to block? I added the pages of information showing the consent, and this was submitted. **Greg Mossop was notified that revised documents were being and could have informed Alec Wood of the delay.**

Undermining my position.

Members Rules

e) not to act maliciously, deliberately or recklessly so as to cause any organisation or individual who is not a member of the Company to broadcast or form a denigratory or misleading opinion of the Company, its activities or of any of its members.

I never have at any time acted 'maliciously, deliberately or recklessly' in my dealings with RAYNET relationships with other agencies or its members. Yet Alec Wood writes to other members saying that I am making **scathing comments**. It would seem to me that Alec Wood has breached that rule!

Let's be clear:

Dictionary

Definitions from [Oxford Languages](#) · [Learn more](#)

Search for a word



scathing

/ˈskeɪtɪŋ/

adjective

witheringly scornful; severely critical.

"she launched a **scathing attack on** the Prime Minister"

Similar: [devastating](#) [withering](#) [blistering](#) [extremely critical](#) [coruscating](#)

[searing](#) [scorching](#) [fierce](#) [ferocious](#) [savage](#) [severe](#) [stinging](#) [biting](#)

[cutting](#) [mordant](#) [trenchant](#) [virulent](#) [caustic](#) [vitriolic](#) [scornful](#) [sharp](#)

[bitter](#) [acid](#) [harsh](#) [unsparing](#) [mordacious](#)

Opposite: [mild](#) [gentle](#) [complimentary](#) [^](#)

Scathing is an extremely strong term used by Alec to describe my character to others!

Where have I ever done this???

Alec goes on with correspondence that dates back six years, raking up matters that were the subject of a complaint against me at the time which Alec very much involved himself in. This matter was considered by CoM, who completely upheld my position.

Alec states:

- 1) *Martin also mentioned converting his private Company Sounds Good Ltd into a CIC in order to attract grants to assist in the upgrading and development of the MEARL equipment!*

Complete rubbish. When I met Alec at the cathedral, I mentioned that there was an irony in that I had just come from a meeting with Sefton Council for Voluntary Service. I have been working to develop websites for community groups where it was suggested that I form a CIC for funding for website and event activities. Nothing to do with MEARL at all.

(subsequent to this complaint, there has been a discussion with the churches to create a separate group to manage the interests of the churches that supply space for the repeaters. This has nothing to do with my Company at all and would be a separate CIO/C. This is to preserve the legacy of MEARL, the other user services and the MRF)

- 2) *[Note: OFCOM cancelled the discount on registering correctly with Merseyside RAYNET – and required Merseyside to become a Registered Charity]*

Ofcom did not cancel the licence; the issue came up because Alec wanted to transfer the licence name. Ofcom had already established that the licence was correctly issued to an organisation concerned with the protection of life.

Business Radio (Area Defined)

Sector/class/product	Business Radio / Area Defined / 409510
Licence number	1117796/1
Licensee	Merseyside Raynet
Licensee address	41 Liverpool Avenue Southport PR8 3NP
Licence first issue date	12/05/2017
Licence version date	12/05/2017
Payment interval	1 year

3) *[Note: The links with MRF and TSG were already well established by Mike Hampson well before Martin's time]*

They had elapsed and it was only after discussions with the then MRF resilience officer and the introduction of MEARL that I was invited to join the TSG

4) *[Note: I designed and constructed all the MEARL kit not Martin]*

Not True. The MEARL repeaters were conceived and installed by myself and Phil Foulkes initially using a Vertex repeater in Southport. This was then moved to Liverpool, and a PRF reporter was placed in Southport. Alec Wood took no part in those installations. The Cathedral repeater was later replaced by a PRF repeater Alec purchased.

I negotiated with a company called Radio Swap for Vertex Radios that were used in the MEARL Scheme.

I sourced the cases and PSUs for the MERAL boxes to be placed in the council offices. Alec screwed the radios onto a base and made them into a portable kit. He also prepared the documnetation.

Each of the council installations was managed by myself.

5) *[Note: The Southport Repeater did not fail on an event - it failed for the third time after the event after Martin had previously inspected it twice and reported nothing wrong just needed switching on again!]*

The Repeater failed on an event when it was reported that it was rebroadcasting a local radio station. I inspected it and could not reproduce the fault. After this, it failed again, which seemed to be associated with prolonged use. I replaced the Repeater.

6) *[Note: Digital development had already been agreed in the published MEARL development plan and started – but further development relied on fundraising which didn't happen under Martin]*

Fundraising was on my agenda.

7) *[Note: The MCV is already serviced / repaired by such a volunteer friend of Richards. There are other issues making this unviable]*

The unviability of the van is not being represented to the MRF, which provides funding!

8) *[Note: Sefton and Liverpool merging is not a new idea and has been, and still is under consideration as Martin should know]*

I do know and was facilitating the move.

9) *[Note: Pubs are not really a good idea - Martin has already been informed that there are Muslim members and Wirral uses Tesco Community Room]*

My suggestion of meeting together was the point. I suggested pubs but hundreds of other meeting places like upstairs rooms at pubs to village and church halls would offer very cheap alternatives for community groups. I was not aware we had Muslim members that were bothered by this.

10) *[Note: Whilst Martin was away Phil who is a member of Merseyside Search and Rescue, has been tasked with liaison and exploring the possibility of jointly sharing a comms vehicle]*

Phil has made it quite clear that MSR and RAYNET are not possible or desired.

ALSO

i) Scathing comments about Merseyside RAYNET

☒ Liverpool has no leaders,

At the time it had neither controller or a deputy

☒ I am not standing as Coordinator simply because in reality, there is nothing to Coordinate

In relation to the merger of groups Liverpool would be the dominate groups and would deal direct the the MRF

☒ My fear is that it will go the same way as Sefton, with controllers and coordinators in their dotage waiting for matron to switch the lights out.

Not scathing (but perhaps glib) a concern for the future. Richard recently died unexpectedly and Stu Nutt was in a nursing home suffering very poor health, lung cancer and dementia. Stu died a week later.

☒ I am looking to see what can be done to get some sort of life back into RAYNET. It is getting old, tired and, frankly, is not locally fit for purpose in its principle objective of supporting the local resilience officers with communications.

☒ Merseyside had RAYNET groups in each of the boroughs, but as the membership declined, we no longer are able to support those councils

Again not scathing at all but a concern for its future. My conversations with local resiliants officers was that they had had no contact since I installed the kit before COVID.

The idea that RAYNET could field equipment and operators to provide comms support at times of disaster or civil disturbance is not something it can really offer and probably never could...

Because RAYNET members would not have the security clearance to enter and work in these establishments nor would they have trained with the police as communication liaison officers.

Sounds Good Ltd, had provided handheld radios to BTR Liverpool for running events and that Alan Rothwell, who runs BTR, thinking he had hired them from RAYNET complained to Richard that they had simply been dropped off without support and had not worked properly. Martin could not understand why Alan Rothwell would assume he was hiring the radios from RAYNET. Martin assured me that he did NOT have private business dealings with any events in which RAYNET had an interest, or were involved.

5 years ago! Alan Rothwell was well aware that the radios he hired were from Sounds Good to whom he paid the invoices, and on one occasion, his staff collected from my house. The radios worked fine Icom F15. On one of Alans events that ran for a week RAYNET Wirrel may have assisted on a couple of afternoons. All of this was dealt with and covered in the complaint in 2017 which cleared any improper dealings

Alec writes to other members in a pompous style, including paragraphs suggesting I do things by the book... Implying that I am acting improperly. Alec fillls his response with other irrelevant material too.

I trust this will be given proper consideration.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Martin', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Martin Maynard G8CIX

41 Liverpool Avenue
Southport PR8 3NP