

MINUTES OF THE 21ST MEETING BETWEEN THE SUPPORTERS' COMMITTEE AND LIVERPOOL FOOTBALL CLUB ON 26 SEPTEMBER 2016 AT ANFIELD.

Representing the LFC Supporters' Committee: Paul Amann (PA), LGBT Supporters; Anna Burgess (AB), Away Fans; Ian Byrne (IB), Family Match Goers; Tony Fitzgerald (AF), Season Ticket Holders and Hospitality; Lee Foley [LF], Official Supporters' Clubs; Karen Gill (KG), Honorary President; Yunus Lunat (YL), BAME Supporters; Katie Price [KP], Disabled Supporters; Matthew Selby (MS), International Fans; Graham Smith (GS), Supporters in the Merseyside Area. **Representing Liverpool Football Club:** Ian Ayre (IA), Chief Executive; Susan Black (SB) Communications Director; Phil Dutton (PD), Head of Ticketing and Hospitality; Billy Hogan [BH], Commercial Director; Yonit Levy-Sharabi [YLS], Customer Experience Manager; Andrew Parkinson (AP), Operations Director; Scott Richardson (SR), Head of CRM; Andrew Shaw [AS], Head of Fan Engagement and Service Delivery; Simon Thornton [ST], Equality and Diversity Adviser. **Facilitator:** William Montgomery (WM).

1. Welcome and introductions:

- 1.1. WM opened welcomed all present and invited Andrew Shaw [AS], Head of Fan and Customer Service, and Simon Thornton [ST], Equality and Diversity Adviser, to introduce themselves as it was their first time attending a meeting between the Supporters' Committee and the Club.
- 1.2. AS said that his role in the Club is Head of Fan Experience and Service Delivery and, as such, has a real interest in the discussions taking place between the Club and the Committee. Prior to joining the Club he confirmed that he spent time with Manchester Airport and within financial services working on customer service strategies. His aim is to help create the best possible experience for fans of the Club.
- 1.3. ST said that his role in the Club was that of Equality and Diversity Adviser, and that he'd been the position for about four months. Previously he'd been working for British Cycling for seven years as Compliance Manager, looking at equality, diversity and compliance. His aim is to support the implementation of the Premier League Quality Standards initiative, recognition the Club aims to achieve in the coming year.
- 1.4. WM confirmed that AP needed to leave the meeting early owing to a prior commitment and, as a consequence, the order of the questions would be altered to ensure AP contributed his expertise where most needed, with questions 7, 8 and 19 taking precedence.
- 1.5. IA stated that he was pleased that members of the Committee had the opportunity to view the facilities in the new main stand the previous day. He continued by saying that he felt it was a great achievement, and very fitting for the Club that the standard of the build was so high. He said that he was grateful for the Committee's input as the Club went through the process, from idea to realisation. As the coming season progresses, there may be opportunities to collaborate more, such as on determining how the concourses could be kept open later so all fans can experience the new facilities. This is difficult from a licensing prospective, but not impossible.
- 1.6. AP continued by saying that the upcoming Rugby League 4 nations final being played at Anfield presented an opportunity for a post match offering to be trialled on a concourse after the game. City licensing will be approached with regards to the mechanics of this being implemented. If this was granted and successful then this could be an opportunity for LFC games in the future.

- 1.7. GS said that while the review of supporter engagement is on-going, the Committee has taken the view that it would be best not to recruit for the two vacancies on the Committee, and will not look to replace existing members who are due to retire on rotation each season. Therefore, the Committee will continue with the current 10 members for the foreseeable future, and until the findings of the review are published.

2. Matters arising from the previous meeting:

- 2.1. With no agenda being available for this meeting, it was decided not to review the minutes or discuss any matters arising from the last meeting on 7 May, and proceed to the questions that have been previously submitted to the Club for consideration prior to discussion at this meeting.

3. Q&A covering The Price of Football:

- 3.1. GS confirmed that a number of questions had been submitted to the Club prior to the meeting for consideration. A number of additional questions had been identified during the pre-meeting, and that a total of 21 questions were being tabled today.
- 3.2. WM invited GS to explain the raison d'être for the subject under discussion. He responded by saying that the main theme was the cost of football, which is not just about ticket prices. He advised that the Committee is constantly being asked to raise issues around cost of tickets and associated matters. In addition to the main theme, there would be other questions that the Committee would like to hear the Club's views on, such as the lessons learned from the opening of the new main stand, which has been perceived by many as a very positive experience.
- 3.3. **Q1 from GS:** The LFC Supporters' Committee, and supporters generally, were appalled about how the Club failed to recognise Gerry McIver, one of the greatest supporters who did so much for so many people after the [Hillsborough] disaster. While the Club's position on recognition of support groups is well known (if not welcomed by most), the Club needs to recognise that there are times when common decency should be considered first and foremost. Can we have the Club's view on why nothing more was done to remember Gerry?
- 3.4. SB responded by saying that there are a couple of things to talk about in relation to this question. The Club's relationship with the Hillsborough families is through HJC, HFSG and the family of the late Anne Williams. Some family members are represented in both groups. The Club's position over the past few years has very much been around speaking with the majority voice for Hillsborough, which, at the moment, is the HFSG.
- 3.5. SB continued, on a practical level the Club speaks on a regular basis to the HJC families through Barry Devonside and Steve Kelly, the family of the late Anne Williams through a family/friend contact and to the HFSG families through the HFSG Committee. On a practical level, when there's a Club-wide initiative – the replica shirt patches initiative, for example – the Club made contact with all the families after seeking guidance from HFSG and HJC. When the Hillsborough Memorial was reinstated a few weeks ago, the Club contacted all the families and over 130 attended Anfield to see the Memorial being reinstated. Another example was when LFC reached the final at Wembley, tickets were made available to all families – the Club making contact with the families through the HJC, HFSG and the family of the late Anne Williams.

- 3.6. Specifically in relation to Gerry McIver, the Club met with the HFSG Committee and his passing was discussed. The view of the Committee was that the Club should write to any family member of the victim who had sadly passed away; offer the Club's condolences by letter, which would be signed by IA, or Kenny Dalglish as a non-executive director. If the family wanted a public statement, this could be requested and would be acted upon by the Club. Gerry McIver was recognised by the Club during a news bulletin on LFCTV and through the Club Magazine.
- 3.7. The HFSG Committee recognises that the Hillsborough families have campaigners working on their behalf all over the world, and the difficulty is that if one person was singled-out for recognition, then it would have to be done for all. Consequently, they feel that a letter is the best solution, with the option of a public statement if the family requests one. It is about being fair to everyone and creating a policy that supports that, and not singling out one person over another.
- 3.8. GS said that in hindsight would it not have been appropriate on this occasion to have had a dialogue with HJC, in light of Gerry being a prominent member of the justice campaign?
- 3.9. SB said that the point on survivors, now that the victims had received the unlawful killing verdict, was an issue which the Club had been having wider discussion on how it recognises victims, survivors and other significant campaigners. And the Club would want to be respectful to everyone and some ideas are under development about how the Club not only keeps the focus on the victims, but the survivors as well. For example, the Club recognises both HFSG and HJC on the website under the page name "Never Forgotten". One idea is to develop a further page called "In Memory", which would feature Gerry McIver, Jim Wafer, who passed away recently, and others survivors from the disaster who had since passed away.
- 3.10. SB continued by saying that with the annual Remembrance Service no longer taking place, the Club is looking for ways in which it can remember the victims each and every year. For example, the match-day programme could feature the names of the victims and give recognition to survivors who had sadly since passed away.
- 3.11. SB said that the Club is considering having a feature at the stadium to recognise survivors. The Club needs to work across departments, including Operations, in order to create something to recognise the survivors and the wider group that has been associated with Hillsborough, in addition to maintaining the official memorial to the victims.
- 3.12. GS said that he didn't feel that the Supporters' Committee was the right group to determine what is right for the families of both victims and survivors. But, communicating the policy or approach with the wider-fan base would be appropriate.
- 3.13. AB said that she wanted to reflect on how Gerry McIver was perceived by the wider fan base and community. The Committee feels that match-going fans have a weighted-favour and Gerry McIver was very well known to the match-going fans because of his constant presence in the shop. We appreciate that the Club can't recognise everybody, but he was a 'stand-out' person, and it was therefore quite disappointing that the stance was taken.

- 3.14. IB spoke passionately and emotionally and said that he was appalled that at Gerry McIver's funeral there was no representation from the Club. As a survivor, Gerry was absolutely phenomenal to him, and his own father. He counselled thousands of Liverpool fans, and did so in his retirement for 20 years, and for the Club not to recognise that man is absolutely appalling. It needs rectifying now, and the Club should contact his family and determine what needs to be done.
- 3.15. IA said that when the Club has been dealing with a recognised group for 20+ years and they say that they would like things done in a certain way, the Club needs to act accordingly. That said, the Club needs to find the right solution for Gerry, but the Club did not seek to be disrespectful to him. It may feel like that, and it may have been perceived that way, but the Club does not act in this way, it's just not what the Club is about.
- 3.16. WM confirmed that the key actions from this discussion are that a] the Club will consult with both HFSG and HJC and agree a policy for dealing with the passing of survivors; b] communicate the policy to the wider fan-base, keeping the Committee involved in the key stages; and c] determining the right solution for marking the passing of Gerry McIver.
- 3.17. **Q2 and Q3 from GS:** Can the Club explain what changes have taken place in relation to car parking this season? There is a view that loyal fans have been pushed out of spaces for high-end hospitality. In addition the Supporters' Committee have had some disabled and mobility challenged supporters ask them to assist over negative changes to their car parking - what provision is there for them to park near the ground or to get them from the more distant car park to ground and back? [formerly Q7 & Q8 of the previously submitted questions]
- 3.18. AP responded by saying that the challenge for the Club is that it had about 1,800 before the main stand was redeveloped. The Club is now accommodating an extra 8,500 people, but the planning condition has meant that the Club was restricted to increasing the number of parking spaces to 2,300. A smaller proportional number to what the Club had prior to the redevelopment.
- 3.19. AP continued, the premise of the planning consent was that there would be no more cars coming to Anfield over and above current levels. Effectively, the Club needed a policy that was focussed on public transport, or other ways of getting to the ground, as opposed to car parking. There is now a re-vamped park-and-ride facility, and the 917 bus service taking people to and from the City Centre has been introduced. The latter has proved very popular and the operator will be doubling the number of busses in the future for this service.
- 3.20. AP continued, not only does the Club have to accommodate 8,500 additional fans, but 1,500 extra staff as well. The Club wants to ensure that disabled fans are accommodated appropriately with the number of disabled parking spaces increasing from 45 to 70, with more nearer to the ground, as well as an increase in the number of disabled drop-off points. With more people wanting such few spaces, the Club is focussing on disabled fans, both those who are registered and known to the Club and those who's circumstances have only come to light since the redevelopment has taken place. Work will continue in this area, and more spaces will become available once the redevelopment work has concluded.

- 3.21. GS said that with 500 extra spaces and 8,500 extra fans, is the reality that some non-hospitality fans have lost access to a parking space to accommodate the increased number of hospitality fans?
- 3.22. AP responded by saying that this was not the case. The Club has a limited number of spaces, and hospitality guests face the same challenges as everyone else. It's a difficult conundrum and the Club is dealing with the challenges the best way possible. The challenges will be greater in the autumn of 2017 when Lime Street Station will close for redevelopment works, thereby increasing the number of fans needing to use private transport to get to the ground.
- 3.23. PA said that the problems with trains are compounded with night fixtures. He is aware of one hospitality season-ticket holder, who is often forced to miss the last few minutes of a game in order to catch the last train from Lime Street to London. Can negotiations take place with the train operators to ensure that this public transport option is viable?
- 3.24. AP said that there was no easy answer and the LFC are not the only club affected in this way. The Club has on-going dialogue with the train operators to determine how the situation can be improved. The Club would like to be in the situation where additional trains are in service on match-days, irrespective of the time of kick-off.
- 3.25. IA said that he would raise the matter at the next meeting of the Premier League and determine if a collective approach can be agreed. It was not a matter of necessarily having extra trains, just trains leaving a little later than usual.
- 3.26. AB said that in terms of disabled fans, is there an option to consider a mobility park-and-ride.
- 3.27. AP said that the Club has one such shuttle buss in operation for the ambulant disabled, but the Club could look at increasing this facility so that as more disabled fans can be dropped off nearer the ground. The Club is keen to expand its capacity and will look to enhance such facilities as the development concluded and more information comes to light.
- 3.28. **Q4 from GS:** Can the Club report on how the operation of the new Main Stand went after the first home game? There were some concerns about the areas around the Main Stand outside being unfinished and a wheelchair user getting stuck. [Q19]
- 3.29. AP said that up to the first home game of the season, it was a real challenge, owing to the construction works continuing right up until the night before the game. The Club was conscious of an additional 8,500 extra fans attending the game and getting them in, and seated, on time. First games of the season are always problematic anyway, but opening a new stand just added to the challenge. That said, the Club engaged in extensive communication leading up to the game, and this largely paid-off as most people were seated on time.
- 3.30. AP continued, the general consensus is that the new stand fits in well and feels part of Anfield. There are a few learning opportunities particularly advising fans of the best turnstile to use for their block/seat. But, overall, the Club has received very favourable feedback.

- 3.31. GS said that the Committee has not received any adverse comments regarding the opening of the new main stand, and the lack of complaint is a very positive situation. The 'radio-silence' over the opening of the new main stand is testament to the work that everyone has put in together. This is a positive story and Supporters' Committee would like to say thank you for making it happen.
- 3.32. PA said that the new main stand is great news but how great is the news in terms of the operational effectiveness, and the plans to bring forward the redevelopment of Anfield Road?
- 3.33. IA responded by saying that the planning application does not dictate when any redevelopment of Anfield Road would start. The Club's objective was always to build and open the main stand. From the outset, the Club did not want to set deadlines or promises it failed to keep. The Club now needs a period of time to ensure that what it has put in place works, and in tandem continue with plans for Anfield Road. However, as with the Main Stand, the Club has to find the right economic model, and only then will it be the right time to move forward.
- 3.34. IA continued, a stand behind a goal doesn't have the benefit of hospitality that would go a long way to meet the redevelopment costs. If you consider the redevelopment of Anfield Road from a purely General Admission perspective, building, say, 6,000 extra seats to take the capacity up to 60,000 would cost somewhere between £60m and £70m. At £12K to £13K per seat, it would take approximately 15 years to pay back, which is not a smart investment for the business. Therefore the Club needs to find a rounded solution that's in the best interests of the football club.
- 3.35. GS said there are people who would think a 15-year return would make sense, and that's the supporters. The supporters would fund such a development upfront if the Club made an appeal for financial support. GS said he was of the view with the right relationship with investors, the £60m, or whatever the figure needed was, could be raised.
- 3.36. IA said that we should have that conversation. He was not in a position to speak for the owners or their plans, but it's an interesting proposition and one worth looking at.
- 3.37. **Q5 from AB:** Supporters think the club is missing out - the majority of regular attenders at Anfield do not buy a great deal whilst at the ground. The captive pricing and embarrassing quality of refreshments are the main reasons. [Q2]
- 3.38. AP responded by saying that drinks should be served at the right temperature. With regards to quality, pricing and value for money, there are areas of the ground that have not had the best facilities. With these areas, the Club endeavours to research what it has, and what it needs to do to improve.
- 3.39. AP continued, in terms of pricing, the Club benchmarks with other football grounds and other event venues, and the prices offered are competitive. The Club aims to earn a fair return on the sale of refreshments, and largely owing to the number of staff employed, the margins are low by comparison to retailers.
- 3.40. GS said that the perception is that the products are expensive and not of good quality. It a vicious circle and people feel they are being 'ripped-off' so opt not to spend at all, or only the bare minimum. If the products were better quality

- and better value, people would spend more which would have a financial benefit to the Club.
- 3.41. AP said that he would look into the matter of the temperature of the drinks being served but in terms of the range of food, much of which is freshly cooked, the Club offers unique menu that is unavailable elsewhere in football. The Club recognises that it constantly needs to look at how it can upgrade the facilities on offer, and offer what people want at the temperature they require it at.
- 3.42. **Q6 from KP:** Is it possible for there to be a more cost effective membership for disabled fans and in addition an alternative gift for visually impaired fans if they are unable to read books designed for the membership? [Q3]
- 3.43. SR responded by saying that he'd spoken to Julie Edler, who heads up the membership and she's happy to have the conversation directly about the membership scheme for disabled fans, including what the alternative gift could be.
- 3.44. **Q7 from KP:** The LDSA has asked for the Club to review the pricing of its merchandise within the Club's stores. Generally it is considered too expensive. [Q6]
- 3.45. BH responded by saying that this is an area where the Club needs to promote what it is doing a little better. The Club has reduced prices going into this season, not necessarily on New Balance products, but LFC own branded products. Adults and kids products have been reduced. For example, kids T-shirts are now priced £10-£15, last year were £10-£20. Adults were £15-£35 and are now £15-£25. These price reductions have come largely following surveys the Club have conducted with the fans covering the quality, fit and price points of the products on offer.
- 3.46. BH continued, the Club has hired a Quality Assurance Manager, which the Club didn't have previously. This has resulted in the products being more consistent in look and feel, and also quality and fit. What we've found is that over 10% of the products that have been received over the course of the QA Manager's tenure have been rejected.
- 3.47. BH confirmed that members and season ticket holders receive a 10% reduction on purchases both in store, and online. Not being widely known by those present, BH confirmed that the Club would make a point of reminding fans of the available discount at checkout.
- 3.48. **Q8 from IB:** Could the Club approach our sponsors to do something similar to the Virgin initiative at Southampton, but focus on subsidising home ticket prices? Or allow supporters to approach them? [Q4]
- 3.49. BH confirmed that the Club is constantly on the lookout for new sponsors and partners. The Club has had conversations specifically looking at the ticketing subsidy, both for home and away fans, but, as yet, these have not materialised in an offer being made. People do need to realise is that any offers need to be incremental. Each year, the Club has a ticketing budget, as well as a sponsorship budget. So if a sponsor diverted money from sponsorship to ticketing, that loss of revenue would have to be replaced by some other means.

- 3.50. BH commented on Virgin and Southampton by saying that this was a very specific initiative that's been very effective for away fans travelling to Southampton. Trying to do something that was meaningful for home fans would be difficult simply because of the number of tickets involved. A potential sponsor would have to spend approximately £800,000 to reduce tickets across the board by £1.
- 3.51. BH confirmed that the Club has been trying to identify sub-sets of fans within the home support, whether these be young fans, or for specific cup games. The Club does want to move this forward but every conversation is different with each sponsor depending on what their objectives are from the relationship. Opportunities such as subsidising tickets do take place with potential sponsors and existing sponsors during renewal negotiations.
- 3.52. BH confirmed that the Club is in dialogue with MBNA about trying to create an opportunity where fans can purchase their season tickets using their MBNA card at a favourable interest rate.
- 3.53. **Q9 from MS:** Supporters were very disappointed about the pricing policy for the sale of old Main Stand seats – while the Supporters' Committee were aware that a sale was to take place, a final consultation about price never took place – in addition it is clear that some sponsors received gifts of some of the seats. While it is too late now it again underlines an occasion when the Club recognises the cost of something but not its value. [Q5]
- 3.54. SR responded by saying that GS wrote to the Club back in August and the Club responded confirming details of the disposal plans for the seats in the old Main Stand. At the outset, the Club wanted to give fans the opportunity to purchase their seat, at a range of prices depending on how they were packaged. The Club were unable to give fans the opportunity to let them purchase their exact seat. This restriction and the price of the seats were shared with the Committee prior to disposal.
- 3.55. TF commented that the exact price of the seats was never confirmed with the Committee, and only a broad range of pricing options was communicated.
- 3.56. SR continued, that it soon became apparent that only about 50% of the seats could be saved. At the same time the reclamation of the old seats had to be removed in a 36-hour window post the final whistle of the last game, otherwise the project would have caused delays to the build programme, so the Club didn't have the luxury of letting fans choose specific seats from specific locations.
- 3.57. The Committee, individually and collectively, felt that the Club lost an opportunity by not offering fans sufficient options to purchase seats at an affordable price. Offering a single price point of £200, irrespective of how smartly packaged it was, was a mistake and a low-cost option should have been considered and discussed with the Committee.
- 3.58. The Committee also challenged the Club's claim of it only had a small window of opportunity in order to extract the seats. In hindsight, the seats should have been removed and taken off-site and stored pending disposal in a more timely and systematic manner. The Committee accepted that they needed to be removed quickly, but there should have been no rush to dispose of them. With more thought, more fans could have obtained a seat at an affordable price.

- 3.59. SR concluded by saying that the Club acted with the best of intentions in trying to find the balance behind all of the different options. He appreciated that the Club had not been able to deliver as hoped in terms of giving the fans their exact seat at a low price. The Club worked hard to identify a workable solution and made best effort to deliver it.
- 3.60. **Q10 from AB:** The Ticket Working Group is currently inactive after the Sunderland walkout – will the Club commit to reinstating it to keep a dialogue going about ticket prices and accessibility? If yes, can a date be arranged for a meeting? [Q9]
- 3.61. PD said that in January the Club set the ticketing pricing policy for the next two years along with new initiatives that need time to bed in. He believes that at this point in time, the Ticketing Working Group would not be effective in light of prices being set for the two years ahead. PD suggested that the matter is taken offline so the raison d'être can be agreed and communicated, with the season ticket amnesty, and away ticket loyalty, including European games, being upper-most in people's minds.
- 3.62. **Q11 from AB:** Can the Club issue a breakdown of sales by category and stand for matches at Anfield on its website after each game? This has been asked a few times, accepted, but has not happened. [Q10]
- 3.63. PD confirmed that the Club would publish the data for Hull and Leicester as soon as possible, and thereafter within 7 days of each game..
- 3.64. **Q12 from AB:** Can the Club issue before each away game the numbers of people in each category of credits for away games? And update it after each away game? [Q11]
- 3.65. PD responded by saying that the context around this question needs to be clarified first. The figures don't change after each game, as they are fixed from the previous season's loyalty. PD said that he would discuss the matter further with AB.
- 3.66. **Q13 from AB:** Can the Club report on the breakdown of how many local supporters benefitted from the new local and youth sales? [Q12]
- 3.67. PD stated that 500 such tickets were set aside for the game against West Ham and these were all taken up in record time. The initiative will continue, and it's expected that each allocation will be used and that young fans from local areas will benefit. The Club also stated that the £9 local sale had also been very well received with many new fans getting access to watch the team play.
- 3.68. LF asked if clarification could be given on what qualified for a 'local postcode'. PD confirmed that the decision to include all postcodes beginning with the letter "L" was taken by the Ticketing Working Group. PD confirmed that he would be happy to revisit the selection criteria again with the Supporters' Committee.
- 3.69. **Q14 from IB:** Will the Club ask the Football League to create a category of young people's priced tickets for League Cup Finals? [Q13]
- 3.70. PD confirmed that the Club will ask the Football League to offer a young person's ticket for League Cup Finals.

- 3.71. **Q15 from YL:** It is clear that some away Clubs are trying to regain lost revenue on the now capped away ticket prices by increasing the cost of junior away tickets. Can the Club ask for reciprocal arrangements for junior tickets with other Clubs? [Q14]
- 3.72. PD stated that the Club made a conscious effort to keep its ticket prices competitive and advised that the tickets for juniors were among the cheapest in the league. He confirmed that the Club talks to other clubs about such matters on a regular basis. That said, the reciprocal arrangements that were in place have been moved to one side for the time being, as the cap was introduced and so far there has been no real noise about reciprocals.
- 3.73. PD agreed to conduct some research into what other clubs are charging and in advance of IA writing a letter to the Premier League for the matter to be discussed at a future meeting. The relevant minute from the meeting will be published and circulated, assuming permission is obtained in advance. At the very least the anecdotal responses from the discussion will be shared with the Committee.
- 3.74. **Q16 from AB:** Would it be possible to have a separate allocation of away tickets for adult and child season ticket holders? [Q15]
- 3.75. PD responded by saying when it comes to away tickets, nothing is off the table. The Club is allocated approximately 3,000 tickets for each Premier League away game. What is needed is a consultation between the Club and the Supporters' Committee, and/or part of any new Ticketing Working Group.
- 3.76. **Q17 from TF:** The introduction of a local sale has been very positively received – the use of L postcodes is recognised as a starting point for this new initiative, will it be reviewed during the season to maybe amend it to a radius rather than a postcode? [Q16]
- 3.77. GS confirmed that this question had been covered as part of Q13 above.
- 3.78. **Q18 from YL:** Can the Club explain the reasoning behind the sale of tickets usually being started at around 8am on a sale day? [Q17]
- 3.79. PD responded by saying the time was set at 8am as this is what the supporters asked for at the time some years ago. It was previously 9am, but research confirmed that fans wanted the opportunity to purchase tickets prior to leaving for work, so 8am was set. As a consequence, most sales are concluded prior to 9am on the day of sale. Suggestions have been received to have sales over lunch and during the evening. Here lies the problem, no one time will suit everybody, but 8am is the considered the time that suits most fans.
- 3.80. **Q19 from PA:** What is the current position about the following: a] the number of tickets that are going to local schools and b] the "three-quarter time" youth scheme for empty seats? [Q18]
- 3.81. SB responded by saying that 25 local schools are taking part in the scheme, resulting in just over 1,000 tickets being allocated to each over a season. The Club is continuing with the "Sweepers' Zone" which involves a number of kids getting involved in various pre-match activities. In addition, partners of the Club have been exceptionally generous in giving back part of their ticket allocations for re-distribution to kids and young fans. The Club is in the process of tracking this initiative, and publishing the results, that sees approximately 30 local young fans attending each game using a returned partner ticket.

- 3.82. BH confirmed that the Club has not been effective at publishing such good news stories. Over a season, Standard Chartered is the biggest contributor to such initiatives, and the Club will get better at communicating that fact using all available media.
- 3.83. PD said that there was some limited success with the "three-quarter time" initiative last season, but there has been no progress with the initiative in the current season. Once the operation of the new stand is running smoothly, the Club will revisit the initiative with a view of reinstating it, and making it a success. It is not without its challenges, and the Club will only be prepared in operating such a scheme if it can be delivered effectively.
- 3.84. There was a brief discussion on the allocation of disabled bays in the new stand, particularly those situated in the middle and upper tiers. In the middle tier the wheelchair bays are a combination of hospitality and general admission, whereas in the upper tier all the wheelchair bays are general admission. PD clarified that if a Carer, who gets a free ticket, wants to enter one of the hospitality lounges, then a charge to cover this element of the ticket will become payable, but the actual match-ticket is covered by the Club.
- 3.85. **Q20 from MS:** Can the Club attach to the minutes of this meeting the Action Points document to create transparency about both the Club's and the Committee's progress on matters?
- 3.86. It was decided not to discuss this question, as much depends on the outcome of the Fan Engagement Review that may effect the format, frequency and structure of the Supporters' Committee, and Working Groups. However, it was agreed that all open action points would be posted on the Club's website so fans can get a measure of progress.
- 3.87. **Q21 from LF:** The number of tickets being allocated to Official Liverpool Supporters' Clubs [OLSCs] has dropped significantly over the years, making it more costly for people to travel [the less tickets allocated, the less will travel, thereby making it more expensive individually]. Is the Club prepared to do more for OLSCs?
- 3.88. SR responded by saying that OLSCs were originally set up partly to help sell-out Anfield. The situation is very different now, and the role of OLSCs has evolved to what it once was. It is correct that OLSCs play a key role in bringing people into the LFC family. With regard to ticketing allocations, the Club has given OLSCs the option of attending games more frequently or attending less frequently as a bigger group. Different OLSCs like to take a different approach depending on the size or geographical location of the group.
- 3.89. SR confirmed that he would be happy to meet with his colleagues within the Club and determine what can be done to address the balance and continue to give OLSCs a reason for being. That said, ticketing will need to be less of a reason for fans to join an OLSC, and the emphasis will need to be on other benefits. The Club does not want to return to the situation that required our branches to act as ticket offices on the club's behalf.

4. Any other business:

- 4.1. SR said that the Club is currently looking at plans for the Club's 125th Anniversary. Consequently, it would be good to hold a meeting with the Supporters' Committee to share ideas and input into the plans to how best mark the occasion.

- 4.2. MS asked if there could be a condensed version of press releases so the Committee could share more easily on social media. It was agreed that MS would speak with SB to determine the best way forward.

5. Date of the next meeting

- 5.1. It was confirmed that the next meeting would take place on either 10 or 11 December 2016.

6. Agreed actions from this meeting

- 6.1. Club to consult with both HFSG and HJC and agree a policy for dealing with the passing of survivors; communicate the policy to the wider fan-base, keeping the Committee involved; and determine the right solution for marking the passing of Gerry McIvor. [3.16]
- 6.2. Club to raise the matter of persuading the train operators to delay departure times lay on extra trains at the next meeting of the Premier League to determine if a collective approach can be agreed across all clubs. [3.25]
- 6.3. Club to consider increasing the number of shuttle bus for the ambulant disabled [and disabled generally] so more disabled fans can be dropped off nearer the ground. [3.27]
- 6.4. Club and Committee to have a conversation about whether the £60m or so needed to redevelop the Anfield Road stand could be raised through the fans themselves. [3.36]
- 6.5. Club to investigate the temperature of the drinks being served from outlets within the ground, and ensure improvements are made where necessary. [3.41]
- 6.6. Club to determine what improvement can be made to the membership scheme for disabled fans, particularly an alternative gift for the visually impaired. [3.43]
- 6.7. Club to review how members and season ticket holders are made aware of the 10% discount on purchases, both in store and online. [3.47]
- 6.8. Club to determine the raison d'être of a Ticketing Working Group, or Forum, with the Committee and decide if a meeting should take place in advance of the outcome of the Fan Engagement Review. [3.61]
- 6.9. Club to publish a breakdown of sales by category and stand for matches at Anfield on the website within seven days of each game. [3.63]
- 6.10. Club to consider the most appropriate solution for publishing, before each away game, the number of fans in each category of credits. [3.65]
- 6.11. Club and Committee to determine what qualifies as a 'local postcode'. [3.68]
- 6.12. Club to ask the Football League to offer a young person's ticket for League Cup Finals. [3.70]
- 6.13. Club to conduct some research into what other clubs are charging for away youth tickets before writing to Premier League and asking for the matter to be discussed at a future meeting, the outcome from which to be shared with the Committee. [3.73]

- 6.14. Club determine what can be done to address the balance and give OLSCs a better reason for being. [3.89]
- 6.15. Club to meet with the Committee and share ideas for the plan to how best mark the occasion of the Club's 125th Anniversary. [4.1]
- 6.16. Club and Committee to consider abridged press releases for use on social media. [4.2]