



## Consultation Feedback Report

### 1. Executive summary

The consultation on the proposed formation of the Leeds First Friday Society received a positive and constructive response overall.

The feedback showed broad support for creating a more formal structure to protect the future of Leeds First Friday, improve transparency, support volunteers, provide clearer governance, and reduce reliance on a small number of individuals. Several respondents recognised that LFF has grown significantly and that a more sustainable structure is now needed to help it continue safely and confidently.

The consultation also raised important questions and concerns. These included membership eligibility, accessibility, legal names and privacy, membership fees, member voice, co chair elections, quorum, safeguarding, liability, insurance, finances, DBS checks, newcomer support and the need to protect the informal and welcoming character of LFF.

A number of changes have been made to the constitution as a direct result of the feedback received. These include:

- making clear that the constitution must be publicly accessible
- clarifying the Society's apolitical and non party political position
- allowing co chairs to waive the attendance requirement in exceptional circumstances
- adding provision for optional membership references
- adjusting AGM timing to avoid annual drift
- clarifying quorum and role holders
- adding a process for members to submit questions, concerns, motions and agenda items
- clarifying the role of the Returning Officer
- adding wording for situations where fewer than three co chair candidates stand
- clarifying decision making where there are fewer than three co chairs
- adding a requirement for co chairs to consider proportionate risk assessment, safeguarding or safety planning documents where appropriate
- adding flexibility for time limited coordination team activity

Other feedback did not require constitutional amendment but has been noted for future operational work. This includes safeguarding guidance, insurance review, newcomer support, volunteer role guidance, data protection processes and continued public messaging around LFF remaining free, open and welcoming.

The consultation has therefore been meaningful other than just symbolic. Feedback has been read, considered and, where appropriate, used to improve the governing documents. The process has strengthened the constitution and helped demonstrate the democratic, transparent and community focused approach behind the formation of the Leeds First Friday Society.

## **2. Purpose of this report**

This report summarises the feedback received during the consultation period on the proposal to form the Leeds First Friday Society and adopt the Society's governing documents.

The consultation invited feedback on the proposed Society, the draft constitution, and the supporting appendices. Feedback was received through the public feedback form and through comments made directly on the draft constitution.

The purpose of this report is to:

- record the feedback received in an anonymised form
- identify the main themes raised
- explain how the feedback has been considered
- identify where changes have been made to the constitution
- explain where no change has been made and why
- show that the consultation process has been meaningful, constructive and transparent

Overall, the feedback received was positive and constructive. Several responses expressed clear support for the formation of the Society and recognised the need to protect the future of Leeds First Friday. Other responses raised thoughtful governance, safeguarding, accessibility and practical concerns. Some of those points have directly resulted in changes to the constitution.

The consultation has therefore strengthened the final proposal. It has helped clarify how the Society will work, how members can participate, how risks will be managed, and how the structure can remain supportive rather than restrictive.

## **3. Overview of feedback received**

Feedback was received in two main ways:

- written responses submitted through the feedback form
- comments made directly on the draft constitution

Feedback included:

- broad support for the formation of the Society

- support for making LFF more sustainable
- support for clearer governance and continuity
- concerns about avoiding unnecessary bureaucracy
- questions about membership, fees and attendance requirements
- comments about privacy, legal names and data protection
- suggestions about meetings, voting, quorum and returning officers
- questions about co chair terms, elections and continuity
- questions about safeguarding, liability and DBS checks
- operational suggestions about newcomer support
- questions about finances, accounts, insurance and record keeping

The feedback was reviewed carefully and grouped into themes. Where appropriate, changes have been made to the constitution. Where the point raised was more operational than constitutional, the response explains how it can be addressed through guidance, policies, role descriptions, event planning or future review.

#### 4. Consultation statistics and feedback analysis

Feedback was received through two routes:

- written responses submitted through the public feedback form
- comments and replies made directly on the draft constitution

In total, the consultation received:

Source	Number received
Feedback form responses	10
Direct document comments and replies	19
<b>Total raw feedback entries</b>	<b>29</b>

Some feedback form responses contained more than one individual point, question or concern. For example, one response might include general support for the Society, a question about membership, and a separate concern about safeguarding. For this reason, the feedback was also broken down into individual feedback points for review.

Measure	Number
Raw feedback entries received	29
Individual feedback points identified	47

#### 4.1. Overall nature of feedback

Each individual feedback point was categorised by its overall nature.

<b>Nature of feedback</b>	<b>Number of individual feedback points</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Supportive or positive	11	23.4%
Constructive, questioning, technical or neutral	35	74.5%
Negative or sceptical	1	2.1%
<b>Total</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>100%</b>

This means that 46 out of 47 individual feedback points, or 97.9%, were either supportive, constructive, questioning, technical or neutral in nature.

Only one individual feedback point was categorised as negative or sceptical. This related to whether formalisation was needed and whether membership fees may follow in future. That point has been addressed in the report, including by reference to the constitution confirming that membership is not required to attend LFF events and that membership is currently set at £0.

#### 4.2. Thematic breakdown

The feedback was also grouped by theme. Some feedback points touched on more than one issue, so this thematic breakdown is intended to show the main areas raised rather than duplicate the sentiment analysis above.

<b>Theme</b>	<b>Approximate number of individual points</b>
General support for the Society and its aims	11
Membership eligibility, attendance, renewal, privacy or vetting	8
Meetings, voting, quorum, agenda items and procedural governance	8
Co chair elections, terms, continuity, vacancies and decision making	7
Safeguarding, conduct, visibility, DBS checks and risk management	6

Liability, insurance, finance, accounts and legal records	5
Protecting LFF's informal character and avoiding hierarchy	4
Newcomer support and operational development	3
Political neutrality and Pride related statements	1
Growth, venue capacity and event scale	1
Technical drafting or minor wording corrections	2

**4.3. Outcome of feedback review**

The consultation resulted in several direct amendments to the constitution. These included changes relating to:

- public access to the constitution
- political neutrality and non party political wording
- flexibility around the attendance requirement in exceptional circumstances
- optional membership references
- AGM timing
- member questions, motions and agenda items
- quorum and role holders
- Returning Officer arrangements
- fewer than three co chair candidates
- co chair decision making where fewer than three co chairs are in office
- co chair vacancies
- proportionate risk assessment, safeguarding and safety planning considerations
- coordination team flexibility
- minor drafting corrections

Other feedback was noted as operational rather than constitutional. These matters should be considered by the co chairs and coordination team as the Society develops, particularly around safeguarding guidance, insurance review, newcomer support, data protection processes, volunteer guidance and practical event planning. In relation to safeguarding and risk assessment, a proportionate constitutional clause has now been added, while the detailed practical process for risk assessments, safeguarding plans or safety planning documents should be developed operationally.

Overall, the feedback received was strongly supportive or constructive. The consultation process has led to meaningful changes to the constitution and has helped strengthen the proposed structure before it is presented for adoption.

## **5. Raw anonymised feedback received**

The following feedback is reproduced in anonymised form. Identifying information has been removed where appropriate.

### **5.1. Feedback form responses**

#### **5.1.1. Form response 1**

*“Overall the the idea is perfect I will like to back it all the way as Leeds first Friday has helped me long way”*

#### **5.1.2. Form response 2**

*“Creating this is a welcome step in ensuring LFF remains. I have been touched by the love and support people have given me since coming out. I am 18 months into my journey and LFF was the second event I went 'out to'. At various times, I have needed that love and support from others and the thought this event may no longer be is frightening.*

*It's more about what is left behind for the generation behind us that I consider vital. I know [personal context redacted] that there are many more trans people waiting to come out into the world and live their lives. Creating the society means that the work we do now gets taken on by them and the world changed as a result. That's not a political outcome, but no doubt it's driven by political decisions affecting our community.*

*For me, the work LFF does in encouraging and supporting newcomers to our community is paramount. Knowing they have a 'safe space' has an impact on someone nervous!”*

#### **5.1.3. Form response 3**

Clause referenced: 4.1.1.3

*“How will you be monitoring a member's activity during a membership year as to what events/sub events they have attended?”*

*As someone who has a chronic disability that makes physically attending an LFF event difficult, plus having other commitments, but would also has found LFF invaluable in their own personal journey so far with support online and sometime quite challenging discussions in the previous group chats - then need to ensure that membership can still be offered to allow for that flexibility where you have to take each day's functioning as it comes.”*

#### **5.1.4. Form response 4**

General feedback:

*“I think it would be better to appoint co-chairs for a period of 3 years, with at least one (the longest serving) stepping down at each AGM. This gives more certain continuity of experience. Also, thinking of something that has happened in the past, it stops an organised clique taking over by simply voting 3 of their number into co-chair positions at the AGM. I expect an AGM will have no more attendees than last night's meeting, say 25, so a few people who rustle up a dozen supporters could simply take over LFF with the current rules.”*

Clause referenced: 5.1.1.1 and 7.2.2

*“If you make it a minimum of 12 months the AGM will have to come at a later date every year. To keep it at about the same time each year better to make it a minimum of 11.”*

#### **5.1.5. Form response 5**

*“Is such formalisation needed? LFF was started as a very informal gathering of like minded people and worked for years without society or memberships. Next it will be charging for membership.”*

#### **5.1.6. Form response 6**

General feedback:

*“I'd like to record my appreciation of all the hard work that has gone into bringing the proposed LFF society this far. I fully support the aims of the society, as laid out in the documents that have been produced. This proposal for the LFF society is a very important and necessary step forward. There is a clear need to create structures that enable and promote continuity. And having the ability to open a LFF society bank account will also be useful in the future.”*

Clause referenced: Clause 4.3, Membership details, privacy and data protection

*“I was pleased to see that the draft constitution brings up the matter of chosen name versus legal name. Given that the constitution is a legal document, I can see that there will be a need for members' legal names to be known so that, for example, any liability issues that might arise can be addressed. However, it needs to be borne in mind that many LFF attendees who would potentially wish to become members of the LFF society may not be "out" to the world at large. For such individuals, confidentiality regarding their legal names might be an issue of some importance. So, I think that it would be helpful to further emphasize the point that confidentiality of legal names will be closely guarded.”*

#### **5.1.7. Form response 7**

*“Hi Everyone.*

*First off just a massive thank you to you all for arranging all of this, it's amazing to see such dedicated people securing the future of LFF for us all. What you have put together is very professional and I will definitely be supporting all you will be standing for.*

*The only concern that I have is that we don't make this into a "them" and "us" situation. I've heard the word "clique" been used before and think that it's made very very clear to the whole community that EVERYONE has a voice and EVERYONE will be heard on any topics or issues.*

*On another note I think there should be a dedicated person(s) for new comers. The made it team do a fantastic job but speaking about my first time at LFF, I had never been to Leeds before nor did I know anyone, where to park and what venue to go to. I was very scared to leave my hotel on my first outing and this put me off coming for a while. Yes I see posts on social media asking various question on this but I feel a representative who can advise personally through email or messengers would be advantageous to new comers. Even a chaperone for newcomers from their hotel to Made it, BES and the other venues would settle a lot of nervous people.*

*Hope to see you all on Friday"*

#### **5.1.8. Form response 8**

*"I attended the initial meeting and have carefully read through all the relevant documents and slides, giving particular attention to the constitution and resolutions*

*In general I am in agreement with the formation of an LFF Society and the guiding principles behind it. I believe it probably represents the best way forward to ensure the future and integrity of LFF. As a long standing, habitual and determined attendee of LFF for [length of attendance redacted], I do believe the formation of a LFF Society potentially secures a strong and prosperous future for the LFF event. Indeed it should strengthen it in enabling improved support and resources for the organisation team, better co ordination with venues and potentially greater financial resourcing to enable future positive strategies.*

*Despite my general support I have a few reservations and concerns as follows*

- \* It could be adversely regarded as an overly officious and patriarchal move*
- \* Greater official and structural visibility could increase the chances of the event being targeted by anti trans groups and individuals, creating greater safeguarding risks for co chairs, volunteers and members*
- \* There is potential that co chairs and volunteers will be become more widely regarded as responsible for any and all issues that may arise at LFF organised events, including the conduct and behaviour of non member attendees*
- \* Potentially increased liability for the LFF Society it's Co Chairs, volunteers and members has to be a huge concern*

*\* I also worry that this may adversely change the informal and friendly character of LFF, which is so highly spoken about. I really hope that we don't see future hierarchical discussions along the lines of 'What do you know about LFF, you're not even a member!'*

*I have a couple of questions*

- \* Have you investigated options for liability cover for the LFF society?*
- \* Who will look after finances and accounts?*
- \* Is there any legal requirement for file keeping and accounts submission?*
- \* How will membership be vetted to prevent infiltration from malicious anti trans individuals/groups*
- \* Will co chairs, organisers and volunteers receive any formal safeguarding training or undergo DBS checks?*
- \* Will the LFF Society be responsible for submitting safeguarding and risk assessment statements for events?*
- \* Finally do you think that LFF could grow to a size that becomes unmanageable for the streets and venues of Leeds and do you have a contingency plan for that?*

*Thankyou for reading and considering my feedback, and most of all a huge thankyou for taking LFF onwards and upwards"*

#### **5.1.9. Form response 9**

*"I think the proposal is very well written and will give LFF the strength to grow and move forward and will help the pressure that those who lead must experience"*

#### **5.1.10. Form response**

*"I think the proposals are a good idea, and necessary as LFF has grown in size and developed."*

### **5.2. Comments made directly on the draft constitution**

#### **5.2.1. Document comment 1**

Relevant section: Section 1, Name and status  
Relevant clause: Suggested new clause after 1.3

*"One small topic not mentioned. (One can either put the clause at the start or right at the end.) You probably need to indicate that this constitution is publicly accessible / easily accessible to all members, and indicate where it is held so they can access it. (E.g. "...as of XX 2026 and until further notice, on the LFF Facebook page.")"*

#### **5.2.2. Document comment 2**

Relevant section: Section 2, Aims and values  
Relevant clause: 2.3.1, apolitical and non party political wording

*“Does this need rewording in light of political party presence at Pride events - re the joint Pride statement banning political parties from a number of 2025 events? It's likely in future we may have a statement on similar things which possibly conflicts with being apolitical.”*

#### **5.2.3. Document comment 3**

Relevant section: Section 4, Membership  
Relevant clauses: 4.2.1 and 4.2.2, membership year and renewal

*“In this situation you probably need to make something explicit, here or in 4.2.1. If someone reapplies in, say, August, does their membership run for a year or until 31st December? (To make things simple, I recommend the latter! EVERYONE 'turns over' on 31st Dec.)”*

#### **5.2.4. Document comment 4**

Relevant section: Section 4, Membership  
Relevant clauses: 4.2.1 and 4.2.2, membership year and renewal  
Reply to: Document comment 3

*“That's taken care of by 4.2.1 and 4.2.2 isn't it?”*

#### **5.2.5. Document comment 5**

Relevant section: Section 4, Membership  
Relevant clauses: 4.3, Membership details, privacy and data protection, and 4.7, Data retention following termination of membership

*“This whole sub-section seems good to me (as is 4.7) and written at the right level of detail. Obviously an issue we need to keep on top of.”*

#### **5.2.6. Document comment 6**

Relevant section: Section 5, Meetings of members  
Relevant clause: 5.3.1, notice of meetings

*“21 days' notice / 14 days' notice.”*

#### **5.2.7. Document comment 7**

Relevant section: Section 5, Meetings of members  
Relevant clause: 5.5, Quorum

*“Seems good. Probably good to be explicit (if this is the intention) that 'members' includes role-holders.”*

#### **5.2.8. Document comment 8**

Relevant section: Section 6, Decision making and voting at members' meetings

Relevant clause: 6.2.4, secret ballot and Returning Officer

*“This section seems good to me as well. Probably worth saying that if a vote is intended to be taken, the person who is proposed as the Returning Officer shall be named at the start of the meeting (or indicated in the papers distributed prior to the meeting).”*

#### **5.2.9. Document comment 9**

Relevant section: Section 7, Co chairs

Relevant clauses: 7.4, nomination and election process, and 7.9, resignation and vacancies

*“Very happy with this. One note. 7.4.5 and 7.4.6 talk about more than three and exactly three. We probably need a clause that talks about 'fewer than three'. I presume two co-chairs also operate as equal chairs, etc. And then there is the situation of just one....”*

#### **5.2.10. Document comment 10**

Relevant section: Section 7, Co chairs

Relevant clauses: 7.2, term of office and election cycle, and 7.4, nomination and election process

*“Genuine question - do we also want to say that someone can serve for X number of continuous terms and then must stand down, perhaps sitting out for a year before running again. (I can imagine reasons for and against.)”*

#### **5.2.11. Document comment 11**

Relevant section: Section 7, Co chairs

Relevant clause: 7.2, term of office and election cycle

Reply to: Document comment 10

*“In my [organisation type redacted], the committee members have a three year term of office. That's c800 members nationally. It'd depend on numbers obviously but perhaps a two year term of office may be sensible whilst we set up?”*

#### **5.2.12. Document comment 12**

Relevant section: Section 7, Co chairs

Relevant clauses: 7.2, term of office and election cycle, and 7.4, nomination and election process

Reply to: Document comment 10

*“[Named person redacted] (with help from others) has transformed LFF over her 4 years of "office". If we are going to adopt an official committee/society then I'm wondering/thinking aloud...*

*1. if a rolling election system might keep the knowledge. Meaning that after an allotted time only one person is up for reelection. The following year person 2 and the following year, person 3. This might prevent the disaster of the 3 co-chairs being de-elected (with the loss of knowledge and contacts etc)*

*2. in general, committees often find getting people to join them quite difficult. Therefore if someone is happy to be a co-chair more than once/twice or several, then as long as the society supports them, I feel that they should be allowed to continue.”*

#### **5.2.13. Document comment 13**

Relevant section: Section 7, Co chairs

Relevant clauses: 7.6, internal decision making between co chairs, and 7.9, resignation and vacancies

Reply to: Document comment 9

*“See comment above if we have fewer than three.”*

#### **5.2.14. Document comment 14**

Relevant section: Section 7, Co chairs

Relevant clause: 7.6.8, conflicts of interest and personal grudges

*“I think this is really good and important.”*

#### **5.2.15. Document comment 15**

Relevant section: Section 8, Coordination team

Relevant clause: 8.2.4, composition and size of the coordination team

*“...or for any particular time-limited event or activity.”*

#### **5.2.16. Document comment 16**

Relevant section: Section 8, Coordination team

Relevant clauses: 8.5, roles within the coordination team, and 4.4.1.6 / 5.4, member voice, concerns and agenda items

*“Again, I think this is good. A suggestion for a role not included. Do we need a “members’ representative”, to act as a conduit / buffer for members’ suggestions or criticisms, to pass on to the main team?”*

**5.2.17. Document comment 17**

Relevant section: Section 9, Sub events and volunteer roles

Relevant clause: 9.1.1.6, workshops

*“small ‘w’ - ?”*

**5.2.18. Document comment 18**

Relevant section: Section 11, Safeguarding and conduct

Relevant clauses: Section 11 generally, likely 11.1 to 11.6

*“This all seems fair and good.”*

**5.2.19. Document comment 19**

Relevant section: Section 12, Finance and property

Relevant clause: 12.6, insurance and public liability cover

*“Yes, this came up at the April meeting. I think this clause is a good one and worded well.”*

**6. Summary of key themes**

The feedback was grouped into the following themes:

1. General support for the Society
2. Need for formalisation and protecting LFF’s character
3. Membership eligibility, attendance and accessibility
4. Membership fees and event access
5. Legal names, privacy and data protection
6. Member voice and avoiding a “them and us” culture
7. Meeting procedures, voting and quorum
8. Co chair elections, continuity and vacancies
9. Coordination team flexibility and roles
10. Newcomer support
11. Safeguarding, conduct and visibility
12. Liability, insurance and risk
13. Finance, accounts and legal records
14. Membership vetting and bad faith applications

- 15. DBS checks and safeguarding training
- 16. Growth, capacity and venue suitability

## **7. Detailed feedback themes and responses**

### **7.1. General support for the formation of the Society**

#### **7.1.1. Feedback summary**

Several responses were strongly supportive of forming the Society. Respondents described the proposal as positive, necessary, well written, professional and important for the future of LFF.

Feedback included comments that LFF has helped people significantly, that the Society is a welcome step to ensure LFF remains, that formalisation will help continuity, and that the proposals will help LFF grow and reduce pressure on those leading it.

#### **7.1.2. Response**

This support is welcomed and appreciated. The feedback shows that the overall direction is understood by many people who engaged with the consultation.

The proposal to form the Society is intended to protect the future of Leeds First Friday, provide clearer foundations, share responsibility, improve transparency, support volunteers and give members a greater voice in how LFF is run.

The presentation explained that LFF has grown significantly and now includes large attendance numbers, regular and one off events, online spaces, venue relationships, safety planning, Pride involvement, fundraising, communications and behind the scenes coordination. The Society is intended to support this work and allow it to continue in a more sustainable way.

#### **7.1.3. Action**

No constitution change required. Positive feedback noted.

### **7.2. Need for formalisation and concern about future membership fees**

#### **7.2.1. Raw feedback considered**

*“Is such formalisation needed? LFF was started as a very informal gathering of like minded people and worked for years without society or memberships. Next it will be charging for membership.”*

#### **7.2.2. Response**

This concern is understood, particularly because Leeds First Friday has always had an open, informal and welcoming character.

The reasons for forming the Society were covered in detail at the first community meeting. In summary, LFF has grown significantly and now involves much more than one monthly meet up. It includes regular and one off events, newcomer support, online spaces, venue relationships, Pride activity, safety planning, volunteers, communication, practical costs and a large amount of behind the scenes coordination.

The purpose of formalising is to give LFF better foundations, make it more sustainable, and reduce reliance on informal arrangements and a small number of individuals.

This is not about changing the event or introducing barriers. Clause 4.1.2 of the constitution states:

*“Membership is not required to attend LFF events. The main monthly Leeds First Friday social and other public meet ups remain open to attendees whether or not they are members.”*

Membership of the Society is currently set at £0. Clause 4.1.5 confirms that the current membership fee, including a fee of £0 where membership is free, must be reported to the members at the AGM as part of the financial report, and that members may vary or overturn the fee for the next membership year by simple majority vote at an AGM or General Meeting.

This means any future membership fee would be subject to member oversight. It is not a plan to introduce charges.

Leeds First Friday remains free to attend. This has been stated repeatedly throughout the process and is built into the constitution.

### **7.2.3. Action**

No constitution change proposed. Existing clauses 4.1.2 and 4.1.5 address this point.

## **7.3. Membership attendance requirement, accessibility and flexibility**

### **7.3.1. Raw feedback considered**

*“How will you be monitoring a member's activity during a membership year as to what events/sub events they have attended?”*

*As someone who has a chronic disability that makes physically attending an LFF event difficult, plus having other commitments, but would also has found LFF invaluable in their own personal journey so far with support online and sometime quite challenging discussions in the previous*

*group chats - then need to ensure that membership can still be offered to allow for that flexibility where you have to take each day's functioning as it comes."*

### **7.3.2. Response**

This is a helpful point, particularly around accessibility and how the attendance requirement will work in practice.

The Society will not monitor members' attendance throughout the year. That would not be practical or proportionate. The requirement is that, when someone applies for membership, they confirm that they have attended at least one LFF event within the previous twelve months. At renewal, members will again be asked to confirm that they still meet the membership criteria.

The reason for the attendance requirement is that the Society exists primarily to support and organise Leeds First Friday. It is important that members have a recent and genuine connection to LFF and some direct experience of the event or its recognised sub events.

However, the feedback identified a genuine issue: a strict attendance requirement may disadvantage people with disabilities, fluctuating health, caring responsibilities or access barriers who are genuinely connected to LFF but may not be able to attend within a particular twelve month period.

### **7.3.3. Change made**

A new clause has been added at 4.1.1.3.1:

*"The co chairs may, in exceptional circumstances, waive the requirement to have attended an LFF event within the previous twelve months for the purposes of application or renewal, where they are satisfied that the applicant or member otherwise has a genuine and relevant connection to Leeds First Friday and that granting or renewing membership would be consistent with the aims, values and proper functioning of the Society. This discretion should be used sparingly and only where the co chairs consider it fair and reasonable to do so."*

This keeps the attendance requirement as the general position, while allowing reasonable discretion in exceptional circumstances.

## **7.4. Legal names, chosen names, privacy and data protection**

### **7.4.1. Raw feedback considered**

*"I was pleased to see that the draft constitution brings up the matter of chosen name versus legal name. Given that the constitution is a legal document, I can see that there will be a need for members' legal names to be known so that, for example, any liability issues that might arise can be addressed. However, it needs to be borne in mind that many LFF attendees who would*

*potentially wish to become members of the LFF society may not be "out" to the world at large. For such individuals, confidentiality regarding their legal names might be an issue of some importance. So, I think that it would be helpful to further emphasize the point that confidentiality of legal names will be closely guarded."*

#### **7.4.2. Response**

This is an important point and has been considered carefully.

The feedback recognises the reason for collecting legal names, while also highlighting that this is sensitive information for many trans and gender diverse people. Some members may not be out publicly, may not use their legal name day to day, or may have understandable concerns about confidentiality.

The constitution already includes specific safeguards. Clause 4.3.4 confirms that a member's chosen name will be used on membership lists seen by other members, in meetings, and in public facing documents where names are used.

Clause 4.3.5 confirms that legal names and contact emails are collected for safeguarding, legal and administrative purposes, will normally only be accessible to the co chairs and any designated data or safeguarding officer, and will not be shared with other members or made public except where the Society is legally required to provide information to a public authority, or where it is necessary to address serious safeguarding concerns in line with the law.

Clause 4.3.6 also requires the Society to take reasonable steps to keep membership data safe and secure and comply with applicable data protection law.

It is also important to stress that membership is not required to attend Leeds First Friday events or to use public LFF online spaces. If someone decides not to apply for membership because they are not comfortable providing a legal name, that does not prevent them from continuing to attend LFF or participate in those public spaces.

#### **7.4.3. Action**

No additional constitution change proposed at this stage, as clauses 4.3.4 to 4.3.6 already provide specific protections. The membership form and privacy information should clearly explain why legal names are collected, how they will be used, and who may access them.

### **7.5. Making the constitution publicly available**

#### **7.5.1. Raw feedback considered**

*“One small topic not mentioned. (One can either put the clause at the start or right at the end.) You probably need to indicate that this constitution is publicly accessible / easily accessible to all members, and indicate where it is held so they can access it.”*

### **7.5.2. Response**

This was accepted as a good governance point. Members should be able to easily access the constitution and understand the rules under which the Society operates.

The wording has been kept broad rather than naming a single platform, because the way documents are stored or shared may change over time. The constitution should not need to be amended simply because the Society later changes document storage location.

### **7.5.3. Change made**

New clauses have been added at 1.5 and 1.5.1:

*“1.5. A current copy of this constitution shall be made publicly available and easily accessible to members, for example through the Society’s website, official online spaces, shared document storage, or another suitable method agreed by the co chairs.*

*1.5.1. Any member may request a copy of the current constitution from the co chairs, and the co chairs must provide this within a reasonable timeframe.”*

## **7.6. Apolitical / non party political wording**

### **7.6.1. Raw feedback considered**

*“Does this need rewording in light of political party presence at Pride events - re the joint Pride statement banning political parties from a number of 2025 events? It’s likely in future we may have a statement on similar things which possibly conflicts with being apolitical.”*

### **7.6.2. Response**

This was accepted as a fair point. The original intention of describing the Society as apolitical was not to prevent LFF from taking a position where something directly affects its events, Pride participation, safety, inclusion or the wellbeing of the community.

The intention is that LFF is not party political, does not endorse political parties, does not exist to promote a particular political ideology, and is not a campaigning or lobbying organisation. Its focus is social connection, community and support.

The wording has therefore been clarified.

### **7.6.3. Change made**

Clause 2.3.1 now states:

*“The Society is social and community focused. It is apolitical and non party political in its activities. The Society does not endorse or support any political party, does not exist to promote a particular political ideology, and is not a campaigning or lobbying organisation. Political debate, party political activity and general campaigning are not the focus of the Society’s events or online spaces. This does not prevent the Society from taking appropriate action or making statements where an issue directly affects LFF, Pride participation, community safety, inclusion, discrimination, or the wellbeing of the community it exists to support.”*

### **7.7. Membership year and renewal**

#### **7.7.1. Raw feedback considered**

*“In this situation you probably need to make something explicit, here or in 4.2.1. If someone reapplies in, say, August, does their membership run for a year or until 31st December? (To make things simple, I recommend the latter! EVERYONE ‘turns over’ on 31st Dec.)”*

A further comment noted:

*“That’s taken care of by 4.2.1 and 4.2.2 isn’t it?”*

#### **7.7.2. Response**

The issue is already covered by the existing wording.

Clause 4.2.1 states that the Society operates a fixed membership year running from 1 January to 31 December.

Clause 4.2.2 states that a person accepted as a member at any point during the membership year remains a member until the following 31 December, unless they resign or their membership is ended under the safeguarding and conduct procedures.

On that basis, membership does not run for a rolling twelve months from the date of joining or rejoining. It runs to the end of the current membership year.

#### **7.7.3. Action**

No constitution change proposed.

### **7.8. AGM timing**

### **7.8.1. Raw feedback considered**

*“If you make it a minimum of 12 months the AGM will have to come at a later date every year. To keep it at about the same time each year better to make it a minimum of 11.”*

### **7.8.2. Response**

This was accepted as a good practical point.

The intention was to make sure AGMs are held annually and not allowed to drift too far apart. However, requiring an AGM to be not less than 12 months after the previous AGM could unintentionally cause the AGM date to drift later each year.

Allowing an AGM to be held not less than 11 months and not more than 14 months after the previous AGM gives enough flexibility to keep the AGM at roughly the same time of year while preserving annual accountability.

### **7.8.3. Change made**

Clause 5.1.1.1 now states:

*“an Annual General Meeting (AGM) once in each calendar year, not less than 11 months and not more than 14 months after the previous AGM”*

Clause 7.2.2 now states:

*“An AGM must not be more than 14 months and not less than 11 months after the previous AGM.”*

## **7.9. Notice period wording**

### **7.9.1. Raw feedback considered**

*“21 days' notice / 14 days' notice.”*

### **7.9.2. Response**

This was a grammar and punctuation point. The constitution has been corrected to use the appropriate possessive wording.

### **7.9.3. Change made**

Clause 5.3.1 now refers to:

*“21 days’ notice of an AGM”*

and

*“14 days’ notice of a General Meeting or EGM”*

## **7.10. Quorum and role holders**

### **7.10.1. Raw feedback considered**

*“Seems good. Probably good to be explicit (if this is the intention) that 'members' includes role-holders.”*

### **7.10.2. Response**

This point was accepted. Co chairs, coordination team members and other role holders should count towards quorum where they are registered members of the Society. Holding a role does not make someone separate from the membership.

### **7.10.3. Change made**

Clause 5.5.2 has been added:

*“For the purposes of quorum, “members” includes all registered members of the Society, including co chairs, coordination team members and any other role holders.”*

## **7.11. Member questions, motions and agenda items**

### **7.11.1. Raw feedback considered**

Feedback raised concern about avoiding a “them” and “us” culture and making it clear that everyone has a voice and can be heard on topics or issues.

A related document comment suggested a possible members’ representative role:

*“Again, I think this is good. A suggestion for a role not included. Do we need a "members' representative", to act as a conduit / buffer for members' suggestions or criticisms, to pass on to the main team?”*

### **7.11.2. Response**

The concern about avoiding a “them and us” culture is important. The purpose of forming the Society is to make LFF more open, transparent and accountable, not to create a closed group or clique.

Members already have the right under clause 4.4.1.6 to raise concerns, suggestions or ideas with the co chairs and coordination team. However, it was agreed that it would be helpful to include a clearer route for members to submit questions, motions or agenda items for meetings.

The idea of a members' representative was considered. This may be useful in future, but it does not need to be written into the constitution at this stage. Members can raise matters directly, and there is nothing preventing a member from being supported by another member or advocate if they wish. A members' representative role could be introduced later as an informal role or role description without requiring a constitutional amendment, unless members decide they want it formally written into the constitution.

### **7.11.3. Change made**

A new section has been added at 5.4:

*"5.4. Member questions, motions and agenda items*

*5.4.1. Members may submit questions, suggestions, concerns, motions or proposed agenda items for consideration at AGMs or General Meetings, provided they are relevant to the Society's aims and business and are submitted within any reasonable timeframe set by the co chairs.*

*5.4.2. The co chairs shall take member submissions into account when setting meeting agendas, but may refuse or defer items which are outside the Society's aims, duplicate matters already being addressed, are vexatious or inappropriate, or cannot reasonably be considered within the time available."*

## **7.12. Returning Officer**

### **7.12.1. Raw feedback considered**

*"This section seems good to me as well. Probably worth saying that if a vote is intended to be taken, the person who is proposed as the Returning Officer shall be named at the start of the meeting (or indicated in the papers distributed prior to the meeting)."*

### **7.12.2. Response**

This was accepted as a sensible governance point. Where a vote is planned in advance, it is good practice for the proposed Returning Officer to be named either in the meeting papers or at the start of the meeting.

### **7.12.3. Change made**

Clause 6.2.4.3 now states:

*“the Returning Officer should normally be named in the meeting agenda or at the start of the meeting”*

### **7.13. Co chair terms, term limits and rolling elections**

#### **7.13.1. Raw feedback considered**

*“I think it would be better to appoint co-chairs for a period of 3 years, with at least one (the longest serving) stepping down at each AGM. This gives more certain continuity of experience. Also, thinking of something that has happened in the past, it stops an organised clique taking over by simply voting 3 of their number into co-chair positions at the AGM. I expect an AGM will have no more attendees than last night's meeting, say 25, so a few people who rustle up a dozen supporters could simply take over LFF with the current rules.”*

Further comments included:

*“Genuine question - do we also want to say that someone can serve for X number of continuous terms and then must stand down, perhaps sitting out for a year before running again. (I can imagine reasons for and against.)”*

*“In my [organisation type redacted], the committee members have a three year term of office. That's c800 members nationally. It'd depend on numbers obviously but perhaps a two year term of office may be sensible whilst we set up?”*

*“[Named person redacted] (with help from others) has transformed LFF over her 4 years of "office". If we are going to adopt an official committee/society then I'm wondering/thinking aloud... 1) if a rolling election system might keep the knowledge. Meaning that after an allotted time only one person is up for reelection. The following year person 2 and the following year, person 3. This might prevent the disaster of the 3 co-chairs being de-elected (with the loss of knowledge and contacts etc) 2) in general, committees often find getting people to join them quite difficult. Therefore if someone is happy to be a co-chair more than once/twice or several, then as long as the society supports them, I feel that they should be allowed to continue.”*

#### **7.13.2. Response**

These are helpful points. There is a clear logic behind longer or staggered terms, particularly around continuity and reducing the risk of all three co chair roles changing at the same time.

The concern about a coordinated group attempting to take control of LFF is understood. However, this is not considered best addressed by longer co chair terms alone. The constitution already includes safeguards around membership eligibility, conduct, bad faith applications, optional references, and safeguarding action where needed. In addition, clause 7.3.1 allows

reasonable additional eligibility criteria for co chair candidates to be agreed and clearly communicated in advance, for example a minimum period of involvement with LFF or membership of the Society. This means the Society has flexibility to introduce proportionate eligibility requirements in future if members consider that necessary, without adding an inflexible rule at this stage.

At this stage, however, the constitution will retain the one year term as drafted. The Society is still being formed, and a one year term keeps the structure simple, clear and accountable to members. It gives members a regular opportunity to review who is leading the Society and to make changes if needed.

Introducing longer terms or staggered elections at this stage would add a layer of complexity before the Society has had the chance to see how the structure works in practice.

Hard limits on consecutive terms are also not proposed at this stage. In practice, community groups often rely on people who are willing and able to continue. If someone is doing a good job and still has the support of members, the constitution does not need to force them to step down. The annual election process gives members the ability to make a change if they want to.

### **7.13.3. Action**

No constitution change proposed on term length, term limits or rolling elections. The concern about coordinated bad faith action is noted. Existing membership safeguards, conduct provisions, optional references and clause 7.3.1 provide mechanisms to manage this risk, including the ability to agree reasonable additional eligibility criteria for co chair candidates in future. This should be kept under review once the Society has been running for a while.

## **7.14. Fewer than three co chair candidates and vacancies**

### **7.14.1. Raw feedback considered**

*“Very happy with this. One note. 7.4.5 and 7.4.6 talk about more than three and exactly three. We probably need a clause that talks about ‘fewer than three’. I presume two co-chairs also operate as equal chairs, etc. And then there is the situation of just one....”*

A linked comment stated:

*“See comment above if we have fewer than three.”*

### **7.14.2. Response**

This was accepted as a useful clarification. The original wording covered exactly three candidates and more than three candidates, but did not explicitly say what would happen if fewer than three eligible candidates stood for election.

It was also appropriate to clarify how authority operates if the Society temporarily has fewer than three co chairs.

### **7.14.3. Changes made**

Clause 7.4.5 has been added:

*“If fewer than three eligible candidates stand for election, the eligible candidate or candidates shall be put to the AGM for ratification by a simple majority vote of members present. Any remaining co chair vacancy or vacancies shall then be dealt with in accordance with the vacancy provisions in this constitution.”*

Clause 7.9.3.3 has been added:

*“Where the Society has fewer than three co chairs, the remaining co chair or co chairs continue to hold authority in accordance with this constitution. Where there are two remaining co chairs, they continue to share authority equally and must act collectively wherever the constitution requires co chairs to act together.”*

## **7.15. Internal decision making where there are fewer than three co chairs**

### **7.15.1. Feedback considered**

The feedback about fewer than three co chairs also raised the question of how decisions should be made if the Society is temporarily operating with only two co chairs and they cannot agree.

### **7.15.2. Response**

This was accepted as a practical governance issue. The constitution has been updated to make clear that decisions are normally made by consensus where possible, or by a majority of co chairs then in office. Where there are two co chairs and they cannot agree, the decision should normally be deferred.

However, where a decision cannot reasonably be deferred because of time sensitivity, event planning, venue requirements, legal or administrative necessity, or another pressing operational reason, the matter may be referred to the coordination team.

This avoids allowing one co chair to simply overrule the other, while still providing a workable route for urgent operational decisions.

### **7.15.3. Changes made**

Clause 7.6.2 now states:

*“Where consensus cannot be reached in a reasonable timeframe, decisions may be made by a simple majority of the co chairs then in office.”*

Clause 7.6.3 states:

*“Where there are two co chairs in office and they cannot agree, the decision should normally be deferred for further discussion.”*

Clause 7.6.4 states:

*“Where there are two co chairs in office and a decision cannot reasonably be deferred because of time sensitivity, event planning, venue requirements, legal or administrative necessity, or another pressing operational reason, the matter may be referred to the coordination team. In such cases, the decision may be made by a simple majority of coordination team members who respond within a reasonable timeframe set by the co chairs.”*

Clause 7.6.4.1 states:

*“Any decision made under clause above must be recorded with brief reasons, including why the decision could not reasonably be deferred.”*

Clause 7.6.5 states:

*“Where urgent action is required to protect safety, wellbeing or the integrity of the Society, a single co chair may act in accordance with the urgent action provisions in this constitution, but must inform the other co chairs as soon as reasonably possible.”*

## **7.16. Conflict of interest and personal grudges**

### **7.16.1. Raw feedback considered**

*“I think this is really good and important.”*

### **7.16.2. Response**

This comment related to the clause preventing co chairs from using their position to pursue personal grudges and requiring them to step back from decisions where they have a clear conflict of interest.

This was supportive feedback.

### **7.16.3. Action**

No wording change proposed. The relevant wording remains at clause 7.6.8.

## **7.17. Coordination team flexibility**

### **7.17.1. Raw feedback considered**

*“...or for any particular time-limited event or activity.”*

### **7.17.2. Response**

This was accepted as a useful clarification. There may be situations where an extended coordination team is not needed for the whole year, but is useful for a particular time limited event, project or activity.

### **7.17.3. Change made**

Clause 8.2.4 now states:

*“There is no minimum number of additional coordination team members. It is for the co chairs to decide whether they require an extended coordination team in any given year, or for any particular time limited event, project or activity.”*

## **7.18. Newcomer support**

### **7.18.1. Raw feedback considered**

*“On another note I think there should be a dedicated person(s) for new comers. The made it team do a fantastic job but speaking about my first time at LFF, I had never been to Leeds before nor did I know anyone, where to park and what venue to go to. I was very scared to leave my hotel on my first outing and this put me off coming for a while. Yes I see posts on social media asking various question on this but I feel a representative who can advise personally through email or messengers would be advantageous to new comers. Even a chaperone for newcomers from their hotel to Made it, BES and the other venues would settle a lot of nervous people.”*

### **7.18.2. Response**

This is valuable operational feedback. The Made It team already do important work, but there may be more that can be done to make the newcomer journey easier, especially for people attending alone, staying in Leeds for the first time, or feeling nervous about getting from hotels to venues.

This does not require a specific constitutional change at this stage because the constitution already allows the Society to create volunteer roles, sub event roles, accessibility or welfare

contacts, and other support structures. Clauses 8.5 and 9 provide flexibility for roles within the coordination team, sub event leads and volunteers.

### **7.18.3. Action**

No constitution change proposed. This should be considered as an operational matter by the co chairs and coordination team once the Society is formed.

## **7.19. Safeguarding risk from increased visibility**

### **7.19.1. Raw feedback considered**

*“Greater official and structural visibility could increase the chances of the event being targeted by anti trans groups and individuals, creating greater safeguarding risks for co chairs, volunteers and members.”*

### **7.19.2. Response**

This is a real concern and something that needs to be taken seriously.

Leeds First Friday is already visible through public social media, public event promotion, Pride involvement, venue relationships and online spaces. The risk of anti trans attention already exists, regardless of whether LFF is formally constituted as a Society.

However, the concern that a more formal structure could increase visibility, or make LFF feel like a clearer target, is understood. It is also accepted that, as LFF becomes more structured, it is important that responsibility for considering risk, safeguarding and safety planning is clearly held somewhere.

One of the reasons for formalising is to make sure risks can be managed more clearly, rather than relying on informal arrangements. The constitution already includes safeguarding and conduct provisions, moderation oversight, the ability to restrict access to official online spaces, and processes for responding to serious behaviour or safety concerns.

A new clause has been added to make clear that the co chairs are responsible for considering whether proportionate risk assessment, safeguarding or safety planning documents are necessary or appropriate in light of the Society’s activities. This does not mean that every informal LFF meet up or public venue social requires a formal written risk assessment. It means that the co chairs must consider the issue where appropriate, particularly where the Society directly organises, sponsors, funds, promotes, controls attendance at, or permits use of the LFF name for an event or activity.

This is a proportionate change. It does not overstate the Society's responsibility for public venues or general attendee behaviour, but it does make clear that risk and safety planning are part of the co chairs' oversight role.

Relevant clauses include:

- clause 2.4, which commits the Society to creating a safe, respectful and inclusive environment and opposing discrimination
- clause 7.5.1.4, which makes co chairs responsible for overseeing safeguarding and conduct matters
- clause 7.5.1.4.1, which requires the co chairs to consider whether a proportionate risk assessment, safeguarding plan or other safety planning document is necessary or appropriate in light of the Society's activities
- section 10, which covers official online spaces and moderation
- section 11, which covers safeguarding and conduct

### **7.19.3. Action**

Constitution change made. Clause 7.5.1.4.1 has been added to require the co chairs to consider whether a proportionate risk assessment, safeguarding plan or other safety planning document is necessary or appropriate in light of the Society's activities. Safeguarding, visibility and risk from hostile individuals or groups will remain an ongoing priority for the co chairs and coordination team.

## **7.20. Responsibility for issues at LFF events and non member conduct**

### **7.20.1. Raw feedback considered**

*"There is potential that co chairs and volunteers will be become more widely regarded as responsible for any and all issues that may arise at LFF organised events, including the conduct and behaviour of non member attendees"*

### **7.20.2. Response**

This is an important point, and the distinction needs to be clear.

Leeds First Friday is already visible. It already has public social media, public event promotion, venue relationships, Pride involvement, online spaces, sub events and large numbers of people attending. The risks around safeguarding, conduct, visibility, public venues and attendee behaviour already exist under the current informal structure.

The purpose of forming the Society is not to make LFF responsible for everything that happens, or for every person who attends a public venue on an LFF night. The purpose is to give LFF

clearer structures, responsibilities and processes for dealing with the things it can reasonably control.

The Society can take responsibility for its own membership, volunteer roles, official online spaces, Society organised activities, private bookings, governance processes and safeguarding decisions within its remit.

However, the regular Leeds First Friday social takes place in public licensed venues. The Society does not control entry to those venues and cannot be responsible for every person present in them or every action of non member attendees.

The constitution reflects this distinction.

Clause 11.3.3 states:

*“Suspension of membership alone does not prevent the individual from entering or being present in public venues where the regular LFF social takes place, as the Society does not control entry to such venues.”*

Clause 11.4.2 states:

*“Suspension of membership does not automatically prevent attendance at public venues where LFF events take place, but may affect access to special events under the Society’s control.”*

Clause 11.6.2 states:

*“Permanent exclusion does not prevent an individual from being present in public venues during the monthly LFF event, as the Society does not control entry to such venues.”*

At the same time, the constitution gives the Society clearer powers and routes to act where something is within its control.

Clause 11.3.2 allows an immediate suspension to include suspension of membership rights, removal from volunteer roles, removal or blocking from LFF online spaces, and exclusion from special events or private bookings organised directly by the Society where the Society controls attendance.

Clause 10.5.2 allows the Society to remove or restrict access to official online spaces, delete or moderate content, or refuse future access to those spaces where a member or non member seriously breaches rules or poses a safeguarding concern.

The constitution also gives clearer responsibility for safeguarding and conduct matters, clearer routes for concerns to be raised, and clearer decision making powers for the co chairs where urgent action is needed.

Rather than creating responsibility for everything that happens at LFF, the Society helps define what LFF can and cannot control, and gives the co chairs and volunteers clearer ways to respond when serious issues arise.

### **7.20.3. Action**

No constitution change proposed. This distinction should be reflected clearly in safeguarding guidance and event planning.

## **7.21. Liability and insurance**

### **7.21.1. Raw feedback considered**

*“Potentially increased liability for the LFF Society it’s Co Chairs, volunteers and members has to be a huge concern”*

*“Have you investigated options for liability cover for the LFF society?”*

### **7.21.2. Response**

Liability is an important concern and will need to be kept under review as the Society develops.

Some of these risks already exist under the current informal structure. LFF already has public events, volunteers, venue relationships, online spaces, Pride involvement and safeguarding considerations. Formalising the Society does not create all of those risks from nothing, but it should give clearer ways to understand and manage them.

The constitution already includes wording requiring the co chairs to consider insurance. Clause 12.6 states:

*“The co chairs shall consider from time to time whether insurance, including public liability insurance, is necessary or appropriate in light of the Society’s activities, and may arrange such cover where they consider it proportionate and in the best interests of the Society.”*

The constitution also makes clear that the Society does not control entry to public venues where the regular monthly LFF social takes place. This is important when considering the limits of the Society’s responsibility.

At this stage, liability insurance has not yet been arranged, but the need for insurance will be considered by the co chairs once the Society is formed, particularly in relation to any Society organised events, private bookings, special activities or situations where the Society has direct control over attendance or activities.

### **7.21.3. Action**

No further constitution change proposed. Clause 12.6 already creates the required mechanism. Insurance, liability and risk assessment should be early practical matters for the incoming co chairs and coordination team to review.

## **7.22. Protecting LFF's informal and friendly character**

### **7.22.1. Raw feedback considered**

*"I also worry that this may adversely change the informal and friendly character of LFF, which is so highly spoken about. I really hope that we don't see future hierarchical discussions along the lines of 'What do you know about LFF, you're not even a member!'"*

### **7.22.2. Response**

This concern is understood. Protecting the informal, friendly and welcoming character of LFF is one of the most important parts of the process.

The Society is not intended to create a hierarchy between members and non members. Membership is not a status marker and is not required to attend Leeds First Friday.

Clause 4.1.2 states:

*"Membership is not required to attend LFF events. The main monthly Leeds First Friday social and other public meet ups remain open to attendees whether or not they are members."*

The purpose of the Society is to support LFF behind the scenes, not to make anyone feel less welcome or less entitled to be part of the community.

The constitution also requires members to act in line with the aims, values and culture of Leeds First Friday, to treat others with respect, avoid harassment, bullying or discrimination, and participate in meetings and decision making constructively.

If anyone were to use membership in a dismissive or exclusionary way, that would be against the spirit of the Society. LFF should remain welcoming to people whether they are members or not.

### **7.22.3. Action**

No constitution change proposed. This cultural point should be reflected clearly in public messaging, membership information and the code of conduct.

## **7.23. Finance and accounts**

### **7.23.1. Raw feedback considered**

*“Who will look after finances and accounts?”*

### **7.23.2. Response**

The constitution places responsibility for finances with the co chairs.

Clause 7.5.1.7 states that the co chairs are responsible for overseeing the finances of the Society, including bank accounts, income and expenditure, and ensuring that a brief financial report is presented at the AGM.

Clause 12.2 states that the Society shall keep simple, accurate records of income and expenditure.

Clause 12.3 states that any bank account in the name of the Society shall be operated by the co chairs, and that payments above a limit set by the Society shall require the approval of at least two co chairs.

Clause 12.5 requires a brief financial report to be presented to members at each AGM.

At this stage, a separate treasurer role has not been created in the constitution, because the structure should remain flexible while the Society is being formed. The co chairs will remain accountable for finances, but practical finance or record keeping tasks can be delegated if needed.

### **7.23.3. Action**

No constitution change proposed. The co chairs may consider delegating practical finance administration or creating an informal finance role later if needed.

## **7.24. Legal requirements for file keeping and accounts submission**

### **7.24.1. Raw feedback considered**

*“Is there any legal requirement for file keeping and accounts submission?”*

### **7.24.2. Response**

As the Society is proposed as an unincorporated association, it would not automatically have the same filing requirements as a company or registered charity.

However, that does not mean there are no record keeping or legal responsibilities. The Society will still need to keep appropriate records, manage money properly, comply with applicable tax, reporting or registration requirements if they arise, and comply with data protection law.

The constitution addresses this.

Clause 12.2 states that the Society shall keep simple, accurate records of income and expenditure.

Clause 12.4 states:

*“The Society shall maintain appropriate financial records and shall comply with any applicable tax, reporting, or registration requirements under the laws of England and Wales. Where required, the Society shall register with the relevant authorities and make any necessary returns or filings.”*

Clause 7.5.1.10 also makes the co chairs responsible for ensuring that the Society complies with any legal or regulatory requirements which apply to its activities.

#### **7.24.3. Action**

No constitution change proposed. The existing clauses cover financial records, legal compliance, tax, reporting and registration requirements, and data protection.

#### **7.25. Membership vetting and bad faith applications**

##### **7.25.1. Raw feedback considered**

*“How will membership be vetted to prevent infiltration from malicious anti trans individuals/groups”*

##### **7.25.2. Response**

This is an important concern.

Membership needs to remain accessible to genuine members of the LFF community, but the Society also needs reasonable safeguards to reduce the risk of bad faith applications or malicious involvement.

The constitution includes several protections. Clause 4.1.1 says that members must be aged 18 or over, support the aims and values of the Society, have attended at least one LFF event within the previous twelve months, and complete the membership registration process.

Clause 4.1.1.3.1 also allows the co chairs to waive the attendance requirement only in exceptional circumstances, where they are satisfied that the applicant or member otherwise has a genuine and relevant connection to LFF and that granting or renewing membership would be consistent with the aims, values and proper functioning of the Society.

The membership process may also ask applicants to provide an optional reference. This could be an existing member, or another person in good standing who is known within the LFF community. Providing a reference will not be mandatory and not providing one will not automatically prevent membership. However, where an applicant is not known to the Society, or where there are questions about whether they meet the membership criteria, a reference may help verify identity, connection to LFF, and eligibility for membership.

The constitution also allows the Society to take action if safeguarding or conduct concerns arise. Serious behaviour in official online spaces, and in some circumstances behaviour in unofficial spaces, may be taken into account where it affects the safety and wellbeing of people within LFF or official spaces.

If someone joins in bad faith or behaves in a way that conflicts with the Society's aims, values or the safety of the community, the safeguarding and conduct provisions allow for action including suspension, removal from online spaces, removal from volunteer roles, or permanent exclusion in the most serious cases.

### **7.25.3. Change made**

Clauses 4.3.3 to 4.3.3.2 have been added:

*“4.3.3. As part of the membership process, the Society may ask an applicant to provide an optional reference from an existing member, or another person in good standing who is known within the Leeds First Friday community.*

*4.3.3.1. Providing a reference is not mandatory and failure to provide one does not automatically prevent membership. However, where an applicant is not known to the Society, or where there are questions about whether the applicant meets the membership criteria, the co chairs may take the presence or absence of a suitable reference into account when deciding whether to accept the application.*

*4.3.3.2. The Society may contact the reference provided for the purpose of verifying the applicant's identity, connection to LFF, and eligibility for membership. Applicants should seek permission from the person before listing them as a reference.”*

## **7.26. Safeguarding training and DBS checks**

### **7.26.1. Raw feedback considered**

*“Will co chairs, organisers and volunteers receive any formal safeguarding training or undergo DBS checks?”*

### **7.26.2. Response**

This is an important safeguarding question and has been considered carefully.

At this stage, DBS checks are not considered required or appropriate for co chairs, coordination team members or general LFF volunteers. DBS checks, particularly enhanced DBS checks, are only appropriate where the specific role is eligible. That usually depends on whether the role involves defined forms of regulated activity with children or adults.

LFF is an adult social community event. The Society does not work with children, does not provide health care, personal care, social work, counselling, mental health treatment, financial assistance or other regulated services. People attend LFF of their own choice, in public venues and social spaces.

Someone helping to welcome people at a social event is not the same as someone providing care, treatment, supervision, teaching, counselling or formal support to a child or adult with care needs. LFF volunteers may help create a friendly and welcoming environment, but they are not acting as professional support workers or regulated care providers.

For that reason, DBS checks are not currently considered legally required or proportionate for LFF Society roles. A basic DBS check could technically be requested for many purposes, but it would only show unspent convictions and would not necessarily be an appropriate or meaningful safeguarding measure for the type of voluntary roles involved in LFF.

Safeguarding training also needs to be proportionate. LFF is not a safeguarding service, health service or mental health service. It is a social event and community space. The Society should avoid creating an unrealistic expectation that volunteers are trained safeguarding professionals or responsible for managing complex safeguarding situations.

The constitution places responsibility for safeguarding and conduct oversight with the co chairs. Volunteers, moderators and coordination team members are expected to follow the Society’s safeguarding expectations and raise concerns promptly, but they are not expected to investigate or resolve safeguarding issues themselves.

That said, safeguarding guidance will be important. The Society should make sure co chairs, coordination team members, moderators, sub event leads and volunteers understand how to recognise concerns, who to report them to, and the limits of their role. This can be done through practical guidance and clear reporting routes, rather than formal safeguarding training for every volunteer.

### **7.26.3. Action**

No constitution change proposed. Safeguarding guidance, reporting routes, and whether any specific role ever requires additional checks or training should be kept under review by the co chairs as the Society develops.

## **7.27. Safeguarding and risk assessment statements for events**

### **7.27.1. Raw feedback considered**

*“Will the LFF Society be responsible for submitting safeguarding and risk assessment statements for events?”*

### **7.27.2. Response**

The answer depends on the type of event or activity being considered.

For the main monthly Leeds First Friday social, LFF takes place in public licensed venues. The Society does not operate those venues, employ their staff, control their security, or control general public access. Those venues have their own legal responsibilities around licensing, premises safety, security, staffing and public liability.

It would therefore not be appropriate to suggest that every informal meet up, public venue social, or ordinary LFF night requires a formal written risk assessment or safeguarding statement from the Society.

However, the feedback has highlighted an important point. Where the Society directly organises, sponsors, funds, promotes, controls attendance at, or permits use of the LFF name for an event or activity, it is sensible for the co chairs to consider whether some form of proportionate risk assessment, safeguarding plan or safety planning document is needed.

This may be particularly relevant for private bookings, Pride activity, special events, workshops, newcomer arrangements, Society controlled activities, or other situations where the Society has more direct involvement or control.

It would be sensible for the constitution to include a proportionate responsibility for the co chairs to consider this. This does not mean that every activity will need a formal written risk assessment. It means that someone is clearly responsible for thinking about the issue and deciding what, if anything, is appropriate in the circumstances.

This approach also avoids putting an overly detailed or rigid checklist into the constitution. Practical factors such as cost, fit with LFF’s aims, public risk, attendee risk, accessibility, cancellation, weather, transport, accommodation and venue suitability are better dealt with through future operational guidance, event planning processes or a risk assessment template.

This is considered a sensible and proportionate change. It strengthens the constitution by making safety planning part of the co chairs' oversight role, without creating unnecessary paperwork for ordinary LFF attendance at public venues.

### **7.27.3. Action**

A new clause has been added at 7.5.1.4.1:

*“As part of this responsibility, the co chairs shall consider from time to time whether a proportionate risk assessment, safeguarding plan or other safety planning document is necessary or appropriate in light of the Society’s activities, particularly where the Society directly organises, sponsors, funds, promotes, controls attendance at, or permits use of the LFF name for an event or activity. The co chairs may prepare or require such documents where they consider this proportionate and in the best interests of the Society.”*

This creates a clear constitutional responsibility for the co chairs to consider risk assessment, safeguarding and safety planning where appropriate, while keeping the requirement proportionate to the nature of the Society and its activities.

## **7.28. Growth, capacity and venue suitability**

### **7.28.1. Raw feedback considered**

*“Finally do you think that LFF could grow to a size that becomes unmanageable for the streets and venues of Leeds and do you have a contingency plan for that?”*

### **7.28.2. Response**

LFF has grown significantly, and there is a need to keep the size, flow and suitability of venues under review. That is already part of the practical planning that happens around LFF, and the Society structure should make that easier to manage through clearer venue liaison, planning and coordination.

However, it is not currently considered likely that LFF will grow to a size that becomes unmanageable for the streets and venues of Leeds. LFF takes place across a wide area with multiple venues, and Leeds has significant capacity across the Freedom Quarter and surrounding nightlife spaces.

Individual venues may become busier at particular points in the evening, as happens with any popular night out, but that is different from the overall event becoming unmanageable. Where particular pressure points arise, these can be reviewed with venues and considered as part of ongoing event planning.

The constitution already makes the co chairs responsible for ensuring the monthly LFF event is planned and coordinated, and for acting as primary contacts with venues and partners.

### **7.28.3. Action**

No constitution change proposed.

## **8. Summary of changes made to the constitution following feedback**

The following changes have been made as a result of consultation feedback:

### **8.1. Public access to constitution**

New clauses 1.5 and 1.5.1 added to require a current copy of the constitution to be publicly available and accessible to members, and to allow members to request a copy from the co chairs.

### **8.2. Apolitical / non party political wording**

Clause 2.3.1 updated to clarify that the Society is non party political, does not endorse political parties, does not promote a political ideology and is not a campaigning or lobbying organisation, while still allowing the Society to act or speak where an issue directly affects LFF, Pride participation, community safety, inclusion, discrimination or wellbeing.

### **8.3. Attendance requirement discretion**

New clause 4.1.1.3.1 added to allow co chairs, in exceptional circumstances, to waive the requirement to have attended an LFF event within the previous twelve months for application or renewal where the applicant or member has a genuine and relevant connection to LFF.

### **8.4. Optional membership reference**

New clauses 4.3.3 to 4.3.3.2 added to allow the membership process to ask for an optional reference from an existing member or another person in good standing known within the LFF community.

### **8.5. AGM timing**

Clauses 5.1.1.1 and 7.2.2 updated so that AGMs must be held not less than 11 months and not more than 14 months after the previous AGM, rather than not less than 12 months.

### **8.6. Notice period wording**

Clause 5.3.1 corrected to refer to “21 days’ notice” and “14 days’ notice”.

### **8.7. Member questions, motions and agenda items**

New section 5.4 added to allow members to submit questions, suggestions, concerns, motions or proposed agenda items for AGMs or General Meetings, subject to relevance and reasonable timeframes.

### **8.8. Quorum and role holders**

New clause 5.5.2 added to clarify that members includes all registered members of the Society, including co chairs, coordination team members and other role holders.

### **8.9. Returning Officer**

Clause 6.2.4.3 added to say that the Returning Officer should normally be named in the meeting agenda or at the start of the meeting.

### **8.10. Fewer than three co chair candidates**

Clause 7.4.5 added to cover the situation where fewer than three eligible candidates stand for election.

### **8.11. Co chair decision making where fewer than three are in office**

Clauses 7.6.2 to 7.6.6 updated to clarify decision making where there are fewer than three co chairs, including how to manage disagreement between two co chairs where a decision cannot reasonably be deferred.

### **8.12. Co chair vacancies**

Clause 7.9.3.3 added to clarify that, where the Society has fewer than three co chairs, the remaining co chair or co chairs continue to hold authority in accordance with the constitution.

### **8.13. Risk assessment, safeguarding and safety planning**

New clause 7.5.1.4.1 added to require the co chairs to consider from time to time whether a proportionate risk assessment, safeguarding plan or other safety planning document is necessary or appropriate in light of the Society's activities, particularly where the Society directly organises, sponsors, funds, promotes, controls attendance at, or permits use of the LFF name for an event or activity.

### **8.14. Coordination team flexibility**

Clause 8.2.4 updated to clarify that an extended coordination team may be required for a particular time limited event, project or activity, as well as for any given year.

#### **8.15. Minor correction**

Clause 9.1.1.6 corrected from “Workshops” to “workshops”.

### **9. Matters noted for future operational work**

Some feedback was important but did not require constitutional changes. These matters should be considered by the co chairs and coordination team as the Society develops.

These include:

- safeguarding guidance, reporting routes and role appropriate safety awareness for co chairs, coordination team members, moderators, sub event leads and volunteers
- practical risk assessment, safeguarding and safety planning guidance or templates to support clause 7.5.1.4.1
- insurance and liability review
- practical finance administration
- data protection processes
- newcomer support and possible dedicated newcomer contact routes
- role descriptions for members, volunteers, coordination team members and co chairs
- public messaging to reinforce that LFF remains free, open and welcoming
- avoiding a “them and us” culture between members and non members
- future consideration of a members’ representative or similar role if members want this
- future review of co chair term lengths or rolling elections once the Society has been operating for a period of time

### **10. Conclusion**

The consultation feedback was, overall, positive and constructive.

Many responses supported the creation of the Leeds First Friday Society and recognised the need for continuity, sustainability, transparency and clearer structures. Several comments also raised thoughtful and practical concerns. These have been considered carefully.

The consultation has resulted in meaningful amendments to the constitution, including changes around public access to the constitution, political neutrality, membership accessibility, optional references, AGM timing, member motions, quorum, returning officers, co chair vacancies, proportionate risk assessment and safety planning considerations, and coordination team flexibility.

This shows that the consultation process has not been a formality. Feedback has been read, considered, and used to improve the final proposal.

The purpose of forming the Leeds First Friday Society remains unchanged: to protect, support and strengthen Leeds First Friday while keeping the event itself free, open, informal, welcoming and community focused.

## **11. Additional document changes made following internal review**

In addition to the changes made directly in response to consultation feedback, some further clarifying amendments have been made to the constitution and appendices following internal review.

These changes were not made because of a specific consultation response. They were made to improve accuracy, reflect the intended process more clearly, and ensure the documents properly describe the transition from the current informal coordination model into the Leeds First Friday Society.

### **11.1. Changes to the constitution**

#### **11.1.1. Commencement date of the Society**

Following internal review, a new clause has been added to the constitution to make clear when the constitution was adopted and when the Leeds First Friday Society formally comes into effect.

This change was not made in response to a specific consultation comment. It was made to avoid any future uncertainty about whether the Society began on the date of the adoption vote, the date of the constitution, or the date the new structure formally takes effect.

New clause 1.4 states:

*“This constitution was adopted on 22nd May 2026 and the Society shall come into effect on 20th July 2026.”*

This provides a clear permanent record within the constitution itself. It is consistent with the wording of the adoption motion and the intended transition period before the Society begins operating under the new structure.

This is a clarifying amendment only. It does not change the substance of the proposal, the governance model, the motions to be voted on, or the intended formation of the Leeds First Friday Society.

## **11.2. Changes to Appendix 1**

### **11.2.1. Founding co chairs roles**

The wording in Appendix 1, section A1.1 has been amended to more accurately describe the role of the founding co chairs.

The earlier wording suggested that all founding co chairs had led the transition from the informal coordination model into the constituted members society and had established the initial governance framework. On further review, this wording was not fully accurate, as not all founding co chairs had been involved in the earlier stages of drafting, consultation and governance development.

The revised wording now recognises the founding co chairs for taking on responsibility for leading the Society through its first phase after formal adoption, helping to establish the Society's early culture, expectations and ways of working, supporting the move into a more sustainable members society, and upholding the Society's purpose of centring and supporting trans and gender diverse people through this period of change. This better reflects the role of the founding co chairs once the Society is adopted, without overstating involvement in the earlier drafting and transition work.

### **11.2.2. Recognition of previous coordinators and contributors**

The wording in Appendix 1, section A1.2.3 has been amended to include "previous coordinators" within the wider acknowledgement of people who have contributed to LFF over the years.

The previous wording acknowledged unnamed volunteers, venue partners and community members. The revised wording now also recognises previous coordinators, while avoiding the need to list every individual by name. This ensures that the document acknowledges the wider history of LFF and the contribution of people who helped coordinate or support the event before the Society was formed.

### **11.2.3. Founding members**

The wording in Appendix 1, section A1.4 has been amended to clarify who will be treated as a founding member of the Leeds First Friday Society.

The earlier wording referred to founding members as those who took part in, or were formally recorded as members at, the inaugural general meeting. On further review, this did not reflect the intended process. The intention is that founding members are those who are eligible for membership, apply for membership before the Society comes into effect on 20th July 2026, and opt, as part of the membership registration process, to be recorded in the Founding Members Register.

The revised wording now reflects that process more accurately. It also confirms that Appendix 2 may be updated to correct errors or to reflect eligible founding members who registered before 20th July 2026 and opted to be included, without this being treated as an amendment to the constitution itself.

### **11.3. Changes to Appendix 2**

#### **11.3.1. Founding Members Register**

The wording in Appendix 2, section A2.1 has been amended to align with the revised founding members process now set out in Appendix 1.

The previous version of Appendix 2 referred to a date of resolution meeting and an agreed founding period. Following internal review, this was considered less clear than tying founding member status directly to the membership registration process.

The revised wording now confirms that founding members are those individuals who were eligible for membership under section 4 of the constitution, applied for membership before the Society came into effect on 20th July 2026, and opted, as part of the membership registration process, to be recorded in the Founding Members Register.

This makes the process clearer and avoids suggesting that founding membership depends on attendance at, or participation in, the adoption meeting.

#### **11.3.2. Administration, confidentiality and data protection**

The wording in Appendix 2, section A2.2.1 has also been updated to reflect the same approach.

The revised wording confirms that the Register may be updated by the co chairs to correct errors or to reflect eligible founding members who applied for membership before 20th July 2026 and opted to be included, without such updates being treated as amendments to the constitution.

This ensures that Appendix 2 can be kept accurate during the founding membership period without requiring a formal constitutional amendment each time a qualifying founding member is added or a correction is made.

### **11.4. Reason for these changes**

These amendments are intended to make the governing documents more accurate, fair and consistent with the intended formation process. They do not change the substance of the proposal to form the Society.

## 12. Next steps

### 12.1. Publication of this report


This consultation feedback report will be circulated on LFF social media and made publicly available ahead of the next community meeting.

The report is being shared so that members of the LFF community can see the feedback received, how it has been considered, what changes have been made, and what will be presented at the community meeting.


### 12.2. Final documents proposed for adoption

The final versions of the governing documents proposed for adoption at the community meeting are available below.


Constitution:

 Constitution - Leeds First Friday Society


Appendix 1: Founding co chairs and acknowledgements:

 Appendix 1: Founding co-chairs and acknowledgements

Appendix 2: Founding Members Register:

 Appendix 2: Founding Members Register

Folder containing all public documents:

 Public Documents

### 12.3. Community Meeting

The next community meeting will take place on:

**Leeds First Friday Community Meeting:** Adopting the Society

Friday 22nd May 2026 at 6.00pm

Online via Google Meet

Meeting link: <https://meet.google.com/kwe-mmqj-zjs>

The meeting link will also be shared with the community in advance of the meeting.

At the meeting, this report will be presented and there will be an opportunity to ask questions about the report, the feedback received, and the changes made to the constitution.

#### 12.3.1. Purpose of the meeting

The purpose of the next meeting is not to reopen the consultation or gather further general feedback. The formal feedback period has now closed. The meeting is intended to:

- present the consultation feedback report
- explain the changes made to the constitution
- answer questions about the report and revised documents
- address any technical issues arising from the latest changes
- move to the formal votes on adoption and ratification

#### **12.4. Meeting agenda**

The agenda for the community meeting will be published alongside this report.

Meeting agenda:

 2026\_05\_22 AGENDA Community Meeting

The agenda sets out the planned structure of the meeting, including presentation of this report, questions on the revised documents, and the formal votes on adoption and ratification.

#### **12.5. Advance voting**

An advance voting form will also be made available before the meeting for people who are unable to attend. This will allow eligible voters to vote on the two motions being presented at the meeting.

The advance voting form should only be used by people who are unable to attend the meeting. Anyone who votes in advance must not vote again at the meeting.

Advance voting form:

[https://docs.google.com/forms/d/e/1FAIpQLSdlftljwyBorUBQVbc2kYP7zvhHbbL\\_xBzcPt69QbObeAFXIQ/viewform?usp=sharing&ouid=112645011222042972385](https://docs.google.com/forms/d/e/1FAIpQLSdlftljwyBorUBQVbc2kYP7zvhHbbL_xBzcPt69QbObeAFXIQ/viewform?usp=sharing&ouid=112645011222042972385)

The advance voting form will open once the proposed coordination team members have been confirmed and added to the form. Until that point, the form may show as not accepting responses.

Advance voting will close at 8.00pm on Thursday 21st May 2026.

Voters will be able to vote For, Against, or Abstain on each motion.

##### **12.5.1. Motion 1: Adoption of the constitution, formation of the Society, and confirmation of founding co chairs**

The first motion will be:

*To adopt the Leeds First Friday Society constitution, including its appendices, and to formally establish the Leeds First Friday Society, with the Society coming into effect on 20th July 2026. This motion also confirms the founding co chairs of the Society as Kandice Aimee Fox, Lizi Bell and Ann East.*

#### **12.5.2. Motion 2: Ratification of the first coordination team**

The second motion will be:

*To ratify the proposed first coordination team of the Leeds First Friday Society, consisting of the individuals named in the advance voting form and presented at the community meeting, to support the founding co chairs in the initial running of the Society and the ongoing support of Leeds First Friday.*

The names of the proposed coordination team members will be included on the advance voting form before advance voting opens and will also be presented at the community meeting before the vote is taken.

#### **12.6. Voting outcome and next steps after the meeting**

The votes will be counted, recorded and shared during the meeting.

After the meeting, the outcome will also be shared publicly with the wider LFF community.

If the motions are passed, confirmation will be shared that the Leeds First Friday Society has been adopted and that the Society will come into effect on 20th July 2026.

The membership application form will then be circulated more widely, so that eligible people can apply to become members before the Society comes into effect.

Further information will also be shared in due course, including key dates for members' meetings, membership processes, and the practical steps involved in moving from the current informal coordination model into the new Society structure.

### **13. Report preparation statement**

This report has been compiled by Kandice Aimee Fox, acting in connection with the proposed formation of the Leeds First Friday Society.

The report has been prepared in good faith using the feedback received through the public consultation process, including responses submitted through the feedback form and comments made directly on the draft constitution.

Feedback has been anonymised where appropriate to protect privacy and avoid identifying individual respondents unnecessarily. Some responses have been grouped into themes where they raised similar or overlapping points. Where feedback has been summarised, care has been taken to reflect the substance of the point being made fairly and accurately.

The purpose of this report is not to dismiss disagreement or present the consultation as unanimous. It is intended to provide a balanced record of the feedback received, explain how that feedback has been considered, and identify where changes have been made to the constitution and supporting documents.

The report also distinguishes between changes made directly in response to consultation feedback and clarifying amendments made following internal review.

Any errors or omissions identified after publication can be raised at the community meeting or sent to the proposed co chairs for review.

**Prepared by: Kandice Aimee Fox**

**For presentation to the Leeds First Friday community ahead of the community meeting on Friday 22nd May 2026.**