

RAYNET-UK

Subject	Merseyside RAYNET Member complaint
Date	9 th October 2022
Presented by	Greg Mossop G0DUB
Traffic Light Protocol	Amber

Introduction

This introduces the complaint made by Martin Maynard G8CIX, an ordinary member of Sefton RAYNET against Alec Wood G8WHR.

The original complaint was lodged by G8CIX on 28th September and is shown here in Appendix A. I set out the method by which this would be dealt with in a response of 29th September which is given in Appendix B.

I am referring this to CoM for the following reasons;

1. The remedy sought by G8CIX is not one I can provide as a ZC, this is something reserved to CoM.
2. G8CIX has challenged my independence, so I feel any decision I take would be immediately appealed.

Matters at issue

The principal issue to be resolved in the complaint is whether under the RAYNET Rules G8WHR has broken the following;

5.1 Requirements

At all times whilst on Company business, members are required:

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.

A secondary issue which may be considered a trigger event in this case is the proposed transfer of members between the Sefton and Liverpool groups. This is strictly outwith the complaint but is key to some of the motivations behind the parties.

In a phone call with G8CIX on 16th September at 16:14BST he set out a desire to merge Sefton and Liverpool groups and offer his services as Controller with G70EA as deputy. 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.

Notwithstanding this, a transfer request was submitted to transfer G8CIX, G4FC0 and G6PFZ which was initially submitted 'out of process' by G8CIX and after challenge by National Registrations was resubmitted by G70EA.

The form REG-01TR was used which only calls for the 'signature' of the receiving group.

This is at odds with the RAYNET-UK Articles of Association which state;

10. An existing Member who wishes to transfer to a different Group to that by which he is already registered shall make an application to transfer in such form as the Committee shall require. An application for transfer may be approved or rejected by the Group Controllers of both the current and proposed Groups in accordance with those Groups' constitutions. Upon acceptance the Group Controller of the receiving Group shall cause the application for transfer to be delivered to the Company in such manner together with such payment as may be required by the Committee. The Committee shall have the right for good and sufficient reason to refuse the transfer of any applicant provided that the Group Controllers concerned shall have a right to challenge the decision in the manner as laid down in the Rules.

The need for both the current and proposed group controllers to endorse the transfer is also stated in the Model Default Group Constitution at;

"3.6 A Member may apply to transfer to a different Group. An application for transfer may be approved or rejected by the Controllers of both the current and proposed Groups in accordance with those Groups' constitutions."

The transfer of members was challenged by G8WHR in a phone call to me on 25th September at 20:38BST as this was non-compliant with the constitutions of both groups. In fact only G8CIX had been transferred to Liverpool group as there were concerns over the willingness of the other members involved to be transferred.

Following this challenge, the transfer of G8CIX was reversed and he is back as a member of Sefton Group.

CoM are requested to clarify that the National Articles of Association have primacy over Group Constitutions and take steps to ensure that appropriate consent is sought from member, and controllers in future.

Timeline and responses

While I set out a tight timescale for the provision of evidence to support the complaint, this was not completely followed and this has led to some duplication in the responses for the reasons I set out here.

Following my initial request for information to support the complaint. G8CIX responded on Saturday 1st October at 21:11BST with two files which are included in the supporting documentation to this introduction;

- Martin Maynard G8CIX.pdf
- Event CV, Reference and DBS Martin Maynard.pdf

These responses were within the timescale set out, and were accepted by email on Sunday 2nd October at 09:34BST and sent to G8WHR for his rebuttal at 10:01BST while I was working the Chester Marathon event to avoid any delays.

G8CIX had however raised a further query about the background to the event and the email trail is shown at Appendix C. In this exchange CoM will see that he withdraws his original submission, even though he had already been told that this had been sent to G8WHR and he resubmitted a revised document at 18:41BST , 8 hours after the first document had been sent to G8WHR. This document was titled;

- Martin Maynard G8CIX Complaint against Alec Wood Revision 2.pdf

This document had grown from 17 pages to 30 and I was reluctant to pass this on before G8WHR had had the opportunity to respond to the original information. However, another email exchange with G8CIX on Monday 3rd and Tuesday 4th October (shown in Appendix D), G8CIX where he sought to see G8WHR's rebuttal to his complaint brought me to a point where I felt I had to send Version 2 of G8CIX's bundle of information , though marked up in a manner (pink highlighter alongside the changed/additional sections) which would help G8WHR respond.

This document was sent to G8WHR on Tuesday 4th October at 22:41BST as;

- 2046_001.pdf

I offered G8WHR additional time to deal with the extra information but he chose not to take up this option and submitted his response on Wednesday 5th October at 17:02BST with the following two documents only a few hours after the three day deadline.

- Response to Martins allegations.pdf
- ANNOTATED Martin resubmission V2.pdf

He noted that "The second file "ANNOTATED (sic) Martin resubmission V2" is a copy of his V2 submission with notes I have added in various places to support the statement in my primary submission - I did not have time to tidy this up further."

I am responding to both parties on 9th October to confirm that I have referred this up to CoM in line with my original email of 29th September.

Suggested Reading Order

There is a great deal of duplication between the submissions but I suggest the following;

1. Appendix A
2. Appendix B
3. Martin Maynard G8CIX.pdf
4. Event CV, Reference and DBS Martin Maynard.pdf (for completeness only)
5. Appendix C
6. Response to Martins allegations.pdf
7. ANNOTATED Martin resubmission V2.pdf

Main Characters

All submissions rely heavily on my ZC knowledge of the persons concerned. Since CoM will not have that benefit, the main names referred to in the submissions are;

Martin Maynard, G8CIX Alec Wood, G8WHR	Member, Sefton RAYNET (Complainant) Acting County Co-Ordinator Merseyside Raynet, Acting Group Controller Wirral group, Trustee Merseyside RAYNET CIO. (Respondent)
Phil Foulkes G70EA	Membership Officer Liverpool Group (now resigned from that role)
Lee Boylan M00AU	Treasurer Liverpool group. Trustee Merseyside RAYNET CIO
Stu Nutt G30CR	Group Controller Sefton RAYNET
Norm Drury G4FC0	Sefton member whose membership was requested to be transferred to Liverpool, initially by G8CIX, confirmed by G70EA.
Tony Holroyd G6PFZ	Sefton member whose membership was requested to be transferred to Liverpool, initially by G8CIX, confirmed by G70EA.

END

Appendix A

Formal complaint against Alec Wood

Martin Maynard <Martin.Maynard@raynet-uk.net>

Wed 28/09/2022 14:58

Greg Mossop <Greg.Mossop@raynet-uk.net>;

gregm@greg-mossop.co.uk <gregm@greg-mossop.co.uk>

Alec Wood <Alec.Wood@raynet-uk.net>;

Phil Foulkes <phil.foulkes@g7oea.co.uk>

Dear Greg

As Zone coordinator, I would like to register with you a formal complaint regarding Alec Wood. You have been copied into most of the emails. Today is the last straw leading to the resignation of a long-valued member from an important post.

Alec is frankly not fit to hold the position of controller or coordinator and is bringing RAYNET into disrepute by his presentations to members and the local resilience authorities from whom we receive financial support.

Until Alec is removed from the role I will not be playing any further part in the organization, and if RAYNET deems his actions and representations as appropriate then I will be resigning from Merseyside RAYNET.

I am sorry this has come to this but I think you have seen the brewing storm.

I await your directions on how you will deal with this matter.

Regards

Martin Maynard

Appendix B

Re: Formal complaint against Alec Wood

Greg Mossop <Greg.Mossop@raynet-uk.net>

Thu 29/09/2022 13:08

Martin Maynard <Martin.Maynard@raynet-uk.net>

Alec Wood <Alec.Wood@raynet-uk.net>;

Cc: Phil Foulkes <phil.foulkes@g7oea.co.uk>

Bcc: Cathy Clark <Cathy.Clark@raynet-uk.net>; Peter Thomson <Peter.Thomson@raynet-uk.net>

Martin/Alec/Phil,

this email is to formally acknowledge the formal complaint made by Martin Maynard against Alec Wood. Martin asks for my directions on how I will deal with this matter and after giving this some thought my response is as follows;

This complaint will be dealt with under the procedure identified in Section 5 of the RAYNET rules (<https://members.raynet-uk.net/downloads/RAYNET%20Rules%20June%202021.pdf>).

As written, Martin's complaint appears to focus on Alec bringing the organisation into disrepute and states in his first paragraph that I have been copied "into most of the emails".

In order to conduct a fair and balanced investigation into this complaint and to allow both parties the opportunity to make their case I am asking Martin and Alec to undertake the following actions.

1. Within no more than three days, Martin to provide copies of all emails or records of meetings as a single bundle of information which he feels support his complaint.
2. On receipt of that bundle of information, it will be offered to Alec who again will have no more than three days from that date to prepare a rebuttal and submit any emails or records of meetings in support of his case, again as a bundle of information.
3. In both cases, please ensure that these emails are complete and if there are any missing words due to them being written in the heat of the moment, extra clarification may be submitted but obviously the email itself must not be altered. If there is information or opinions presented in the emails which are not salient to the complaint or would further inflame the situation please mark the affected passages as such and I will consider redaction.
4. Neither party involved in the complaint will make any contact with the other, nor make any comment to RAYNET members or any RAYNET stakeholder, including email or social media, about the complaint until a decision is reached. My reasons for this are explained below.
5. Once I have both bundles of evidence I will make my first decision on how to progress according to the remedies set out in the RAYNET Rules.

For the avoidance of doubt, the remedies available to me in my role are;

- a) provide advice or guidance to the member concerned.
- b) issue a verbal warning to the member.
- c) issue a written reprimand to the member.
- d) refer the matter to the Committee of Management.

The Committee of Management has further powers which are;

- c) a written notice suspending the member's appointment as a controller.
- d) a written notice terminating the member's appointment as controller.
- e) a written notice suspending the member's membership.
- f) a written notice terminating the member's membership.

If the remedy is not acceptable to either party an appeals process is available involving a panel formed from independent Group or County Co-Ordinators. The reason I am asking for bundles of evidence is to fast track the discovery process that the CoM (If I escalate this issue) or the Appeals Panel will have to undertake to consider the case. Keeping your complaint and rebuttal focused to the point is essential to this.

Since the Appeals panel may be drawn from any Controller in the Country prepared to serve, the reason I want you both to focus your communications to me and not make any public/social media comments or include the wider organisation is to avoid prejudicing the selection of a panel or their thought process. Failure to follow this request will obviously harm your case.

In the time I have been typing this email, there have been more emails from both of you, including other parties. I will not be considering those emails unless resubmitted as part of your evidence. I recognise that passions are running high over this issue but now that a process has been triggered I trust you will understand that I have to follow that process to ensure a fair outcome.

Phil is included in this email only because he was a party to the original complaint, I do not expect him to be included in further correspondence.

To Phil I have to say that I am sorry to read your resignation as Membership Officer for Liverpool Group and if the complaint had not been raised would have sought to provide some explanation since communications are breaking down. I hope that at some point in the future we might be able to do this but having seen your email, you will understand that I cannot comment until my steps in the process are complete and have just amended the membership database to show you leaving that role and your access to the membership lists will be limited.

The next Committee of Management meeting is the 10th October, providing both parties abide by the timescale set out to provide their arguments I will be able to decide and/or CoM will be available promptly to make a decision on that date.

I thank you both for your co-operation in in this matter and hope we can bring this to a timely conclusion.

73,

Greg Mossop, GODUB

Trustee and Zonal Co-Ordinator

Appendix C

Re: Thought re complaint.

Martin Maynard <Martin.Maynard@raynet-uk.net>

Sun 02/10/2022 15:18

- Greg Mossop <Greg.Mossop@raynet-uk.net>

In light of your comments, I am withdrawing the bundle and will submit a new one shortly.

Get [Outlook for Android](#)

From: Martin Maynard <Martin.Maynard@raynet-uk.net>

Sent: Sunday, October 2, 2022 12:15:56 PM

To: Greg Mossop <Greg.Mossop@raynet-uk.net>

Subject: Re: Thought re complaint.

Thank you. It did seem out of character.

Get [Outlook for Android](#)

From: Greg Mossop <Greg.Mossop@raynet-uk.net>

Sent: Sunday, October 2, 2022 10:21:08 AM

To: Martin Maynard <Martin.Maynard@raynet-uk.net>

Subject: Re: Thought re complaint.

Martin,

read what I said. My request was for Alec to inform you. I have made no comment on who reversed the transfer, who the parties concerned were and have not set out to make anyone look foolish.

Alec has been sent the information for his rebuttal now.

73,

Greg

From: Martin Maynard <Martin.Maynard@raynet-uk.net>

Sent: 02 October 2022 09:46

To: Greg Mossop <Greg.Mossop@raynet-uk.net>

Subject: Re: Thought re complaint.

Ok, I am somewhat surprised that you would reverse transfers without reference to me or Phil as registrations officer. It's made quite a fool out of me.

Get [Outlook for Android](#)

From: Greg Mossop <Greg.Mossop@raynet-uk.net>
Sent: Sunday, October 2, 2022 9:34:57 AM
To: Martin Maynard <Martin.Maynard@raynet-uk.net>
Subject: Re: Thought re complaint.

Martin,
thank you for your email of last night. I will pass the attachments to Alec for his response when I finish today's duty at Chester Marathon (unless I get an opportunity during the event).

In relation to your question below. After an email exchange with Alec I asked him to inform everyone of the status of transfers so he was 'requested'.

I am aware I am in the middle of this which is why I have been very clear about the process and the eventual escalation routes.

73,
Greg, GODUB
ZC10

From: Martin Maynard <Martin.Maynard@raynet-uk.net>
Sent: 02 October 2022 08:08
To: Greg Mossop <Greg.Mossop@raynet-uk.net>
Subject: Thought re complaint.

Greg

In relation to the reversals of membership transfers, it occurred to me that you might have been party to that as I would not have thought Alec would have the authority to make these changes himself. In his email to members, he states ' I have been asked to inform you'! Was this instruction from yourself as zone coordinator?

I leave it to you to judge whether you are able to consider this matter in an impartial manner.

Regards

In relation to the reversals of membership transfers, it occurred to me that you might have been party to that as I would not have thought Alec would have the authority to make these changes himself. In his email to members, he states ' I have been asked to inform you'! Was this instruction from yourself as zone coordinator?

I think this is unlikely as I think you would have simply got on the phone to clarify. I therefore leave it to you to judge whether you are able to consider this matter impartially.

Regards

Get [Outlook for Android](#)

Appendix D

Re: Compliant

Greg Mossop <Greg.Mossop@raynet-uk.net>

Tue 04/10/2022 21:29

- Martin Maynard <Martin.Maynard@raynet-uk.net>

Martin,

I note your comments below but until Alec has made his response this is a little premature. I remind you of point 5 in the email I sent you both on Thursday 29th which stated;

"Once I have both bundles of evidence I will make my first decision on how to progress according to the remedies set out in the RAYNET Rules."

You submitted your first response bundle on Sunday morning of 17 pages in the timescales set out and this was sent to Alec for his response at 10:00 on Sunday and you were advised of this at 10:21 as you engaged in another email thread. Following those email interactions you stated that you were withdrawing your bundle at 15:19 even though you had been informed it was already in Alec's hands. You submitted your second bundle, now comprising 30 pages at 18:41.

I have now read your second bundle of information, highlighted the changed sections and noted that although you stated at the beginning that the revision was due to information that came to light, you did not include the email trail which provided that information. In the interests of full disclosure I will send this revision and the emails to Alec so he need only read the changed segments and amend his response accordingly.

On receipt of both bundles I will review them and identify the points of agreement and disagreement to focus any further investigation or requests for information.

Regards,

Greg

From: Martin Maynard <Martin.Maynard@raynet-uk.net>

Sent: 03 October 2022 21:36

To: Greg Mossop <Greg.Mossop@raynet-uk.net>; gregm@greg-mossop.co.uk <gregm@greg-mossop.co.uk>

Subject: Compliant

Hi Greg

Having taken advice on this matter I believe I should be allowed see the rebuttable to my compliant. This is not to add further detail but to comment in the accuracy of the information on which my compliant might be considered. Those comments if any would then be feedback to Alec who can also, in turn, comment on my reply. In this way you or whoever else might be involve has an agreed position on which to reach a division. In effect full open disclosure ensures accuracy and fairness.

Thank you.

Regards

Get [Outlook for Android](#)