

IN THE MATTER OF AN APPEAL TO THE (FIRST-TIER) TRIBUNAL (INFORMATION RIGHTS) UNDER SECTION 57 OF THE FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT 2000

Case Number: EA/2010/0162

BETWEEN

MR C ZACHARIDES (Appellant)

and

THE INFORMATION COMMISSIONER (Respondent)

and

THE UK SPORTS COUNCIL (Additional Party)

**APPELLANT'S WITNESS STATEMENTS DUE BY
26TH JANUARY 2011**

Mr John Bicourt	5 pages
Mr Jim Cowan	6 pages
Mr Dennis Daly	7 pages
Mr William Laws	8 pages
Mr Rob Whittingham	30 pages
Mr Mike Winch	5 pages

Mr John Bicourt

Legal Points:

- i) To help establish that an action for Breach of Confidentiality against UK Sport by UK Athletics could not succeed, and would not be mounted because the relationship between the two organisations is a sham.
- ii) The growth in public funding for no benefit gives cause to a compelling public interest in disclosure.
- iii) Detriment to the confider. To help establish that no item of information about legal activity would reveal secrets which would hinder the attempts of any British Athlete to win an international medal.

Athletics

Biography:

Athlete

As an athlete John specialised in the 3000 metres steeplechase. He represented Great Britain in two Olympic Games, Munich (1972) and Montreal (1976). He also competed for GB at the European Championships in Rome, and for England at the Commonwealth Games, Christchurch where He just missed out on a medal, placing 4th. In 1976, he was ranked no 1 in Britain with a time of 8:22.83 which still ranks him in the top ten on the all time list in 2010.

School Teacher

Throughout his competitive athletics career, John qualified and worked as a school teacher, and through his two Olympic Games was Head of the PE Dept., and Senior Housemaster at St Austin's boys secondary school in Charlton. He went on to become a senior lecturer at his old University College at St, Mary's in Twickenham.

Athletics Agent

During the transition of athletics from an amateur sport to a professional sport John Bicourt was recognised as a pioneer and was generally regarded as the first athlete's manager in the world. In 1984 John formed AIM Limited which was His own International Athletes Management company. As an Agent John formally represented over 120 athletes covering all events, including 14 Olympic Medalists 6 of whom were Olympic Champions (Tessa Sanderson, John Ngugi, Peter Rono, Khalid Skah, Matthew Birir and Nick Hysong).

John arranged for and accompanied Linford Christie to his break-through sprint performance in Madrid where he won and set a then new British record for 100 metres. Improving from a previous pb of 10.21 to 10.17 in his heat and then 10.05 in the final, which moved Linford into the ranks of the world elite in sprinting.

Athletics Coach

John is a UKA licensed, Level 4 athletics coach (highest level). Athletes coached by John Bicourt have won 6 Olympic Medals as follows:

John Ngugi - Gold Medal in the 5,000m at the 1988 Olympics in Seoul, South Korea

Matthew Birir - Gold Medal in the 3k Steeplechase at the 1992 Olympics in Barcelona, Spain

Richard Chelimo - Silver Medal in the 10,000m at the 1992 Olympics in Barcelona, Spain

Nixon Kiprotich - Silver Medal in the 800m at the 1992 Olympics in Barcelona, Spain

William Mutwol - Bronze Medal in the 3k Steeplechase at the 1992 Olympics in Barcelona, Spain

Mark Rowland - Bronze Medal in the 3k Steeplechase at the 1988 Olympics in Seoul, South Korea

Two athletes coached by John broke world records on the track (Richard Chelimo and Bernard Barmasai).

John continues to coach, and is the elected Coaching Officer of the Association of British Athletics Clubs (ABAC)

John Bicourt Witness Evidence

The evidence provided below is an article written by John Bicourt and published on 16th March 2010. The UK Athletics Chief Executive, Mr Niels de Vos responded directly to John Bicourt's article with his own article published on 18th March 2010 (Included in the bundle pages 351 to 353). The second part of John Bicourt's evidence below is a response to the Niels de Vos article.

DO THE PUBLIC GET VALUE FOR MONEY FROM UK ATHLETICS

For those trying to justify the £150 million public monies invested in athletics as insignificant by comparing it with the health costs associated with level of obesity in the nation, the private investment in health clubs and with what happens in the United States College system is entirely spurious and irrelevant.

Football, for example, has massively more money but it's not tax payers' money and they're not accountable to the wider public. Neither is motor sport or many other sport and leisure related activities.

The MP's expenses row involved the "trifling" sum of "only" £1.2 million and the Government spent more than that to investigate it and bring those responsible to account. Why? Because it was public money being improperly used and the public expected it to be challenged.

The only proper way to assess value for 12 years of public money being spent by this unelected and unaccountable national governing body is to look at the state of our own sport in this country and what development was promised and expected to be achieved, not JUST at a tiny elite level but also through the critical and essential development of the grass-roots and the sustainable pool of talent at every level where clear evidence from recorded results shows dramatic decline both in standards in depth and participation particularly after the age of 16.

UK Athletics' original remit was to develop the sport from grass roots-right through to elite but they have instead concentrated purely only on the elite once they have risen, unaided by them, up through the grass roots and in that cause have employed 150 staff, including part time, at a salary cost of over £5 million per year whilst the grass roots that actually produce the sport and its athletes relies on volunteers only and no public funding.

UK Athletics continues to be funded on the success and presumed success of a very small elite group - some of whom have won medals without UK Athletics and lottery support - to give the impression that the whole of the sport from the rest of the elite down is thriving and vibrant, when in fact it isn't. And the long term prognosis is not good. So something is not right.

At the Beijing Olympics and the Berlin World Championships, look at the number of events with no British representative and further, the number of events with only one out of as possible three? So why does UK Athletics continue to employ those directors of events and event coaches responsible who cannot deliver?

Look at the number of GB athletes who seem to produce season's best and some personal bests in the qualifying of global championships but then fail to reproduce it when in matters in the semi-final or in a final for the few who make it?

The spending [and largely wasting] of public money on a costly and ineffective administration for an elite few may not matter to the likes of those on the BBC athletics forum who have their own agenda to support UK Athletics but it does to others and the issues - continually advised to the Department for Culture, Media and Sport - won't go away, much as they would like them to.

A RESPONSE FROM JOHN BICOURT

Niels De Vos, the CEO of UK Athletics Ltd in his riposte to my previous article, has entirely and perhaps deliberately, missed the point. It is not a question of how much public money is spent by UKA but whether it provides a reasonable and expected return in value to the funding bodies that provide the public money.

Incredibly, given his role as the CEO of UKA, his own figures and assertions, proffered within his defensive attack on my article, are completely inappropriate, highly misleading and clearly designed, it seems, to hide from UKA's public and commercial funders the true picture of GB's medals and top 8 placings over the last three Olympic Games and six World Championships.

Niels De Vos has provided figures regarding GB achievements at Olympic and World Championships to "prove" how our teams' performance under their guidance and support has supposedly improved? He has failed to even recognise there are two World Championships in every Olympic cycle and not one as he states.

Peter Matthews, a world respected athletics statistician, made the following comment on De Vos's figures - "To count all four relay medalists is absurd, grossly misleading, not what one would expect of a responsible governing body"!

De Vos's misleading figures quoted for GB."medallists" during three Olympic cycles, including World Championships are:

- Sydney 2000/Edmonton 2001 - 6
- Athens 2004/Helsinki 2005 - 12
- Beijing 2008/Berlin 2009 - 16

Whereas the correct number of medals won (the only globally recognised count) during the Olympic cycle are in fact:

- Seville 1999/Sydney 2000/Edmonton 2001 - 15 Medals
- Paris 2003/Athens 2004/Helsinki 2005 - 11 Medals
- Osaka 2007/Beijing 2008/Berlin 2009 - 15 Medals

So clearly no improvement on a decade earlier when our medallists then, were already established world class performers, without the benefit of UKA's funding.

For the same cycles he states (re: number of GB athletes in top 8 places)

- Sydney/Edmonton - 33
- Athens/Helsinki - 27
- Beijing/Berlin - 40

Whereas the correct accumulated figures for the same cycle are:

- 1999/2000/2001 - 51
- 2003/2004/2005 - 31
- 2007/2008/2009 - 51

(Nb The correct figures above are verified by two of the top statisticians in the world)

Mr. De Vos's inappropriate and grossly misleading figures once again falsely shows an improvement whereas the correct figures show no improvement at all from a decade earlier. So millions of pounds of public funds have been handed to UKA over the 11 years to stand still!

It should also be noted the '95/97 unfunded cycle achieved 17 medals and 47 top 8 places.

DeVos, claims GB finished as top ranked European nation in the recent World Indoor Championships, when in fact GB was 2nd European nation behind Russia. This "oversight" conveniently made GB look better than it was and despite finishing 4th overall, (not unexpectedly with the third largest team) De Vos's, Head Coach, (Charles Van Commonee) stated that it was, "disappointing" and that a number of athletes had not performed as expected - Britain produced only 6 Top 8 individual placings from a team with 23 individual competitors.

The true measure of achievement, however, and the measure for UK Sport's funding level of UKA, is the World OUTDOOR Championships and the Olympic Games. Little wonder, then, that De Vos would want to make it look as good as possible?

DeVos states that UKA receives £6million per year (public funding via UK Sport) to fund their Olympic programme. Of the "£6million", DeVos says 25% of that sum is invested to, "ensure we are able to take full British teams to all major track and field championships - not just senior teams but junior teams too" !

This "full teams" claim is entirely false and contrary to UKA's own stated selection policy. UKA have never taken a full British team to any of the major track and field championships. In fact one of the biggest criticisms of UKA is their incompetence and continuing failure despite having Directors of events, (now Directors of "speed", endurance" and "jumps") numerous professional coaches, managed High Performance Centres and, what they claim is the best medical and sport science support system, to produce more qualified athletes for OG's and WC's where GB is continually unrepresented in a number of events.

DeVos then curiously breaks down his £6m into separate disciplines and says this equates to just £375,000 per year per discipline, "making athletics, by disciplines amongst the lowest funded of Olympic sports, and the sport offering perhaps the best value for money of all"! . This is farcically irrelevant and not how they actually break the funding down and only suggests his crass misunderstanding of athletics.

What IS highly relevant is the glaring and embarrassing lack of GB representatives in so many Olympic and World Championship events.

De Vos, claims that UK Athletics has a role to provide a strategic insight and direction for the Home Countries National Governing Bodies, yet in the 11 years since its inception, UKA has still not managed to produce a comprehensive strategy for the development of the sport!

Their self lauded Coach Education Programme has continuously failed to be granted the government's funded Sports Coach UK/ UK Coaching Certificate, being deemed "unfit for purpose." Now UKA have decided to go their own way and the coaching qualification program is on hold pending the launch a new programme in the Autumn which will sit outside the nationally recognised coaching accreditation process for all NGB's (UKCC).

The quoted £18m into "grass roots" (but not the clubs) is mainly marketing spend from which Aviva receive a good value return but it is not benefiting the real development of athletics. The stated £18m has produced no measurable growth in the sport at the critical U20 and senior competitive level and there are no published detailed figures to back up what DeVos claims of how the money is spent and what benefit this has bought.

De Vos's claims the results of the independent Active People survey (IPSOS Mori) "showed that participation in athletics has risen for the fourth consecutive 6 month period". However, these figures are mainly centred on people jogging and therefore are nothing to do with UKA, who by their own, self-stated interest, focus on the elite.

DeVos states that UKA "clearly shows excellent value for money" but by what measure? Spending money is NOT a measure of value. Returns might be, but only if they match or exceed the purpose for which the money was provided. In UKA's case the agreed measure with UK Sport is global event medal targets which continually get revised down and often still get missed.

Despite missing the low, greatly reduced, goal of 5 medals in Beijing, Mr DeVos, was awarded a £28,000 pay increase, this at a time of the greatest recession since the 1930's.

His acerbic comments on the Association of British Athletics Clubs (which is in fact a fully democratic and unfunded pressure group) is completely wrong and rather hypocritical given that UKA, (Ltd by guarantee) is a body which is not transparent, is self appointed, undemocratic and unaccountable to the sport.

Given his gross misrepresentation on GB's medals and top 8 placings over three Olympic cycles (have they also been presented to the government's funding body?) and the poor value return in global achievements for public money invested, I believe that UK Sport should immediately review Mr. De Vos's position.

Mr Jim Cowan

Legal Points:

- i) To help establish that an action for Breach of Confidentiality against UK Sport by UK Athletics could not succeed, and would not be mounted because the relationship between the two organisations is a sham.
- ii) The growth in public funding for no benefit gives cause to a compelling public interest in disclosure.

Athletics Biography:

Young Athlete

Jim Cowan has been involved in athletics his whole life. Son of international sprinter John Cowan, Jim was introduced at a young age before getting hooked when taught by Olympic Hammer thrower, and BBC Commentator Paul Dickinson who was his Human Biology teacher at school.

Athletics Coach

Although moderately successful as an athlete, Jim had greater success as a coach having coached an athlete of county standard or above in every Olympic event. Best known as a middle and long distance coach the better known athletes he has worked with include the late, great Benson Masya (world half marathon champion/record holder), Albert Kemboi (800m), Moses Masai (7th world junior xc championship who has since gone on to 4th in Olympics and 3rd in World champs at 10,000m), Ernest Meli Kimeli (3rd world junior xc champs).

Jim has also worked as National Coach for the Sultanate of Oman and as a coaching consultant for television including Channel Four (UK), Channel 7 (Australia) and Fox (USA).

Athletics Administration

As an administrator Jim was a club committee member at Thames Valley Harriers before moving away from London. He has worked in coach education for both BAAB and UKA, the latter withdrawing his services in dissatisfaction at poor quality courses. When UKA was established Jim also sat on the Development Policy & Support Team before resigning to take up an overseas post.

Current Occupation:

Jim now owns and runs his own consultancy company, Cowan Global specialising in strategy with a special focus on sports and leisure.

Other Relevant Experience

Jim has wide ranging experience of the power of sport as a force for good, in engaging communities and in driving physical participation. Indeed, the UK's largest participation event, the Race for Life was conceptualised, designed and launched by Jim and, to date, his events have raised over £1/4 Billion for a range of charities.

Jim Cowan Witness Evidence

Jim Cowan in December 2006, identifies the failure of UK Athletics in achieving the UK Coaching Certificate accreditation, which is still the case in 2011. Jim Cowan's evidence continues by showing UK Sport's failure to ensure that UK Athletics had a joined up strategic vision for the sport they fund.

UK ATHLETICS CAN'T GET COACHING RIGHT AND THAT'S OFFICIAL!

On 15th November an announcement appeared under 'latest news' on the Sports Coach UK website; "11 sports now endorsed by UK Coaching Certificate."

Sadly athletics is still not among the sports accredited, further evidence of the failings of UK Athletics and the undermining of coaching and coach education in our sport.

So, what is the UK Coaching Certificate (UKCC) and why is athletics' absence from those sports endorsed such a scandal?

In 2002 the DCMS Coaching Task Force Report called for the implementation of a 'national coaching certificate' at five levels. The UKCC provides the framework for National Governing Bodies (NGB's) to develop their qualifications against, ensuring a minimum quality standard at each level. In turn these levels are linked to National Standards so that (for example) a level 3 swimming coach is viewed as being as professionally competent as a level 3 plumber. In this way it is hoped that accreditation by the UKCC will be recognised as a sign of quality, where the role of the coach is better respected and understood and coaching can develop as an established profession for those wishing to explore that route.

Various sports were identified as either phase 1, phase 2 or phase 3 sports with the six sports in phase 1 (athletics, cricket, rowing, rugby union, swimming and triathlon) being 'inducted' into the process in January 2004. Phase 1 delivery plans and funding were agreed in April 2004.

A further fifteen phase 2 and ten phase 3 sports were to come into the process later on however the initial focus, support and resources went to the six sports in phase one.

So, in short, there is now in place an agreed method for assessing an NGB's competence in coach education. All NGB's had significant work to do however support and resources (including funding) were in place for phase 1 sports and the expectation was that the six would achieve at least level one endorsement by the end of 2005.

The latest announcement from UKCC on progress tells us how well the six sports are progressing:

- Triathlon has achieved level 1.
- Swimming has achieved level 1 in four disciplines, swimming, synchro, water polo and diving.
- Cricket, rowing and rugby union have all achieved level 2.
- Athletics has yet to achieve any UKCC endorsement and has had several submissions rejected. (In fact, off the record, UKCC and Sports Coach UK staff will tell you that they find UKA arrogant and very difficult to work with).

Incredibly, despite the 'head start', athletics has been overtaken by phase 2 sports badminton (level 1), cycling (level 2), hockey (level 3), rugby league (level 2), tennis (level 1) and squash (level 1).

In comparing phase 1 and phase 2 sports it should be remembered that those in phase 1 were provided with a higher lever of support and resource (including funding). Level 3 sports will receive support but no funding.

Given the different levels of support and comparing overall resources available to NGB's, it is a diabolical disgrace that athletics under the stewardship of UKA has struggled to match the performance of relative minnows like badminton and hockey.

For some time, UKA has been criticised for its poor support of coaching and the poor quality of its coach education. On the evidence provided over the first three years of the UKCC that criticism is not only justified, but can be evidenced from an official, Government recognised and supported, source.

A FUTURE FOR ATHLETICS IN THE UK

26th August 2008

Pick up a newspaper or turn on the television over the last couple of days and, in amongst the deserved celebrations for Team GB's performance in Beijing, one theme keeps jumping off the pages at me; athletics has failed.

I could be pedantic and point out that it is the NGB and structure the Government, UK Sport and Sport England imposed on athletics that has failed, not the sport itself. I could also point out that many, many people have been telling Government, UK Sport, Sport England and even UK Athletics that failure was inevitable for a number of years but they weren't listening.

Now, here we are. The Government and its funding partners hoped that by burying their heads in the sand this day would not arrive. But it has and the panic is setting in. That panic is driven by one thought and one thought only; medals in 2012.

Yes, medals in 2012 are important, but we must not also forget the well being of the sport of athletics in the scramble that the panic will generate. Short term thinking and short term fixes will only hide the problems in athletics, not solve them. However, proper solutions to the long term issues will support 2012 ambitions and help produce further medals beyond then.

Indeed, wasn't one of the big selling points for hosting the Games in London the legacy that would be left behind? What I'm talking about is making sure that we avoid the panic and focus on that legacy in athletics. If we then need to add some short term programmes to 'save' 2012, so be it, however I believe that if we get the rest right, the medals will follow.

Before I look at some of the fixes we need, let's add some realism by looking at whose futures we are talking about. The average age of an Olympic athletics medallist is between 24 and 28. There are always exceptions both below and above that age band, it is only an average.

That average age tells us that, realistically, anyone under the age of 18 today is unlikely to medal in 2012. Yet those 18 and under are surely the very people the 'legacy dream' is aimed at. In Olympic terms today's child of four will peak in 2028 and 2032. The child of 8 in 2024; it is 2020 for the twelve year old and those who have just sat their GCSEs are looking at 2016.

What are UKA's plans for all of these young people?

They don't have any! Legacy is just a word to this NGB. Planning is a fantasy.

UK Athletics are a decade old. In ten years they have yet to produce a strategy for the development of the sport. Plenty of initiatives they can sell to sponsors, but precious little integration of those initiatives, little to show how they add up and where they lead to. Forget the lack of medals; that lack of strategy is UKA's single biggest failure and the reason we are where we are now.

Spike Milligan once, jokingly, stated "we don't have a plan so nothing can go wrong". UKA may be from the Spike Milligan school of thought but they are finding out now that without planning things can go wrong, very wrong.

So far so good (or in UKA's case, so bad), but how do we go about fixing things?

A STRATEGY FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF ATHLETICS

Government, their funding partners and UKA seem to be under the illusion that 'development' is that bit where we get young people involved, where we put on come and try days and where we 'play' at sport.

They are, in part, right but they miss the whole picture. Development is all encompassing, it covers every aspect that takes 'little Johnny' from his very first athletics experience all the way to the top of the Olympic podium.

Without understanding that premise, the rest is an exercise in unrelated schemes and initiatives which, if we cross our fingers, might work but frequently don't.

It is time for athletics to make the most important role in the sport that of the person who pulls this together, someone they don't employ yet!

Development; it is a continuum:

Foundation → Participation → Performance → Excellence.

Let's take a look at that continuum in closer detail.

→ FOUNDATION TO PARTICIPATION

UKA have employed a number of initiatives over recent years in the attempt to provide a entry way into the sport. These include Startrack, Sportshall Athletics, Youth Games and Shine Awards. As standalone initiatives, some have been good, some not so but all have been seriously undermined by the failure to provide clearly signposted 'exit routes' for progression along the continuum.

For example, in many areas Startrack schemes are run by local authorities without the involvement of the most obvious exit route, the local club. Indeed, in many areas local clubs are not even aware when and where schemes are scheduled to take place! Here we are at the very beginning of the development pathway for tomorrow's performer and the continuum is already broken. A well thought out strategy will have in place strong, sustainable pathways. This means proper links between not only club, school and community but also athlete, club and coach.

→ PARTICIPATION TO PERFORMANCE

It is difficult to find any examples of successful initiatives servicing this link in the continuum from the last decade. Strong clubs providing high quality, relevant competition opportunities supported by well trained, competent coaches and other volunteers are essential to provide for those progressing from first contact with the sport. They support the athlete who desires to explore his/her potential and provide a pathway to develop for those with that potential.

Under UKA volunteers are leaving the sport. Under UKA coaching and coach education has been badly neglected. Under UKA club competition has been undermined. Any strategy for the development of athletics must address this missing link in the continuum and restore a strong club structure that supports quality athlete development in all geographical locations.

→ PERFORMANCE TO EXCELLENCE

One of the main reasons Excellence has suffered is the neglect of Participation to Performance. Senior English athletes do not even have their own national championships anymore! The leap from the best competition available in the UK to the next level is too big a step with the result that performers arrive at the Olympics lacking in experience of high level competition.

Short term fixes such as funding a select group and relocating them to 'high performance' venues and coaches simply hide the issues. Far more sensible to invest some of the available money in stronger pathways, in rewarding a stepping stone series of performance targets and in centralised support for athlete, coach and club to continue the good work, sharing the knowledge and taking that knowledge back to the club to ensure the next generation of performer continues to benefit.

Pulling together the strategy and the managing its implementation should be the responsibility of one person a Head of Athletics, a person fully accountable for its success or failure measured by clearly defined and agreed measures.

DELIVERING THE STRATEGY

It is underneath this Head of Athletics is where Heads of both Performance and Participation sit, responsible for their own briefs but with a strong understanding of the other's work area and how they are responsible to each other's success.

Underneath these individuals sits a team of National Event Coaches. Their job is to support funded athletes, their coaches and their clubs to ensure they are serviced appropriately at one end of the continuum and to ensure the ongoing development of their event below that level.

TWO ESSENTIAL COMPONENTS OF THE STRATEGY

There are a number of elements which merit special attention in creating, maintaining and delivering the continuum. The following are the main two:

—> TRANSPARENCY

It is a sad fact but also very true that the relationship UK Athletics has with the sport it is supposed to govern is abysmal. Put simply, a large number within the sport simply no longer trust their NGB. This lack of trust has been allowed to grow to the point where UKA could provide the answers to all the problems facing the sport and few would believe them while even fewer would be prepared to engage with them.

This is not a healthy state of affairs which has grown out of a serious lack of transparency by UKA. Without a shared sense of ownership, the grass roots will not 'go with' the NGB. If you look at cycling and rowing you see two sports trusted, supported and believed in by those they represent. The same cannot be said for athletics. Consultation needs to be open, decisions need to be explained. The current situation of inexplicable decisions being imposed on a sport cannot continue.

—> COACHING, EDUCATION AND TRAINING

"Education is our passport to the future, for tomorrow belongs to those who prepare for it today."

Malcolm X wasn't referring to athletics in the UK in the early 21st century but he could have been.

Coach education under UK Athletics has become a joke that even they accepted five years wasn't good enough. How much has changed in the last five years? Nothing, they continue to deliver the same sub standard material while charging coaches for the 'privilege'.

Education and training are the cornerstones of a successful structure. It is not good enough simply to have a hand full of quality coaches working with a hand full of top athletes (UKA don't even have that), it should be the aspiration of those charged with the care of the sport to ensure top quality coaches and coaching at every stage of the development continuum.

High quality training opportunities for all volunteers should exist alongside 'vocational' workshops and opportunities.

Even UK Athletics. staunchest supporters accept they have completely and utterly failed in this area.

A FULLY INTEGRATED STRATEGY

Other areas which must be covered in any strategy in a way that fully integrates, both horizontally and vertically, across the full continuum and across every other area listed are:

- Partnership development and working
- Recruitment and retention
- Clubs and club development
- Events and competition
- Schools athletics
- Club-School-Community links
- Volunteer investment
- Facilities
- Marketing and communication
- Funding and sponsorship
- Talent ID
- Athlete Support Services
- Employment
- Equity
- Plus many more

It is not enough to look at any of these areas in isolation. They all feed on and from each other. The strategy should recognise this.

THE WAY AHEAD

Whether Government and their funding partners force change on UKA, UKA accept change themselves or, as a last resort, the sport forms its own new NGB and ignores UKA, it is vital that there is a shared strategy which leads the development of the sport.

Not everyone will agree with every step of the process, that is part and parcel of life. However by becoming transparent/maintaining transparency it will be easier to carry the sport forward together. By planning properly, in an integrated way, it will be to a shared vision of a successful future.

Athletics in 2008 is at the biggest cross roads in its history. The wrong decisions now could turn it into a minority sport within a decade.

By leading on the dismantling on accountability and democracy in the sport the Government put itself in the position of huge responsibility to the sport and everyone involved in it. They must not shirk that responsibility, they must force change on the sport now and they must insist on proper strategic planning for the future.

©Jim Cowan
26th August 2008

Mr Dennis Daly

Legal Point:

- i) The growth in public funding for no benefit gives cause to a compelling public interest in disclosure.
- ii) To help establish that an action for Breach of Confidentiality against UK Sport by UK Athletics could not succeed, and would not be mounted because the relationship between the two organisations is a sham.

Athletics

Biography:

Athlete, Athletics Coach and Club Administrator

I have been the Hon Secretary of Windsor Slough Eton & Hounslow Athletic Club since 1972, and thus have witnessed the various changes that have occurred in the sport of athletics over the past 50 years. I was active as athlete until just 7 years ago, and am a former South of England Champion in the Hammer event.

I am also engaged as a volunteer coach for the throwing events and have coached 3 National Champions at Discus with my latest protégé being ranked No2 in 2010.

Windsor Slough Eton & Hounslow Athletics Club

The club can trace its roots back to 1883, thus being one of the oldest athletic clubs in the UK. A series of amalgamations over the ensuing years has seen the club emerge in its current form, with headquarters at the Thames Valley Athletic Centre in Eton, one of the foremost facilities in the South of England, opened in 2000, and brought about by the success the club has generated.

The club currently has some 632 members making it one of the largest Track & Field clubs in the UK. The club has enjoyed considerable success over the last 20 years and is now ranked amongst the top clubs in the country. The club has achieved National success throughout all the various age groups. The Senior Mens and Senior Ladies teams compete in the upper divisions of the respective National Leagues, the Under 20 Male/Female team has been National finalists (top 8 clubs) over the last 6 years and the Young Athletes Team (M & F Under 17,15,13) were National Champions in 2008 and were runners up in 2010.

The club have been awarded the recent accolades by UK Athletics:

2008 - National Young Athletes Club of the Year
2009 - Overall National Club of the Year (all age groups)

The club have had in their membership the following international athletes of note:

Keith Connor - Olympic Medallist Triple Jump
Jeff Gutteridge - Commonwealth Games medallist - Pole Vault
Stan Eldon - UK record holder 3 miles/6 miles
Mark Richardson - 400m
James McIlroy - 800m
Jack Lane - 10,000m
Bev Kinch - 100m/Long Jump
Shirley Thomas - 100m/200m
Janine MacGregor - 400m
Wendy Sly - 3000m/1500m
Lorna Boothe - Hurdles
Tessa Sanderson & Kelly Morgan - Javelin

Association of British Athletic Clubs (ABAC)

I was instrumental in the formation of the ABAC some 5 years ago when alarm bells began to ring at the direction the sport was being taken by UK Athletics. ABAC was established to act as a 'ginger group' to monitor the activities of UK Athletics and to encourage policy change where felt necessary. ABAC has amongst its member clubs, some of the major Track & Field clubs in the UK. Its offshoot the Association of Running Clubs (ARC) now has some 165 Road Running clubs in its membership. I took on the role of Deputy Chairman of ABAC in 2010.

Dennis Daly Witness Evidence

Dennis Daly identifies how UK Athletics have failed to pursue the interests of the athletics community, with the same tenacity with which they have pursued the agenda of UK Sport. This creates the impression that the only purpose of UK Athletics is to deliver a voluntary workforce into the arms of UK Sport and its paymasters in government.

THE STATE OF ATHLETICS IN THE UK

I feel that my experience at grass roots level as a club officer, coach and former athlete make me well placed to comment on the current state of athletics in the UK.

UKA were created by UK Sport to take over the control of the sport in the UK from the Amateur Athletic Association on a manifesto as to how the sport would benefit from being professionally run. What was lost however was the democracy within the sport whereby the grass roots clubs at least had some say as to how the sport should be governed. We now have professionals in control of UK Athletics who have no notable long term experience or background within the sport and who are totally driven on achieving UK Sport generated short term bench marks with no real long term planning in place to ensure the future development of our sport.

What we have is an organisation totally focussed on achieving medals at international level and completely ignoring the grass roots clubs that have developed and provided such athletes. UKA continue to hide their shortcomings under a smokescreen of 'spin and hype' and unsubstantiated statistics, that cloud the real problems within the sport.

The true facts totally contradict the 'hype' being propagated by UKA.

The recent 'consultation' undertaken by the Governing Bodies concluded that all was well in the sport and that there were an increasing number of participants and coaches. The increase in the number of participants was deliberately manipulated by including the number of 'participants' in the mass road races such as the Great North Run. For most of these participants this was a 'one off' experience under the premise of 'been there - done that' with no intention of further participation in the sport or the taking out membership of an athletic club.

So perturbed were ABAC with the conclusions of this 'consultation' such that they carried out their own consultation exercise, circulating 320 plus Track & Field clubs throughout the UK. What emerged were results that totally contradicted the UKA survey. Only one Track & Field club had been requested to participate in the UKA Consultation thus immediately belying the credibility of their findings. The response to the ABAC survey indicated a general trend was a decreasing number of athletes, officials and coaches and a general disenchantment with the activities of UKA.

Increasing Bureaucracy

The inception of UKA has seen a significant increase in the level of bureaucracy now being imposed upon the volunteers that actually run the sport. Some of this bureaucracy is Government or UK Sport driven but rather than fight the case for athletics, UKA have simply adopted a conciliatory approach and driven through the UK Sport/government agenda. The resulting increasing bureaucracy has seen a serious decline in the number of volunteers engaged in running the sport at grass roots.

Athletics is a unique sport covering a dozen different disciplines through running, throwing and jumping, each needing specialist coaching knowledge. Unlike football, rugby, cricket etc where three or four officials are needed to run a match, an athletics competition needs at least 30 officials to deliver a properly organised competition (major events will need double this number). Thus any decrease in the number of volunteers within the sport will have a more serious impact on athletics than other sports.

The failure of UK Athletics to recognise the serious impact of this increasing bureaucracy is a betrayal of the best interests of the sport and confirms that that the main focus of their strategy is to implement the dictates of UK Sport/Sport England.

Rather than attempting to moderate the situation they have also resorted to unnecessary and increasing impositions on the volunteers resulting in existing volunteers deserting in exasperation and new volunteers being deterred from entering the sport.

CRB Checks

CRB checks have now become mandatory for volunteers working with children. Whilst understanding the logic behind this draconian legislation, during 40 years at WSEH AC we have never encountered an incident of 'child abuse' - thus perhaps putting the issue in its true perspective. The current CRB requirements are too intrusive and onerous and are proving a major deterrent to new volunteers.

Against the best interests of the sport UKA have unnecessarily extended the need for CRB checks to all 'match officials' even though they have no direct contact with young athletes and without any real regard to the effect of this requirement - loss of existing officials and a major deterrent for new officials.

The effect at club level is also significant. Time was when parents could be relied upon to give lifts to matches to 'disadvantaged youngsters'. CRB concerns have put paid to this practice and the club now has to hire coaches to even the most local of matches (min cost usually £300). Thus the youngsters from the less well of families now cannot afford the coach fare and therefore are lost to the sport and are left to roam the streets.

WSEH are also seeing the effect of CRB legislation in other aspects of club activities. For the last 37 years the club has enjoyed a reciprocal exchange with a German club - possibly the longest running exchange of its type in Europe and which is now unfortunately in jeopardy. Paranoid UK parents are now demanding to know whether the German families with whom their children will be staying are CRB checked. Such onerous legislation does not exist in Germany, hence their surprise at the question!

The local Red Cross will no longer provide First Aid attendance at competitions involving Under 18's and thus WSEH now have had to resort to expensive Para Medics to provide the necessary cover with such increasing cost impact that we now limiting the number of home matches we stage.

Insurance/Compensation Culture

The Governments ludicrous decision to allow 'ambulance chasing' solicitors to advertise has also had an adverse impact on our sport.

WSEH have been subjected to two insurance claims in the past 10 years arising from minor accidents. The inquisition by the insurance company resulted in two coaches leaving the sport rather than expose themselves to further risk.

UK Athletics have been less than transparent as to what cover is provided under their policy. Their initial Coaches Insurance Document included in the small print a significant 'excess' sum to be paid by the volunteer coach in the event of a claim. After representations by ABAC, this condition was subsequently excluded. UK Athletics have recently changed their insurance company and there seemed to be a reluctance by UK Athletics to publish the cover provided under the new policy. Once again representation proved necessary by ABAC before the policy cover was posted on the UKA website. To date however there has been no mail shot to the clubs. This lack of transparency is such that a number of clubs, including WSEH have needed to take out additional cover with alternative insurers

Clubmark

The energy devoted by UK Athletics in imposing the wishes of UK Sport/Sport England contrasts starkly with the lack of enthusiasm shown in representing the best interests of the clubs.

Clubs are now being pressured into obtaining Clubmark with the threat that funding will be denied unless clubs comply. The additional work load imposed on the diminishing and overburdened band of officials is both onerous and unnecessary.

I was a director of a large building contracting company in the 90's when Govt agencies imposed a requirement that unless companies became Quality Assured they would be excluded from Govt tender lists. My company spent numerous hours and some £250K getting the QA mark, only to see the need disappear as the recession in the 90's bit. QA is now a 'dead duck' in the industry - hence my cynicism re Clubmark.

WSEH is measured by the success it achieves in competition not the fact that we have achieved a paperwork qualification. I have yet to get one athlete/parent asking whether we have 'Clubmark' before taking out membership. It is simply another case of bureaucracy gone mad!

Schools Sports Partnership

There is much publicity in the press at present regarding the future demise of School Sports Partnerships. Our experience is that it is not money well spent. In our large catchment area just two schools have forged school/club links, one of these a private school, and involving just a dozen or so athletes.

WSEH's own efforts in the encouragement of school participation in athletics, has met with increasing disappointment. WSEH have for 30 years funded and helped to promote the Slough Primary Schools Track & Field championships. Time was when some 25 schools would support this event. Last summer just 12 attended. Enquiries to the absent schools indicated that these schools were no longer prepared to engage in 'out of school' activities because of the insurance risks. The Schools Cross Country event that WSEH also used to organise and fund has also been abandoned through lack of support.

An effective schools/club link is absolutely essential for the future of our sport. UK Athletics have failed in their duty to monitor this most fundamental issue. A simple questionnaire to clubs would have delivered the necessary evidence to generate a change of policy at UK Sport/government level.

What is needed is the funding to be directed to the clubs to allow clubs to fund/take coaches into the schools to overcome the schools insurance worries.

15 years ago WSEH obtained sponsorship from Mars Ltd that enabled the club to do just that over a 3 year period. The venture saw an immediate increase in club membership plus a bond being established between the teachers and the club coaches that paid dividends for several years afterwards.

Despite having a series of Sponsorship Officers since, further sponsorship has not materialised and thus we no longer enjoy these close schools link. Notwithstanding this, WSEH are making further attempts at such a link this Spring by organising a schools road relay event around the traffic free paths of Eton Playing Fields adjacent to our headquarters.

Coaching

Since the inception of UKA there have been a number of coaching initiatives causing confusion and exasperation, with no noticeable increase in the number of active coaches. In fact the opposite is true with a number of experienced coaches leaving the sport in disillusionment.

The number of coaches claimed by UKA as being active within our sport is highly questionable.

Three years ago WSEH were sent a list of coaches purported by UKA to be attached/active within our club. Of the list of 67 coaches 7 were not known at WSEH, 9 were no longer coaching and 26 (mainly youngsters) had attended coaching courses for CV purposes but did not actually coach. Of the list of 67, only 20 were actively engaged in coaching. These statistics, if extended nationally, indicate a far less healthy state of coaching in the UK, and suggest that UK Athletics are manipulating the statistics to paint a glowing picture of coaching in the UK.

The latest coaching initiative floated by UKA also seems doomed to fail due to the complete lack of understanding of prospective coaches aspirations. I recently was telephoned by a highly respected National Coach, not amongst my regular contacts, but who was in total despair at UKA's lack of understanding of coaching needs.

Future coaches come from athletes nearing retirement or interested parents hoping to improve the performance of their children. As such they have a specific event in mind. The new coaching structure costs some £325 for a 4 day course over 2 weekends and covers the whole spectrum of events. Thus much of the course is of little interest to anyone already committed to a single event. The extremely high cost and time factor is also a major deterrent. Both could be reduced if the courses were sensibly single event focussed.

Recent feedback regarding a the new UKA coaching course in the London area is alarming. A London Network funded 16 coaches to attend a recent UKA 4 day course. Of these only 3 passed at the end of the course, with often spurious/over zealous reasons to justify the failures. The effect on those that did not pass will have been devastating and no doubt the sport will lose out accordingly. An urgent inquest and rethink is necessary by UKA/UK Sport.

Officials

UK Athletics have recently chosen to change the structure for Technical Officials for reasons that are not immediately apparent as being beneficial to the sport. Level 3 officials have now been re-graded as Level 2 regional or Level 2 area. Some officials see this as a downgrading and are thus abandoning the sport. When the sport is desperate for officials it is appalling that UK Athletics did not contemplate the psychological consequences of their actions. A case of change for the sake of change without considering the effects!!

Funding at Grass Roots/ Networks

The clubs were totally misled by the Foster Report that heralded a new dawn with the modernisation of our sport by the imposition of UK Athletics. Improved funding for grass roots was just one of the promises.

WSEH AC is one of the largest and most successful clubs in the UK and we have yet to see any of the promised funding.

UKA's condescending attitude to grass roots is clearly demonstrated by the fact that the notification that WSEH were acknowledged by UKA as overall UK Top Club of the Year in 2009 was simply received via letter. No award ceremony, no trophy (we have since commissioned our own) and just a paltry sum of £500 from their multi million pound budget!!

Clubs are also now expected to pay a membership levy of £5 per athlete (a significant sum for WSEH) and necessitating subscriptions rising to meet the cost. We have yet to see any benefit from this additional financial burden and increased administration.

England Athletics was originally established with 9 regional bases, each with an England Athletics Administration Officer. Within 4 years the regions were abandoned and the administration was centralised. In its place England Athletics dreamed up a wondrous alternative termed Networks whereby local clubs should organise themselves into Networks with guaranteed funding of £30,000 per annum for 3 years. For the Berks network, in which WSEH participates there are 8 clubs large and small, and there is already infighting as to how the money should be allocated. Not that there will be much funding left for individual club funding as EA have insisted that the Network employs a Young Athlete Co-ordinator and a Coaching Co-ordinator thus exposing the clubs to all the risks of being an employer and have introduced a number of caveats as to how the funding should be distributed. There is thus little tangible benefit arising from the EA Networks scheme and the whole issue seems a ploy by EA to reduce their own costs whilst passing the administration onto the already overburdened volunteer officials whilst still exercising total control for UK Sport with England Athletics acting as the ringmaster.

Permits

UK Athletics have recently been exercising their muscle by stating that all Track & Field Competitions will now require to be issued with 'permits' by UKA or the UKA insurance will be invalidated. This is totally unnecessary as stadiums already must have their facilities checked and certified by UKA to allow competitions to proceed under UKA Rules. The requirement is simply a means for UKA to totally control the various league structures that are still democratic and run by the clubs. What will happen has already been seen in Road Running where the Association of Running Clubs (now with 165 member clubs) was formed with own insurance cover to negate the UKA 'permitting' requirements. The sport has thus been split rather than unified by UKA's heavy handed approach. Will they never learn!!

By the establishment of their Power of 10 Ranking Lists, UK Athletics have taken control of this aspect of the sport from the National Union of Track Statisticians - a body run by a band of dedicated volunteers to good effect for the last 40 years. They have also engaged the services of Athletics Weekly, the one publication covering Track & Field athletics in the UK, to assist in the running of the operation. Not surprisingly Athletics Weekly are unwilling to 'rock the boat' on any issues contrary to UK Athletics interests. UK Athletics thus now have total control of this aspect of our sport. This is illustrated by their recent announcement that 'marks' achieved by athletes in competitions without UK permits will be discounted from being registered in the Power of 10 Ranking Lists. The Power of 10 thus will cease to be a true record of the state of athletics in the UK. This opportunity for further manipulation of statistics is of serious concern. It will cause athletes to revert to the TOPS ranking website, still run by volunteers, to see the true rankings.

A case of money being spent by UK Athletics for total power over the sport, including buying the silence of the sole media publication.

Publicity

Of major concern is the misrepresentation propounded by UK Sport/UK Athletics that all is well in the sport.

One aspect of UKA's role is to publicise our sport. On that score they have failed miserably. Athletics on TV is rarely now shown and it is difficult to find coverage of any significance in the national press.

UKA should be maximising publicity with the upcoming London Olympics. They made few friends amongst the sporting press when they hijacked this year's Athletic Sports Writers Awards Dinner by staging a UKA event. How not to win friends and influence people!

The London Olympics should be a showcase for British athletics. UK Athletics own medal count is shrinking with each ongoing prediction - itself an indication of the diminishing stature of the sport under the influence of UK Athletics.

Participation Levels

The participation levels in our sport have been deliberately obscured by UKA including 'fun runners' in mass participation road races within their statistics. The majority of these runners do not go on to join established athletic clubs.

Some 12 years ago WSE AC had a membership of some 300 athletes. This was boosted to 500 by the amalgamation with the Borough of Hounslow AC some 10 years ago. Several satellite coaching groups have been absorbed in the ensuing years via coaches wishing to be part of the WSEH success story. We now have satellite coaching groups operating at High Wycombe, Woking and Isleworth which has seen our membership boosted to the current 630 mark. The increase in membership has thus not been achieved via the activities of UK Athletics but simply by amalgamation or by attracting coaching groups from other clubs. The true membership of WSEH has remained static over the past 15 years, though the number of active senior athletes has been in decline. The main reason is that virtually every young athlete these days targets a university place. Thus the link between the club/coach and athlete is broken and if there is no athletics structure at the university, the development work done by the clubs is lost and the athlete leaves the sport. What is needed are adequate and experienced coaches, operating within the university framework, much as happens in the USA, to ensure that the work done by the clubs is maintained and perhaps even strengthened. UK Athletics seem to have turned a blind eye to this obvious weak link in the chain. WSEH have at least recognised the problem and now pay expenses for the club's university based athletes to travel to matches.

Summary

This statement illustrates that there are major flaws in the organisation of our sport that are being concealed by the 'hype' and 'spin' being published by UK Athletics - a body that is totally focussed on 'medal counts' to the detriment of the sport at grass roots level. This misrepresentation of the facts by UK Sport/UK Athletics provides for 'high expectation' rather than the 'low desperation' that actually pervades the sport. There is the urgent need for democracy, accountability and transparency to be restored if the terminal decline of our sport is to be halted. UK Athletics are failing miserably on all counts and immediate action is now needed if our sport is to be restored to its former glory.

Dennis Daly - Hon Sec Windsor Slough Eton & Hounslow AC

Mr William Laws

Legal Points:

- i) To help establish that an action for Breach of Confidentiality against UK Sport by UK Athletics could not succeed, and would not be mounted because the relationship between the two organisations is a sham.
- ii) The growth in public funding for no benefit gives cause to a compelling public interest in disclosure.

Athletics

Biography:

Athlete

Joined Belgrave in 1953 having been inspired by Bannister, Chattaway and Brasher training at Battersea track. Belgrave employed their coach Franz Stampfl to enthuse youngsters of which I was one.

I competed for Belgrave in road relay teams over many year and was a member of the 3 man winning Belgrave team in the SEAA Vets 10 mile championships of 1978.

Belgrave Harriers

Belgrave Harriers formed in 1887 will celebrate its 125th anniversary in 2012.

Belgrave Harriers is arguably the most successful Athletics Club in the UK of all time.

During my 30 years as team manager from 1980 to 2010, Belgrave Harriers won the British Athletics League Premier Division 11 times, and represented Great Britain in the European Champion Clubs Cup 9 times during the same period.

I have been a committee member since 1975 to the present.

I became a Life member of Belgrave Harriers in 1989/1990 when I was elected President of of the club.

Athletics Administration

I was elected Deputy Chairman of the Association of British Athletics Clubs (ABAC) from 2004 and elected Chairman in 2010.

I was Elected Chairman of the South London Athletics Network (SLAN) in 2010.

EXTERNAL ABAC REPORTS

The following 10 pages of evidence from Mr William Laws, have been imported into this document, so lack the identification labels at the head, and the foot of each page, which would give consistency to the presentation.

- 1) **The growth in UKA and Athletics Governance (5 pages)**
This report documents the growth in funding to UK Athletics coming from UK Sport and Sport England, despite failure to meet any objective KPI targets.
- 2) **Participation 11-15 years old (2 pages)**
This report highlights a technique of the Sports Councils to manipulate participation numbers by using a paper survey method, rather than counting the individuals who have been recorded in the results sheets of school and club competitions over a year.

The growth in UKA and Athletics Governance.

1. Background. As the countdown to the London Olympics approaches its final year there is much uncertainty concerning the state of athletics in the UK. The sport has seen many changes imposed on it since the forced collapse of the British Athletics Federation (BAF) in 1997 and the establishment of the current Governing Body - UK Athletics Ltd- in 1998.

This report looks at the extent and costs of running the sport in the UK over the last decade. With this information and the witness evidence provided by others, may be used to assess whether the sport's achievements over the same period have been commensurate with the resources employed.

This evidence lists key facts only and draws no conclusions. It is intended that this document will form part of a wider ABAC report, and will produce an overall commentary with the aim of evoking public debate on the future of athletics in the UK

2. Development of the Governance Structure. Prior to 1998 governance of the sport of athletics in the UK was vested with the BAF while a parallel organisation - the Amateur Athletics Association (AAA)- represented clubs and athletes by updating rules and organising the sport's competition structures. Both organisations were "owned" by the clubs who were members able to control the sport democratically by participating at the Annual General Meetings of both bodies. At this stage there were approx a total of 10 paid staff employed by these organisations which together had an annual income of less than £2million.

In 1997 BAF faced bankruptcy due to a major court case. Following the 1997 general election the new Government supported the release of taxpayers monies to the sport on the basis that BAF would be wound up and a new governing body – UK Athletics Ltd – would be established. This Company was incorporated in 1998 and received IAAF recognition in 1999. UKA Ltd was set up as a private company limited by guarantee without share capital. Clubs were excluded from joining UKA Ltd. However the AAA's continued to function as before, representing the interests of clubs.

In 2004 Sir Andrew Foster published a report which contained proposals to totally re-organise the sport. His plans included disbanding the AAA's and its three Territorial Associations and replacing them with National bodies, each with subsidiary regions. In 2005 (at the request of UK Sport) UKA Ltd., produced a "One Stop Plan" for athletics which resulted in devolving some governance from UKA Ltd to the home countries.

3. The Governance structure at 2011

UKA Ltd. Company number 3686940

From 1998 to 2006, UKA Ltd., directly governed athletics for the whole of the UK with responsibilities ranging from grass roots club athletics through to elite athlete performance. Following an Independent Poll financed by UKA Ltd., in 2005 and undertaken by Electoral Reform Services Ltd., UKA Ltd., devolved much of its governance functions to four home country organisations: England Athletics Ltd., Scottish Athletics Ltd., Welsh Athletics Ltd., and Athletics Northern Ireland Ltd.

All of these are private companies limited by guarantee without share capital. They have no membership, are controlled by boards of directors and to varying degrees rely heavily on Grant aid from UK Sport, Sport England, Sport Scotland plus lottery grants. The appointment of senior executive directors is in the gift of UK Sport.

Scottish Athletics Ltd. Company number 217377

Established in March 2001, SA Ltd., has filed annual accounts from 2002. Initially accounts were brief but following the 2006 devolvement of governance from UKA Ltd., accounts have been more much more detailed. From 2007 to 2009 SA Ltd., received extra funding from UKA Ltd., as part of the distribution of legacy funds form UK Sport. Other than during this period, director costs and staff costs have been contained at near constant levels. In 2010 it reported the number of affiliated clubs and Associations at 158 down from a high of 173 in 2006.

England Athletics Ltd. Company number 5583713

Incorporated in 2005 EA Ltd., commenced operations on April 1st 2006. It initially set up a delivery structure with 9 Regions but these proved unwieldy and expensive to operate and were scrapped in 2008. EA Ltd., relies heavily on grant aid much of which is passed to it via UKA Ltd., although it has some independent grant aid.

Athletics Northern Ireland Ltd. Company number NI 059740

ANI Ltd., was incorporated in 2008 before which time the sport in Northern Ireland was controlled by the Northern Ireland Federation which formed in 1989. It only files an abbreviated balance sheet at Companies House and after its first year of operation recorded net assets of £30,871. No information is available on income and expenditure. The website lists 60 affiliated clubs.

Welsh Athletics Ltd. Company number 06179841

Incorporated in March 2008 WA Ltd., has only filed an Annual return at Companies House and accounts are not publically available The WA Ltd., website lists 83 affiliated welsh clubs.

10 year Trend Statistics from published accounts – Income, grant aid, staff costs and numbers

In the main body of this document, we record the key data for the sport's governing bodies. It is noted that the details in the various accounts are very variable with those of UKA Ltd., becoming more opaque in recent years. Notes annotate each of the following tables to explain where the audit trail has necessitated interpretation.

Table 1 gives income data for UKA Ltd., over the last 10 years together with equivalent data for EA Ltd., over the 4 years since its inception.

Table 1. UKA Ltd., Annual Total Income (including Grant Aid) since 2000. EA Ltd., since 2006.

Income and staff numbers	UK A Ltd		
	Financial Year	Total Income £	Grant Aid £
2000 - 2001	13,608,306	715,238	26
2001 - 2002	10,802,141	537,832	39
2002 - 2003	16,382,423	4,738,519	91 (60)
2003 - 2004	17,170,553	5,401,184	93 (108)
2004 - 2005	18,563,590	5,870,019	94 (116)
2005 - 2006	18,122,086	6,159,351	94
2006 - 2007	21,975,676	7,492,478	119 (205)
	<i>2,932,175</i>		
2007 - 2008	23,490,060	7,864,365	119 (141)
	<i>4,266,779</i>		
2008 - 2009	24,833,297	9,086,037	113 (37)
	<i>6,336,444</i>		
2009 - 2010	24,811,894	9,086,037*	102
	<i>7,289,083</i>		
Totals			
UKA Ltd(10 yrs)	£ 189,780,026	£ 56,951,061	
EA Ltd (4 yrs)	£ <u>4,164,896**</u>		
Totals since 2000	£ 193,944,922		

England Athletics Ltd. figures shown in red

Note. 1. The 2009-2010 Grant Aid figures are not detailed separately in the latest UKA Accounts. (In previous years they have been.) * This figure has been assumed to be the same as the previous year

2. England Athletics Accounts do not detail Grant Aid. Their 2008 – 2009 Summary of Accounts state that 80% of income is from Grant Aid, Most of this appears to be from UKA and therefore the Grant income to UKA and EA should not be aggregated.

3. **The aggregate income for England Athletics from new sources has been calculated on the basis that only 20% is generated from non grant sources.

Table 2 details staff costs and numbers for UKA Ltd and EA Ltd since 2000.

Table 2. Annual salary and staff costs for UKA Ltd and England Athletics Ltd

Staff costs. UKA Ltd and	England Athletics Ltd		
Financial Year	CEO Total Remuneration £	Total Staff costs£ (Full time numbers)	Average Salary £ Incl. Directors
2000 - 2001		754,147 (26)	29,005
2001 - 2002	88,982	971,690 (39)	24,915
2002 - 2003	92,700	2,944,204 (91)	32,353
2003 - 2004	95,481	3,360,330 (93)	36,133
2004 - 2005	98,345	3,636,948 (94)	38,691
2005 - 2006	109,753	4,027,164 (94)	42,842
2006 - 2007	116,786	5,350,862 (119)	44,965
		<i>1,277,511 (37)</i>	<i>34,527</i>
2007 - 2008	128,333	5,542,602 (119)	46,576
		<i>1,681,754 (43)</i>	<i>39,110</i>
2008 - 2009	169,301	5,190,161 (113)	45,930
		<i>2,084,258 (53)</i>	<i>39,326</i>
2009 - 2010	192,981	5,866,385 (102)	57,513
		<i>2,100,675 (47)</i>	<i>44,695</i>
Totals			
UKA Ltd (10 yrs)		32,293,631	
E A Ltd (4 yrs)		7,144,198	
Total Staff Costs since 2000		<u>39,437,829</u>	

England Athletics figures shown in Red.

Note. 1. England Athletics accounts do not list the remuneration of the top paid Director.

2. David Moorcroft was CEO for UKA Ltd., from 1998 to Jan 2007. Neils de Vos was appointed CEO in May 2007 and remains in post.

3. CEO remuneration combines salary and contributions to a money purchase pension scheme.

Table 3 details income, grant aid and staff costs for Scottish Athletics since start up in 2001

Table 3. Annual Scottish Athletics costs

Income and staff costs Scottish Athletics Ltd			
Financial Year	Total Income £	Grant Aid £	Staff Costs £
2000 - 2001			
2001 - 2002	759,017	377,156	214,216
2002 - 2003	887,629	472,701	265,224
2003 - 2004	998,081	564,164	268,851
2004 - 2005	1,052,003	577,158	300,256
2005 - 2006	1,180,860	675,363	281,821
2006 - 2007	1,585,685	722,300	259,989
2007 - 2008	2,029,146	773,090	305,028
2008 - 2009	2,018,458	775,871	290,665
2009 - 2010	<u>1,841,508</u>	<u>823,624</u>	<u>348,438</u>
Nine Year Totals	£ 10,293,304	£5,761,427	£2,534,488

Note 1. SA Ltd accounts only record total admin costs up to 2006. From 2006 to 2010 the accounts detail staff costs as well which average 60% of total admin costs. The staff costs up to 2006 are calculated as 60% of admin costs.

2. Staff numbers have been calculated to be 10 full time equivalents.

3. UKA grant aid is not included in the above grant aid figures to avoid double counting when the home countries data are combined. **UKA legacy grants** were as follows.

2007 –£ 126,713, 2008 – £278,744, 2009 – £176,962, 2010 – 0. **Total £582,419**

4. Total cash flows over the last 10 years

The amount of resources available to athletics' governing bodies over the last 10 years may be calculated from the foregoing tables. The totals are :

1. Total income from 2000 to 2010 was £195,786,430

2. Total of prime grants received was £ 62,712,488

3. Total spent on all staff during this period was £ 41,972,317

5. Growth in governance.

The following data looks at 3 financial years (FY) in the last decade.

The first year covers FY 2000-2001 when UKA Ltd alone governed the whole sport in the UK.

The second looks at FY 2005-2006, the period when Scottish Athletics Ltd had assumed control of the sport in Scotland while UKA Ltd retained control of the sport in England Wales and Northern Ireland.

The third period covers FY 2009-2010 four years after UKA Ltd had devolved governance to England Athletics Ltd for the sport in England. No data is in the public domain for Wales and Northern Ireland governing bodies and this additional data is therefore not included.

	<u>FY 2000-2001</u>	<u>FY 2005-2006</u>	<u>FY 2009-2010</u>
Annual Income	£ 13,608,306	£ 19,302,946	£ 28,111,218
Prime Grant Income	£ 715,238	£ 6,834,714	£ 9,909,661
Annual staff costs	£ 754,147	£ 4,308,985	£ 8,315,498
No full time staff	26	104	159

6. Value for money

The growth in the size and cost of governing athletics in the UK is quantified here for the first time. The big question remains. Has the sport truly benefitted and had value for money?

Participation 11-15 years old

Background. Sport England regularly commission surveys aimed at determining participation levels in sport. Over recent years a number of "Active People Surveys" have been completed and data from these have been used in a series of detailed sport evidence packs. The latest Athletics information pack dated 26 June 2009 claims to provide information which can be used to develop UK Athletics proposals. Specifically, they claim that this information can be used to provide a rationale for focusing on particular areas and for developing and agreeing interventions in partnership with Sport England. The latest Athletics information pack also claims to provide information on two of Sport England's key Strategic Outcomes. "Grow" and "Sustain".

Some interesting figures are recorded, namely:

- 1.6million people participate in athletics.
- 609,000 are women and 992,000 are men.
- 159,000 young people **aged 11-15** participate in track and field regularly
- 383,000 young people **aged 11-15** participate in jogging/cc and road running regularly
- 233,000 participants are aged 16-19 years
- 194,000 participants are aged 20-24 years

The definition of "regularly" as used in the evidence packs is that an athlete competes at least once a month.

This Fact File provides statistics relating to competing 11-15 year olds athletes in 2010

Quick numbers check. In this section we look at the implications on the number of meetings which would be needed to accommodate the numbers published by Sport England.

We start with the fact that on average the number of athletes of 11-15 years of age competing at a National Young Athletes League (NYAL) meeting is 110. For 159,000 young athletes to compete once a month it would be necessary to hold around 1,500 meetings each month for this age group alone.

In the six summer months there are about 300 recorded track and field meetings per month in the UK, which cater for all age groups. Assuming 50% of these meetings are for 11-15 year olds then there are close to 150 young athlete meetings of all types held per month in the summer. **This is 1350 meetings per month short of what would be needed to accommodate the participation numbers claimed by Sport England.**

There are of course small numbers of inter schools meetings but the details and performances of these events are not recorded as in the main they are not organised to recognised procedures nor are most of the officials trained to recognised standards.

Participation statistics. In this section we record the numbers of young athletes registered with the sport's governing bodies and the numbers obtained from all competition results which are collected daily and collated by the country's leading statisticians.

England Athletics fully implemented its athlete registration scheme in 2008 which required that all competing athletes be registered with them. The total numbers registered in England within this age group in that year were:-

- Age 11 - 2954
- Age 12 - 4707
- Age 13 - 5239
- Age 14 - 5185
- Age 15 - 4498

Making a grand total of 22,583 young athletes registered with England Athletics in 2008-2009.

More recent reports for athletics in England claim the number of registered athletes has grown by about 3% in the last 2 years. The breakdown of the latest participation figures into age groups has not been published and so the change in numbers in the 11-15 age group over the last year is unknown. Although registered athletes in this age group are likely to compete in track and field all registered athletes do not in fact compete. Several clubs have reported that coaching sessions frequently entail looking after youngsters who do not compete and some clubs now demand that young athletes must agree to compete before being allowed to participate.

It will be noted from the breakdown that age 13 is the peak age for track & field registration, it declines from then on.

National Young Athletes League (NYAL) in England. Analysis has shown that between 12,500 and 13,000 athletes aged 11 to 15 competed in the NYAL in 2010. Athletes reaching the age of 16 in 2010 have not been counted. A detailed analysis of athletes competing in the more senior NJAL shows that junior athletes compete on average 2.2 times per season. It may be assumed that athletes in the 11-15 age group have a similar participation record. That is less than 3 NYAL competitions per year.

English Schools County Championships (ESCC). It is known that many competitors at the annual ESCC events do not belong to clubs. Schools County Championships can give an indication of the numbers of these non club competitors. An analysis has been made using results from half of the 2010 Schools County Championships. Using this data and factoring the rest of the Counties by size we have calculated that in 2010 the number of 11 to 15 year olds competing in all 43 county championships in England was just under 11,000.

It should be noted that many 'athletes' competing in these meetings have no recorded performances elsewhere. It is most unlikely that all of them fulfil the Sport England criteria of competing once a month.

From the same sample it has been calculated that there has been a drop off in participation at Schools County Championships from 2009 to 2010 of around 2% in this age group. However, this figure includes some counties who have increased the number of U13 events in 2010. Therefore taking this into account the drop off in the 11-15 age group is 3.5% over the last year.

English Schools Cup. The largest single competition in the 11-15 age group is the English Schools Cup. The number of competing athletes in this competition during the last 3 years were:-

2008	- 27,000
2009	- 26,300
2010	- 26,900

It relevant to note that 80% of the schools in the English Schools Cup only compete in the first round. Therefore the majority of the 11-15 year old participants will not meet the Sport England criteria of competing once a month

The total number of 11-15 year old athletes. The number of 11-15 year olds belonging to athletic clubs and registered with England Athletics in 2008-2009 was 22,583. Of these close to 13,000 (approx 56%) compete for clubs on average 2.2 times per year in the NYAL

Clearly there are some young athletes competing in school events who do not belong to clubs. Analysis of the Schools' County and English Championships has identified the total number of 11-15 year olds in these events. The cross checking of names to identify participation of club athletes registered with EA at these events is outside the scope of this study.

The maximum total number of 11-15 year old athletes (boys and girls together) participating in athletics can be obtained by adding the individual competition participants together. These figures are:- YAL **13,000** athletes, ES County Champs **11,000** athletes, ES Cup **27,000** athletes making a **total of 51,000**.

Concluding summary.

The June 2009 Sport England Athletics Information Pack claims that 158,000 athletes between the ages of 11 and 15 years regularly compete at least once per month. (Later figures quote 165,000).

In the year 2008-2009 there were 22,583 athletes in this age group who belonged to athletic clubs and were registered with England Athletics.

In 2010 13,000 athletes in this age group competed in the National Young Athletes League on average 2.2 times in the season.

In 2010 there were major schools competitions at which a number of non affiliated children competed. If all these people only competed in one competition including the NYAL the maximum number of 11-15 year olds competing would total 51,000.

Based on the above and using the most favourable assumptions we deduce that the population of 11-15 year old athletes is only 30.9 % of the figure claimed by Sport England.

Mr Rob Whittingham

Legal Points:

- i) To help establish that an action for Breach of Confidentiality against UK Sport by UK Athletics could not succeed, and would not be mounted because the relationship between the two organisations is a sham.
- ii) The growth in public funding for no benefit gives cause to a compelling public interest in disclosure.

Athletics Biography:

Athletics Statistician

Rob Whittingham has run his computer software company for 34 years and has expertise in databases and websites. His clients included FTSE 100 companies.

Rob has been the Co-Editor of the British Athletics Annual for 20 years since 1991. The British Athletics Annual has the same status in athletics as the 'Wisden' has in cricket. It is the definitive athletics reference book.

Rob's athletics expertise is well recognised by the media. He has worked for TV companies at both live and recorded events. He has assisted Mark Butler, the BBC athletics statistician during Olympic Games and World Championships, and is the principle editor of the definitive book on athletics at the Commonwealth Games.

Rob been involved with athletics statistics on a commercial basis since 1995. He worked with UKA when it was formed in 1998 until 2002 to provide a website and statistical data for the sport. For the first year this work was done on a voluntary basis. In 2005 Rob provided UKA with a comprehensive analysis of World and British athletic trends. This is still the only independent analysis that UKA has ever commissioned.

Rob created the "Power of 10" project and website in 2006:

<http://www.thepowerof10.info>

He provided all the targets, limits and technical information for the website. At the launch of Power of 10, UK Athletics expressed the view that Rob's involvement served "to give the project credibility". Rob ran the project and website from 2006 to 2008 and devised all the improvements during this time. The Power of 10 is referred to by UK Athletics as a key tool in their development strategy (Bundle 335-339 - McCain reference)

In 2005 the British Olympic Association asked Rob to produce a 'theoretical' medal tables for all sports. These tables are used by the BOA to track if Britain is on course for 4th place in the medal table in 2012 and are published on an open website.

Rob's comprehensive statistics on British Athletics are freely available on his rankings website:

<http://www.topsinathletics.com>

Rob Whittingham Witness Evidence

Rob Whittingham calls on his own experience, and that of his colleagues in the National Union of Track Statisticians (NUTS) in presenting a definitive picture of the current status in British Athletics, and puts the information into a historical context.

KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS ARE THE CONTROLLING MECHANISM

The Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) by which UKA is monitored by UK Sport appear to be set by UKA themselves.

UK Sport do not profess any detailed knowledge on track and field athletics and rely on UKA to provide accurate information on their performance against these KPIs.

Since neither accurate information on the KPIs, or the results claimed by UKA, are currently being made available it is impossible for any outside monitoring to take place.

Without this information UKA and UK Sport appear as a single entity.

The problems that this lack of transparency can cause is best illustrated by a KPI between Sport England and UKA/England Athletics.

The only **objective** performance KPI set by Sport England for the funding received by UKA/England Athletics is the raising of the number of athletes reaching certain target performance levels.

These targets are shown on the website:

www.thepowerof10.info

This website which has existed since 2006 is funded by Sport England with lottery funding. The fundamental premise of the targets is that they are not lowered since they are levels which have been achieved in the past. If standards rise in a specific event they are raised on a year by year basis.

After obtaining funding in December 2008, new targets were not published for 2009 in January as normal but were delayed until around June 2009. At this stage in the season it is possible to access how standards are progressing.

I examined the new targets and in January 2010 contacted Sport England with my concerns. Around 35% of the targets had been lowered thus making the KPI much easier to achieve.

Sport England approached UKA regarding this and were given false information, both for specific events and the overall effect of the changes.

I presented evidence to Sport England that the information was false and they went back to UKA and it was agreed that the 2008 targets that I set in December 2007 would be the fixed targets. Although this is better than lowered targets it is certainly not the robust KPI which was set for funding and represents only a small increase in performance over four years.

Without me being able to obtain detailed information under the freedom of information act it would not have been possible to see this attempt to manipulate the KPI by UKA

Again with little information being made public it is almost impossible to see if KPIs between UKA and UK Sport are being manipulated. However, an article by Niels de Vos, the Chief Executive Officer of UKA published on an open website (Included in the bundle pages 351 to 353) suggests such manipulation is taking place. It would appear that relay medals are being counted as 4 medals. I have checked with two leading statisticians who have both published many books on the history of athletics, neither have ever seen this measure being used in the history of the sport.

Unless the freedom of information act applies to UKA/UKSport it will be impossible to ascertain whether the very substantial amounts of lottery funding is being appropriately monitored.

ATHLETICS STATISTICS

British Athletes At The World Level International Championships

The following pages of evidence include two statistical reports. The first report is a comprehensive analysis of the performances of British Athletes at the World Level International Championships from 1993 to 2010.

The achievement of every athlete is recorded on a table showing the position in the final, or the round reached in the competition.

This report is restricted to the Olympic Games and the IAAF World Championships, which are the competitions used to measure progress at elite level in athletics.

Accordingly, the Commonwealth Games and the European Championships are excluded from these reports because they are not part of the criteria used by UK Sport (Key Performance Indicators - KPI's) to measure return on investment.

Report Showing 1st, 10th & 50th Ranked Performances from 1958 - 2010

My Co-Editor of the British Athletics Annual, Mr Peter Matthews has compiled a comprehensive analysis of the domestic standard of every event for male and female athletes from 1958 to 2010. By comparing the performances of the 1st, 10th and 50th ranked individuals from year to year, it is possible to establish the general decline in performance in Great Britain.

The 23 page report by Mr Peter Matthews headed "UK STATISTICS OVER THE YEARS 1958-2010" has been imported into this document, so lacks the identification labels at the head, and the foot of each page, which would give consistency to the presentation of the evidence.

CHAMPIONSHIP PERFORMANCES

Male Performances at the Olympic Games and the IAAF World Athletics Championships between 1993 and 2010.

Each cell indicates the performance of upto three British competitors.

Key

- 1** All numbers indicate the finishing position of the athlete in a track or field final.
- h** Athlete was knocked out in the heats of a track event.
- q** Athlete was knocked out in the quarter finals of a track event.
- s** Athlete was knocked out in the semi finals of a track event.
- f** Athlete reached the final but did not register a legal performance. (No jumps, no throws, or dropped the baton in the relay).
- Q** Athlete was knocked out at the qualifying pool stage of a field event.
- dq** Disqualified (False start rule, running out of lane etc.)
- dnf** Did not finish.
- Event was not contested.

Men	2009 World Champs	2008 Olympic Games	2007 World Champs	2005 World Champs	2004 Olympic Games	2003 World Champs	2001 World Champs	2000 Olympic Games	1999 World Champs	1997 World Champs	1996 Olympic Games	1995 World Champs	1993 World Champs
100 Metres	6 s q	s s q	6 s s q	s s s q	s s h	4 s dq 5 7 s	4 6 q	3 7 s s q q	f s q	6 s q	1 s		
200 Metres	s	5 s		s s	s s h	4 s q 5 8 q	2 5 q	7 s q s s q	s q h	7 s h 2			
400 Metres	7 s s	6 s	s h h	5 s h	s h h	s s h	s h h	6 8 h 4 6 8	2 5 q	5 7 q s q			
800 Metres		s	s	s	s	h		h h q h h	s s h	8 s			
1500 Metres	s s h	8 s	9	s h	6	s s	s s	9 s h s	11 s s	9 s h 6 s			
5,000 Metres	7 h	h	6		h	s	s	h h h h h	14 h h	9 s s			
10,000 Metres						9		8 s s	dnf	h			
Marathon		24	11 51	12 44	4 23 50	dnf	4 19 56	17 dnf	5 55 60 4	dnf	13 dnf		
3000m Steeplechase		h	h	h	h		s s	s	s s h s h h	15 s s			
110m Hurdles	4 s s q q		s	h	h h	s	6 h h	5 q h 1 h	2 s q	4 q q 2 s s	1 2 s		
400m Hurdles	7 h		h	s	s h	6 s	5 s	s s h h h h	h h	s h h h s			
High Jump		2 8 9	10 14 Q	Q		Q	Q	f Q	4 Q Q 3 Q	4 Q Q 3 Q Q			
Pole Vault	7=	Q	Q		Q	Q	Q	Q	Q	Q Q	Q		
Long Jump	5 8	10 Q	Q Q	Q	5	9 Q				Q	Q		
Triple Jump	1 10 Q	2 7 Q	6	Q	f Q	12	1 7 9	1 5 6 3 11 Q 2 Q	2 Q	1 Q	3 Q Q		
Shot Putt	11			12		Q	Q	Q	Q	Q Q	Q		
Discus Throw					Q		Q	Q Q	Q Q	8 Q	9 Q		
Hammer Throw						Q	Q		Q	Q	Q		
Javelin Throw	Q			Q	4 Q	9	12 Q Q	2 11 Q	8 Q Q 2 4 Q	2 12 Q 2 6	3 4 Q		
Decathlon		21			4	3	4	2	dnf	12	19		
20 Kilometre Walk											25	26 30 dnf	
50 Kilometre Walk							39			34	dnf	23	
4 x 100 Metres Relay	3	h	3	3	1	2	h	2	3	h	s	2	
4 x 400 Metres Relay	2	4	6	4	5	5	6	6	h	2	4	h	

CHAMPIONSHIP PERFORMANCES

Female Performances at the Olympic Games and the IAAF World Athletics Championships between 1993 and 2010.

Each cell indicates the performance of upto three British competitors.

Key

- 1** All numbers indicate the finishing position of the athlete in a track or field final.
- h** Athlete was knocked out in the heats of a track event.
- q** Athlete was knocked out in the quarter finals of a track event.
- s** Athlete was knocked out in the semi finals of a track event.
- f** Athlete reached the final but did not register a legal performance. (No jumps, no throws, or dropped the baton in the relay).
- Q** Athlete was knocked out at the qualifying pool stage of a field event.
- dq** Disqualified (False start rule, running out of lane etc.)
- dnf** Did not finish.
- Event was not contested.

Women	2009	2008	2007	2005	2004	2003	2001	2000	1999	1997	1996	1995	1993
	World Champs	Olympic Games	World Champs	World Champs	Olympic Games	World Champs	World Champs	Olympic Games	World Champs	World Champs	Olympic Games	World Champs	World Champs
100 Metres		6 q h s q q q			s	s	q q h	h h h	q h	h h	q q q	q h h	q q
200 Metres	7	s	q h		7 q	q q		q q	q q	q q	q q	s	q q
400 Metres	5 s	1 s s 1 2 s s s s	1 2 s s s s	s s s	s s s	7	s h	3 4 q	5 q	s s	q q	s	s
800 Metres	3 8 s	s s h s s s	s s s	1 s	1 s	2 s h	6	3	s h		4 h	3	4 s
1500 Metres	2 h h	4 s h s s	s s	10	1 s	3 10	s s	7 11 s	h h	s h	11	2	s
5,000/3,000 Metres			9	15	5		11 h h	12 s		4	5 h h	5 h	5 7 9
10,000 Metres		12 23	4	9 dnf	12 dnf		4	4	2			6 15	dnf s
Marathon		6 23 26 9 19	1 18 25 25 29	1 18 25 25 29	dnf 39			26		23 28 35	16 45 58 22 28	14 16	
3000m Steeplechase	h	h h	h h	h	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
100m Hurdles	s	8		h	h	h		q	q h	s h	s h	h	s s h
400m Hurdles	s s	3	8	s		s	s h h	8 h h	s h h	s	s	h	1 s s
High Jump							Q			Q	Q Q	Q	Q
Pole Vault	6	Q	Q	Q			9	Q		-	-	-	-
Long Jump	7			8	7	4		Q	5	Q	Q		Q Q Q
Triple Jump							7	11	12	5 Q	4 Q	12 Q	9 Q
Shot Putt								Q		Q	11	Q	Q
Discus Throw		Q			Q Q	Q				Q	Q	Q	Q
Hammer Throw	Q	Q		Q	Q Q	10	6	9	14	-	-	-	-
Javelin Throw	Q	4	Q	12	Q					Q Q	Q Q	Q	Q
Hepthathlon	1 14	4 31	3 4	5	3 dnf	5 14		1	2	2	3	7	dnf
20km (10km) Walk	dnf	22	25					33			32	35	23 29 42
4 x 100 Metres Relay	6	f	4	h			6	s	8		8	h	8
4 x 400 Metres Relay	4	5	3	3	4	6	5	6	h	6	h	5	3

PERFORMANCE TOTALS

All totals shown on this page have been extrapolated from the previous two pages showing the Mens and Women's Championship Performances between 1993 and 2010.

Funding cycles end after the Olympic Games, so the current funding cycle runs from 2009 to 2012. The sport did not receive public funding for the cycle from 1993/1996

Top 8 positions are counted because they are used as a key performance indicators to measure value for money and progress achieved with the public funding.

Totals	2009 World Champs	2008 Olympic Games	2007 World Champs	2005 World Champs	2004 Olympic Games	2003 World Champs	2001 World Champs	2000 Olympic Games	1999 World Champs	1997 World Champs	1996 Olympic Games	1995 World Champs	1993 World Champs
Total Medals	6	4	5	3	4	3	2	6	7	6	6	5	10
Gold Medals	2	1	1	1	3	0	1	2	1	0	0	1	3
Silver Medals	2	2	2	0	0	2	0	2	4	5	4	3	3
Bronze Medals	2	1	2	2	1	1	1	2	2	1	2	1	4
Top 8 including Relay	20	18	13	7	14	11	15	21	15	16	13	17	17
Top 8 excluding Relay	16	16	9	4	11	8	12	19	13	13	11	15	14
Total Competitors	43	55	46	41	43	37	47	69	53	64	74	67	73
Total Events	43	43	43	43	42	42	42	42	42	40	40	40	40
Events with 3 Competitors	7	8	6	4	6	3	9	14	8	10	13	11	13
Events with 2 Competitors	5	8	7	4	11	5	4	5	9	12	11	7	8
Events with 1 Competitor	12	15	14	21	13	18	12	17	11	10	13	20	18
Events with 0 Competitors	19	12	16	14	12	16	17	6	14	8	3	2	1
				FUNDING CYCLE 2005/2008		FUNDING CYCLE 2001/2004		FUNDING CYCLE 1997/2000		FUNDING CYCLE 1993/1996			
Total Medals	12	9	19	21	13	10	18	11	7	8	13	20	18
Top 8 excluding Relay	29	31	45	45	45	45	45	45	45	45	45	45	45
Total Competitors	142	127	186	186	186	186	186	186	186	186	186	186	186
Events with 0 Competitors	42	45	28	28	28	28	28	28	28	28	28	28	28

UK STATISTICS OVER THE YEARS 1958-2010

Here is a detailed analysis of British athletics over the past 50 years – using the data compiled by the NUTS and published annually in our British Athletics Annuals.

For each standard event I show the best performance of the year by a British athlete (and the name of that athlete), then the marks by the 10th and 50th best British athletes that year and the number of British athletes achieving a set performance (around the 100th best at the peak for that event).

In the final column I show the number of British athletes making world top 100s. Note I cannot do that for women in 1958-65 as I only have access to world top 50s for those years; so then I show numbers in the top 50 in brackets.

Women's events have, of course, expanded to their current near-parity with men over the period. It is amazing to realise that it was not until 1969 that the women's 1500m was first run at a major championship, with 3000m following in 1974, marathon in 1984 and 10,000m in 1985. The 3000m steeplechase for women was first officially recognised by the IAAF on 1 January 2000,

There was no competition for women at three field events in 1958. World records were first recognised for triple jump in 1990, pole vault in 1994 and hammer in 1995.

Up to 1969 British athletics used imperial measurements for measuring field events and, generally, for the distances contested. In order to establish proper comparisons, I have converted performances at imperial events to metric equivalents as follows:

100 yards to 100m: I have considered 9.3y to be equivalent to 10.1m and then on a sliding scale through to 10.0y roughly equivalent to 10.9m and (for women's events) 11.2y equivalent to 12.2m.

220 yards to 200m: 0.1 secs deducted from yards time.

440 yards to 400m: 0.3 secs deducted from yards time.

880 yards to 800m: 0.7 secs deducted from yards time for men's lists, 0.8 secs for women's lists.

1 mile to 1500m: Sparks tables used, Conversions include: 3:50.0 mile to 3:33.1 1500m, 3:55.0 to 3:37.7, 4:00.0 to 3:42.3, 4:05.0 to 3:46.9, 4:10.0 to 3:51.5, 4:30.0 to 4:09.9, 4:40.0 to 4:19.1, 4:50.0 to 4:28.3, 5:00.0 to 4:37.5.

3 miles to 5000m: Sparks tables used e.g. 13:20.0 to 13:48.8, 13:40.0 to 14:09.4, 14:00.0 to 14:30.2

6 miles to 10,000m: Sparks tables used e.g. 28:00.0 to 29:00.2, 29:00.0 to 30:02.4, 30:00.0 to 31:04.4, 31:00.0 to 32:06.2

120 yards hurdles to 110 metres hurdles: No conversion needed.

Note: Bob Sparks, former NUTS chairman and ATFS president, compiled formulae to convert times between the various metric and Imperial events.

Another problem comes with the introduction of automatic timing. Fortunately good British timekeeping means that we do not have the 0.24 differential that is recommended by the IAAF (caused by timekeepers reacting to the gun at the start but anticipating the finish rather than reacting to seeing the athlete finish), so generally I have been able to incorporate hand and auto times, but I have used auto times exclusively for best, 10th and 50th best times for 100m, 200m and 110mh from 1980, by when the use of automatic timing had become widespread for major meetings. I have, however included hand times for those events in the counts to performance standards.

Indoor marks are included. Wind-assisted marks are excluded from these lists.

Note that I have included amendments known to me to originally published lists.

I am sure that all long-term athletics enthusiasts will find much of great fascination in these figures. In general one can readily see the great increase in standards to the mid-1980s and a steady decline thereafter, particularly in depth. Within that there has been the catastrophic collapse of our men's distance running standards and, a sad reflection of the decline in the sport in general, the steep fall in numbers competing at a reasonable level in the multi-events. There is, of course, much better news for sprints standards.

There has also been generally a less steep decline for women than more men, I suspect that this is related to the early maturity of women, which means that there are more young athletes in UK lists for women before we reach the crucial drop-off period of the late teens.

Peter Matthews

100 METRES			10th	50th	ToWld	200 METRES			10th	50th	ToWld	
	Best				10.8	Best					22.1	
1958	10.29	Radford	10.65	11.0	17	1	20.8	Radford	21.7	22.3	36	4
1959	9.4y	Radford	10.65	10.9	27	3	21.1	Rad'/D Jones	21.6	22.1	51	5
1960	9.4y	Radford	10.65	10.9	33	3	20.4*	Radford	21.5	22.1	61	5
1961	10.3	D Jones	10.55	10.9	45	2	20.9	D Jones	21.5	22.0	64	6
1962	9.5y	Radford	10.6	10.8	53	2	20.9	Brightwell	21.4	22.1	58	5
1963	10.3	B/D Jones	10.6	10.8	50	5	20.9	D Jones	21.4	22.0	77	4
1964	9.5y	L Davies	10.55	10.77	56	1	20.9	Campbell	21.4	22.0	64	3
1965	9.5y	R Jones	10.55	10.77	54	1	21.0	Campbell	21.6	22.0	80	1
1966	10.3	Campbell	10.55	10.77	67	1	21.1	3 men	21.3	21.9	82	3
1967	10.2	Campbell	10.6	10.77	52	1	20.7*	Campbell	21.4	21.9	85	2
1968	10.3	three men	10.55	10.77	64	3	20.66A	Steane	21.3	21.9	87	3
1969	10.3	Kelly/R Jones	10.55	10.8	60	2	21.0	Kelly/Yardley	21.5	21.9	92	1
1970	10.3	Reynolds	10.6	10.8	63	1	20.7	Reynolds	21.4	21.9	90	1
1971	10.4	H'day/B Green	10.6	10.8	59	0	20.6	Jenkins	21.4	22.0	75	2
1972	10.1	Jenk/B Green	10.6	10.9	44	2	20.3	Jenkins	21.4	22.0	69	3
1973	10.3	Halliday	10.6	10.9	44	1	20.66	Jenkins	21.6	22.1	55	2
1974	10.3	H'day/Piggot	10.6	10.9	49	2	20.5	Jenkins	21.5	22.1	62	3
1975	10.4	Roberts	10.7	10.9	44	0	20.86	A Bennett	21.6	22.0	60	2
1976	10.4	Roberts/B Green	10.6	10.8	60	0	20.8	Jenkins	21.3	22.0	87	1
1977	10.4	Roberts	10.6	10.8	60	0	20.9	Wells	21.28	21.9	94	3
1978	10.15	Wells	10.6	10.8	71	2	20.5	Wells (20.61)	21.2	21.8	103	2
1979	10.19	Wells	10.5	10.8	72	6	20.4	Wells (20.42)	21.21	21.8	95	5
	Best			<u>10.90/10.7</u>		Best				<u>22.10/21.9</u>		
1980	10.11	Wells	10.59	10.7	55	3	20.21	Wells	21.3	21.7	87	6
1981	10.17	Wells	10.55	10.8	60	2	20.26	Wells	21.24	21.7	83	4
1982	10.20	Wells	10.51	10.8	56	5	20.43	McFarlane/Wells	21.21	21.7	91	5
1983	10.20	Sharp	10.56	10.7	59	5	20.52	Wells	21.00	21.64	97	4
1984	10.18	Wells	10.49	<u>10.7</u>	70	4	20.36	T Bennett	20.93	<u>21.68</u>	112	4
1985	10.28	Obeng	10.56	10.91	72	3	20.54	Mafe	21.02	21.91	97	3
1986	10.04	Christie	10.43	10.83	77	7	20.41	Regis	21.16	21.94	115	5
1987	10.03	Christie	10.37	10.90	66	6	20.16	Regis	21.06	21.81	112	2
1988	9.97	Christie	10.44	10.89	68	2	20.09	Christie	21.17	21.94	115	4
1989	10.10	Christie	10.48	10.81	77	2	20.35	Regis	21.15	21.77	111	5
1990	10.02	Christie	10.44	10.88	70	6	20.11	Regis	20.89	21.76	119	8
1991	9.92	Christie	10.37	10.83	68	9	20.12	Regis	21.08	21.84	124	6
1992	9.96	Christie	10.39	10.84	102	5	20.09	Regis	20.95	21.65	130	5
1993	9.87	Christie	10.39	10.81	95	4	19.94	Regis	21.12	21.68	116	2
1994	9.91	Christie	10.36	10.78	95	6	19.87A	Regis	20.91	21.68	121	6
1995	9.97A	Christie	10.40	10.79	87	5	20.11	Christie	20.86	21.69	111	6
1996	10.03	Christie	10.38	10.71	89	4	20.29	Christie	20.79	21.52	132	7
1997	10.04	Christie	10.31	10.70	95	6	20.38	Golding	20.75	21.52	128	8
1998	10.04	Campbell	10.35	10.67	102	4	20.18	Golding	20.77	21.56	123	7
1999	9.97	Chambers	10.31	10.70	92	6	20.20	Golding	20.73	21.69	113	7
2000	10.06	Campbell	10.31	10.76	85	5	20.13	Campbell	20.83	21.67	111	5
2001	9.99	Chambers	10.30	10.78	81	6	20.08	Malcolm	20.81	21.72	106	8
2002	9.87	Chambers	10.32	10.75	81	4	20.19	Devonish	20.90	21.73	105	7
2003	10.03	Chambers	10.36	10.73	86	6	20.25	Malcolm	20.79	21.64	110	6
2004	10.12	Lewis-Francis	10.36	10.74	87	4	20.41	Golding	20.90	21.64	110	5
2005	10.08	Gardener	10.34	10.73	92	7	20.15	Malcolm	20.92	21.66	122	4
2006	10.07	Chambers	10.34	10.71	105	7	20.29	Malcolm	20.98	21.68	118	4
2007	10.06	Devonish	10.28	10.67	115	6	20.33	Devonish	20.87	21.58	115	1
2008	10.00	Chambers	10.26	10.67	112	9	20.25	Malcolm	20.97	21.59	132	5
2009	10.00	Chambers	10.27	10.69	116	7	20.37	Sandeman	20.96	21.58	126	6
2010	9.99	Chambers	10.26	10.67	124	7	20.38	Malcolm	20.85	21.54	143	5
1968:	10.3	R Jones, Reynolds, Kelly	(10.35A)					1966:	21.1*	Morrison, L Davies, Campbell		

400 METRES			10th	50th	ToWld	800 METRES			10th	50th	ToWld	
	Best				49.0	Best				1:52.0		
1958	46.3	Wrighton	48.3	49.7	23	5	1:47.0	Hewson,Rawson	1:50.9	1:53.7	18	8
1959	46.9*	Wrighton	48.1	49.5	30	5	1:47.9*	Hewson	1:50.8	1:53.6	22	8
1960	46.1	Brightwell	47.9	49.3	39	5	1:48.0	T Farrell	1:50.3	1:53.5	29	8
1961	45.7	Metcalfe	47.8	49.2	46	6	1:47.9	Kilford	1:50.3	1:53.0	31	9
1962	45.6*	Brightwell	47.9	49.2	41	4	1:48.2*	Fleet	1:50.3	1:52.9	35	8
1963	46.2	M'calfe, B'well	47.9	49.1	43	4	1:47.1*	Boulter	1:50.0	1:52.5	37	8
1964	45.7	Brightwell	47.8	48.9	55	3	1:47.1	Boulter	1:49.2	1:52.3	45	10
1965	46.9	three men !	47.8	49.2	46	4	1:46.6	C Carter	1:49.3	1:51.9	53	12
1966	46.7	Graham	47.6	48.9	56	4	1:46.3	C Carter	1:49.0	1:51.9	52	8
1967	46.3*	Graham	47.5	49.0	56	3	1:46.6*	Boulter	1:49.1	1:51.7	58	9
1968	45.9	C Campbell	47.2	48.7	67	4	1:46.5*	C Carter	1:48.9	1:51.9	52	8
1969	46.5	D Jenkins	47.4	49.0	52	6	1:46.8	A Carter/Adams	1:49.7	1:52.0	50	6
1970	46.65	Bilham	47.4	49.0	55	3	1:47.2	three men !	1:49.0	1:52.2	47	9
1971	45.5	Jenkins	47.4	49.2	45	2	1:46.2	A Carter	1:49.9	1:52.2	44	6
1972	45.3	Jenkins	47.5	49.0	50	4	1:46.1	Campbell	1:48.8	1:52.5	39	5
1973	45.2	Jenkins	47.54	49.1	48	3	1:45.12	A Carter	1:48.86	1:52.3	44	8
1974	45.18	Jenkins	47.4	49.3	45	1	1:45.57	A Carter	1:49.44	1:52.3	41	7
1975	44.93	Jenkins	47.53	49.1	48	4	1:46.09	Ovett	1:49.3	1:52.1	49	6
1976	45.20	Jenkins	47.10	49.1	49	4	1:45.44	Ovett	1:49.0	1:52.1	47	6
1977	45.89	Cohen	47.5	48.7	66	3	1:44.95	Coe	1:48.3	1:51.5	64	5
1978	45.49	Cohen	47.05	48.68	78	5	1:43.97	Coe	1:48.84	1:51.3	74	6
1979	45.97	Scutt	46.94	48.60	73	1	1:42.33	Coe	1:48.5	1:51.2	74	6
1980	45.29	Jenkins	46.56	48.5	84	9	1:44.7	Coe	1:48.41	1:50.95	76	8
1981	45.86	Jenkins	47.03	48.4	98	4	1:41.73	Coe	1:48.00	1:51.0	90	8
1982	45.45	P Brown	46.8	48.14	107	3	1:44.45	Cram	1:46.46	1:50.81	98	14
1983	45.58	T Bennett	46.97	48.16	112	4	1:43.61	Cram	1:46.46	1:50.78	86	12
1984	45.43	Akabusi	46.84	48.1	130e	3	1:43.64	Coe	1:46.16	1:50.49	111	11
1985	44.82	Redmond	46.60	48.2	118e	7	1:42.88	Cram	1:48.2	1:50.69	110	7
1986	44.59	Black	46.39	48.0	125e	6	1:43.19	Cram	1:47.14	1:50.4	108	9
1987	44.50	Redmond	46.38	48.2	101+	5	1:43.41	Elliott	1:46.38	1:50.7	112	13
1988	44.67	Redmond	46.43	48.1	101+	5	1:43.42	Cram	1:46.13	1:49.83	100	12
1989	45.54	Redmond	46.59	48.25	103	3	1:43.38	Coe	1:47.1	1:50.0	108	11
1990	44.91	Black	46.7	48.19	112	5	1:42.97	Elliott	1:46.65	1:50.31	107	13
1991	44.62	Black	46.7	48.24	109	7	1:44.20	McKean	1:47.17	1:50.2	118	9
1992	44.47	Grindley	46.42	48.24	100	7	1:44.38	McKean	1:46.37	1:50.0	97	11
1993	44.50	Grindley	46.35	48.1	123	7	1:43.84	Steele	1:47.59	1:50.6	92	6
1994	44.78	Black	46.39	47.9	121	5	1:46.13	Steele	1:48.38	1:50.9	84	3
1995	44.59	Black	46.31	48.19	119	8	1:46.02	Strang	1:48.03	1:50.49	89	3
1996	44.37	Black	46.06	48.08	113	8	1:45.69	Winrow	1:47.9	1:50.38	91	4
1997	44.36	I Thomas	46.11	48.00	107	9	1:46.05	Sesay	1:48.22	1:50.5	96	4
1998	44.37	Richardson	46.12	48.11	110	8	1:45.71	Hart	1:48.31	1:51.27	71	3
1999	44.47	Richardson	46.27	48.15	104	4	1:45.51	Robb	1:48.10	1:51.2	71	5
2000	44.72	Richardson	46.19	48.18	99	5	1:45.81	Whiteman	1:48.55	1:50.79	79	3
2001	45.14	Richardson	46.56	48.11	89	3	1:47.16	Speaight	1:48.85	1:51.03	71	0
2002	44.98	Caines	46.46	48.1	94	4	1:45.52	Mcllroy	1:48.14	1:50.75	77	4
2003	45.27	Benjamin	46.47	48.26	93	4	1:45.30	Mcllroy	1:48.3	1:51.05	69	5
2004	45.04	Benjamin	46.14	48.12	102	5	1:45.70	Soos	1:48.30	1:50.80	80	3
2005	44.56	Benjamin	46.65	48.12	103	4	1:44.65	Mcllroy	1:48.41	1:50.54	79	1
2006	45.35	Rooney	46.67	48.26	84	4	1:45.10	Hill	1:47.20	1:51.18	71	9
2007	45.28	Benjamin	46.35	48.06	104	4	1:45.17	Rimmer	1:47.86	1:51.08	73	5
2008	44.60	Rooney	46.51	48.01	116	3	1:44.68	Rimmer	1:48.06	1:50.88	73	2
2009	44.74	Bingham	46.17	47.99	126	8	1:46.13	Rimmer	1:47.92	1:50.56	91	4
2010	44.84	Bingham	46.44	47.90	134	4	1:43.89	Rimmer	1:47.38	1:50.10	102	5

! 1965: Yardley, C Campbell, Warden

1970: Davies, A Carter, Campbell

1500 METRES/1 MILE			10th	50th	ToWld	5000 METRES			10th	50th	ToWld	
Best					3:49.0/4:07.3M	Best				14:20.0/13:50.2M		
Note: lists include mile times converted to 1500m and 3 miles times converted to 5000m.												
1958	3:41.1	Hewson	3:47.3	3:54.8	14	13	13:51.2*	Eldon	14:17.2	14:43.6	12	14
1959	3:42.9	Johnson	3:47.3	3:52.8	17	15	13:47.8	Eldon	14:11.8	14:40.6	26	29
1960	3:59.9M	Pirie	3:44.9	3:52.8	32	17	13:45.8*	Tulloh	14:08.0	14:37.0	20	18
1961	3:42.5	Pirie	3:45.7	3:52.3	26	14	13:40.4*	Tulloh	14:07.4	14:30.2	26	23
1962	3:58.0M	S Taylor	3:45.2	3:51.3	30	19	13:44.6*	Tulloh	14:01.6	14:27.4	32	20
1963	4:00.8M	Cornell	3:45.4	3:51.8	27	15	13:51.2*	Tulloh	14:01.8	14:29.0	32	18
1964	3:39.10	Simpson	3:44.0	3:50.9	33	18	13:45.2*	Wiggs	13:58.8	14:26.8	41	17
1965	3:55.7M	Simpson	3:42.6	3:50.3	33	18	13:33.0	Wiggs	13:56.6	14:22.8	42	24
1966	3:56.1M	Duggan	3:45.1	3:49.3	41	8	13:37.0*	Rushmer	13:55.6	14:18.8	53	15
1967	3:57.6M	Simpson	3:44.4	3:49.5	42	12	13:34.6*	McCafferty	13:52.6	14:19.6	52	18
1968	3:58.6M	Boulter/Wh'ton	3:43.1	3:48.1	64	11	13:40.6	Blinston	13:53.4	14:15.6	71	15
1969	3:39.12	I Stewart	3:43.9	3:48.2	69	13	13:29.0	R Taylor	13:48.4	14:15.4	69	18
1970	3:39.0	P Stewart	3:42.7	3:49.3	48	13	13:22.85	I Stewart	13:52.6	14:16.0	66	16
1971	3:39.2	Foster	3:42.7	3:48.5	54	11	13:22.2	Bedford	13:47.4	14:10.8	79	12
1972	3:55.3M	P Stewart	3:43.0	3:48.5	53	7	13:17.21	Bedford	13:42.6	14:08.0	85	12
1973	3:38.45	Clement	3:42.06	3:47.6	70	8	13:23.71	Foster	13:42.6	14:10.2	79	15
1974	3:37.38	Clement	3:42.56	3:47.7	66	6	13:14.6	Foster	13:44.6	14:11.8	70	11
1975	3:54.95M	Clement	3:40.56	3:47.8	64	12	13:27.00	I Stewart	13:43.99	14:11.8	67	9
1976	3:37.53	Clement	3:40.9	3:48.2	65	8	13:20.34	Foster	13:43.71	14:14.2	63	7
1977	3:34.45	Ovett	3:41.1	3:47.6	78	11	13:20.4	Rose	13:39.17	14:05.6	94	11
1978	3:35.48	Moorcroft	3:40.57	3:46.5	88	10	13:25.20	McLeod	13:36.63	14:05.4	82	13
1979	3:32.03	Coe	3:40.4	3:45.5	99	9	13:24.25	McLeod	13:30.65	14:02.0	87	13
1980	3:31.36	Ovett	3:40.9	3:45.71	96	8	13:17.9	Muir	13:31.9	14:07.8	83	14
1981	3:47.33M	Coe	3:39.90	3:46.1	100	10	13:15.59	Goater	13:34.27	14:05.5	93	15
1982	3:49.34M	Moorcroft	3:38.6	3:44.63	112	14	13:00.41	Moorcroft	13:29.11	14:02.6	96	15
1983	3:30.77	Ovett	3:40.54	3:44.55	119	6	13:20.94	Martin	13:30.79	14:04.4	93	18
1984	3:32.39	Coe	3:38.44	3:44.4	148	13	13:11.50	Hutchings	13:28.44	14:05.1	100	18
1985	3:29.67	Cram	3:40.13	3:45.2	135	10	13:18.47	Muir	13:37.29	14:02.6	112	12
1986	3:29.77	Coe	3:37.2	3:44.3	132	13	13:10.15	Buckner	13:30.6	14:00.85	95	15
1987	3:31.43	Cram	3:39.72	3:44.3	133	9	13:10.48	Buckner	13:37.31	14:05.30	100	10
1988	3:30.95	Cram	3:38.79	3:44.97	135	11	13:21.60	Davies-Hale	13:31.66	14:00.03	98	12
1989	3:34.05	Coe	3:38.81	3:43.98	130	11	13:17.82	Buckner	13:28.58	14:06.76	87	14
1990	3:32.69	Elliott	3:38.08	3:45.26	128	14	13:14.28	Staines	13:37.86	14:06.20	102	10
1991	3:49.46M	Elliott	3:39.5	3:44.98	123	10	13:13.01	Denmark	13:39.25	14:06.4	80	8
1992	3:35.94	McKay	3:38.64	3:44.58	122	11	13:09.80	Hamer	13:30.83	14:10.28	70	10
1993	3:35.04	Yates	3:39.46	3:45.26	97	10	13:16.48	Denmark	13:47.78	14:12.80	75	4
1994	3:35.32	Yates	3:40.17	3:46.0	92	9	13:22.40	Denmark	13:46.5	14:15.00	68	4
1995	3:34.05	Mayock	3:41.1	3:46.3	81	7	13:13.77	Denmark	13:49.15	14:19.9	50	4
1996	3:33.38	Mayock	3:40.47	3:45.6	88	6	13:17.48	Nuttall	13:50.04	14:18.17	53	4
1997	3:31.86	Mayock	3:40.34	3:46.3	73	4	13:17.21	Cullen	13:43.84	14:14.8	56	4
1998	3:32.69	Whiteman	3:41.2	3:47.24	77	4	13:19.03	Brown	13:48.5	14:23.0	41	6
1999	3:32.97	Mayock	3:42.23	3:46.6	77	2	13:23.07	Keska	13:46.01	14:13.55	57	4
2000	3:50.61M	Mayock	3:41.19	3:47.0	80	5	13:28.22	Bowditch	13:45.26	14:26.91	42	1
2001	3:34.43	Mayock	3:42.58	3:47.13	72	4	13:24.44	Openshaw	13:51.75	14:29.96	39	3
2002	3:32.43	Whiteman	3:41.89	3:47.09	68	5	13:19.43	Mayock	13:48.60	14:25.85	45	3
2003	3:35.49	Whiteman	3:42.26	3:47.58	66	4	13:31.64	And. Graffin	14:00.20	14:28.02	35	0
2004	3:32.37	East	3:41.04	3:48.48	55	4	13:22.99	Mayock	13:53.74	14:28.98	34	2
2005	3:33.32	East	3:40.62	3:48.12	60	6	13:30.53	Farah	14:03.10	14:31.43	31	0
2006	3:36.52	Baddeley	3:41.14	3:47.41	73	5	13:09.40	Farah	13:54.66	14:28.03	36	2
2007	3:34.74	Baddeley	3:41.40	3:47.83	65	4	13:07.00	Farah	13:57.66	14:30.0	33	1
2008	3:34.36	Baddeley	3:41.46	3:47.33	62	4	13:08.11	Farah	13:57.88	14:26.47	40	1
2009	3:33.98	Farah	3:40.81	3:45.04	76	6	13:09.14	Farah	13:44.64	14:18.6	53	3
2010	3:33.96	Lancashire	3:39.84	3:45.71	106	4	12:57.94	Farah	13:51.81	14:25.69	39	3

10,000 METRES			10th	50th	ToWld	MARATHON			10th	50th	ToWld	
	Best			31:00/29:55.6M		Best					2:25	
Note: lists include 6 miles times converted to 10000m.												
1958	29:02.8	Eldon	29:57.8	31:27.8	33	17	2:21:15	F Norris	2:28:20	2:39:29	5	20
1959	29:13.0*	Eldon	29:48.9	31:20.1	37	17	2:23:08	O'Gorman	2:29:22	2:41:52	2	15
1960	28:52.6	Merriman	29:57.0	31:10.6	41	12	2:18:16	O'Gorman	2:24:21	2:37:59	12	20
1961	28:54.4*	Hyman	29:53.4	30:55.6	53	19	2:20:25	Wilkinson	2:26:52	2:36:55	4	25
1962	28:49.6*	Fow/Bullivant	29:30.4	30:58.2	51	12	2:21:17	Kilby	2:27:02	2:40:00	3	10
1963	28:49.6*	Hill	29:52.0	30:58.6	51	12	2:14:43	Kilby	2:25:23	2:35:05	8	16
1964	28:25.4*	Bullivant	29:20.6	30:50.0	55	15	2:13:55	Heatley	2:21:30	2:34:02	12	12
1965	28:37.2	Freary	29:19.8	30:37.6	89	17	2:16:50	Adcocks	2:22:24	2:32:06	12	11
1966	28:22.6*	Tulloh	28:53.4	30:32.4	84	16	2:19:04	G Taylor	2:24:00	2:33:22	12	5
1967	28:36.2*	Johnston	28:54.8	30:12.4	130e	16	2:14:45	Alder	2:21:40	2:30:44	22	2
1968	28:21.0*	Johnston	28:52.2	30:05.4	115e	20	2:10:48	Adcocks	2:20:16	2:32:14	24	14
1969	28:06.6	R Taylor	28:50.0	29:54.4	110e	25	2:11:07	Adcocks	2:17:42	2:28:22	34	17
1970	28:06.2	Bedford	28:47.8	29:59.0	125e	20	2:09:28	Hill	2:18:59	2:26:51	38	18
1971	27:47.0	Bedford	28:52.4	29:45.8	140e	14	2:12:39	Hill	2:16:24	2:23:59	58	24
1972	27:52.44	Bedford	28:51.4	30:02.6	120e	10	2:12:51	Hill	2:17:18	2:24:50	52	18
1973	27:30.80	Bedford	28:33.30	29:54.4	119	17	2:12:40	Thompson	2:17:18	2:23:39	62	18
1974	27:48.49	Black	28:40.8	29:57.2	98	13	2:09:12	Thompson	2:17:23	2:25:28	45	11
1975	27:45.43	Foster	28:34.0	30:00.0	110	16	2:12:34	Hill	2:17:14	2:24:20	56	14
1976	27:53.70	Foster	28:41.67	29:58.4	115	4	2:12:54	Thompson	2:19:02	2:25:31	47	7
1977	27:36.62	Foster	28:31.51	29:52.0	130e	11	2:13:57	C Stewart	2:17:16	2:24:18	55	11
1978	27:30.3	Foster	28:37.08	29:58.0	111	12	2:12:32	Wright	2:15:47	2:22:37	71	11
1979	27:39.76	McLeod	28:27.4	29:55.6	116	10	2:10:51	Ford	2:16:01	2:21:52	90	9
1980	28:11.98	Rose	28:40.78	30:16.65	92	7	2:11:22	Cannon	2:16:04	2:21:05	82	5
1981	27:43.76	G Smith	28:38.35	29:54.7	103	11	2:09:28	Graham	2:13:50	2:19:24	136	14
1982	27:34.58	Goater	28:26.51	29:58.9	100	11	2:09:24	H Jones	2:13:51	2:19:19	186	11
1983	27:31.19	Rose	28:13.04	29:53.40	100	15	2:09:08	G Smith	2:12:51	2:17:33	229	13
1984	27:58.64	S Jones	28:38.82	29:53.9	111	6	2:08:05	S Jones	2:13:49	2:17:42	184	8
1985	27:53.91	S Jones	29:06.7	30:10.2	103	3	2:07:13	S Jones	2:14:20	2:18:34	186	7
1986	27:51.76	Solly	28:11.07	29:41.90	96	18	2:10:13	Spedding	2:14:54	2:19:47	130	7
1987	27:59.24	Thackery	28:41.70	30:16.0	112	7	2:10:11	H Jones	2:14:03	2:20:10	101	7
1988	27:23.06	Martin	28:27.28	30:04.4	95	9	2:08:20	S Jones	2:13:32	2:21:15	87	9
1989	28:11.15	Binns	28:43.48	30:00.5	84	8	2:09:54	Milovsorov	2:13:34	2:21:21	83	11
1990	28:04.04	Bristow	28:25.01	30:09.5	89	15	2:10:10	Hutton	2:16:00	2:23:01	67	5
1991	27:48.73	Staines	28:33.48	30:10.3	96	7	2:10:30	Long	2:14:13	2:22:24	75	7
1992	27:48.32	Evans	28:46.63	30:22.24	88	7	2:10:06	S Jones	2:14:27	2:23:36	67	4
1993	27:40.03	Nerurkar	28:53.07	30:39.54	69	6	2:10:03	Nerurkar	2:15:30	2:24:44	51	6
1994	28:03.34	Denmark	28:55.57	31:02.01	49	3	2:11:05	Martin	2:15:41	2:24:25	55	4
1995	27:49.54	Evans	29:07.33	31:01.15	49	3	2:10:31	Evans	2:18:40	2:25:47	43	4
1996	27:59.72	Brown	29:08.66	30:57.22	50	3	2:08:52	Evans	2:18:55	2:28:17	36	5
1997	27:27.47	Brown	29:17.65	31:07.9	45	3	2:08:36	Nerurkar	2:16:23	2:26:30	38	3
1998	27:18.14	Brown	29:24.15	c.31:25	32	2	2:11:10	Brown	2:17:43	2:29:04	26	1
1999	27:50.33	Cullen	29:32.48	31:48.5	26	1	2:09:44	Brown	2:20:23	2:27:26	32	1
2000	27:44.09	Keska	29:10.86	31:36.97	29	4	2:11:17	Brown	2:18:49	2:28:48	29	2
2001	28:06.29	Keska	29:10.98	31:30.91	35	1	2:10:46	Steinle	2:19:26	2:30:41	25	1
2002	27:53.42	Brown	28:52.36	31:30.6	39	2	2:09:17	Steinle	2:20:54	2:30:03	27	1
2003	27:47.89	Keska	29:27.94	32:30.2	20	1	2:15:41	Steinle	2:20:25	2:30:04	24	0
2004	28:45.74	Tromans	29:43.11	31:57.66	27	0	2:12:26	Brown	2:18:49	2:29:49	26	0
2005	28:40.58	G Thompson	29:52.04	32+	28	0	2:09:31	Brown	2:18:47	2:29:49	26	1
2006	28:32.90	Lemoncello	30:07.11	32:39.69	22	0	2:11:46	Brown	2:19:16	2:30:26	20	0
2007	28:28.04	Lemoncello	29:59.48	32:13.4	28	0	2:10:37	Abyu	2:23:27	2:33:11	11	1
2008	27:44.54	Farah	29:30.88	32:37.7	19	1	2:13:06	Abyu	2:22:38	2:29:29	25	0
2009	27:57.23	Lemoncello	29:31.01	32:13.85	37	1	2:12:14	Robinson	2:20:44	2:29:17	26	0
2010	27:28.86	Farah	29:40.47	31:46.6	36	3	2:13:40	Lemoncello	2:19:05	2:28:12	28	0

110 METRES HURDLES			10th	50th	ToWld	400m HURDLES			10th	50th	ToWld	
	Best				15.5	Best					55.5	
1958	14.3	Hildreth	15.0	15.9	28	3	51.3*	Goudge	54.4	58.3e	15	7
1959	14.3y	Hildreth	14.8	16.0	32	3	51.5*	Goudge	54.7	57.9	16	6
1960	14.3	Hildreth/Birrell	14.9	15.9	30	3	51.0	T Farrell	54.2	57.5	17	6
1961	14.2	Birrell/Parker	15.0	15.8	36	2	51.0	Surety	54.5	58.0e	21	5
1962	14.2y	Taitt	14.9	15.8	37	2	51.6*	Surety	53.8	57.7	24	5
1963	13.9	Parker	14.8	15.9	32	3	50.5	Cooper	54.3	57.1	23	5
1964	14.2	3 men	15.0	15.8	34	3	50.1	Cooper	54.1	56.9	28	4
1965	14.2y	Morrod	14.9	15.7	37	1	50.9	Cooper	53.3	56.4	35	5
1966	13.9	Hemery	14.8	15.6	47	3	50.6	Sherwood	53.4	56.4	33	5
1967	13.9	Pascoe	14.7	15.5	51	4	50.2	Sherwood	53.3	56.4	35	3
1968	13.7y	Hemery	14.8	15.6	47	3	48.12A	Hemery	53.3	55.7	46	4
1969	13.6	Hemery	14.7	15.6	48	3	49.9	Sherwood	52.9	55.6	46	6
1970	13.6	Hemery	14.7	15.6	46	3	50.03	Sherwood	52.4	55.8	45	3
1971	13.7	Pascoe	14.9	15.7	42	2	50.8	Schärer	52.8	55.4	52	4
1972	13.7	Pascoe	14.8	15.6	49	2	48.52	Hemery	52.8	55.7	46	4
1973	13.5	Price (13.69)	14.7	15.5	57	2	49.5	Pascoe	52.56	55.7	46	4
1974	13.7	Kirkpatrick	14.8	15.5	51	3	48.82	Pascoe	52.77	55.6	49	4
1975	13.6	Price	14.45	15.5	64	1	48.59	Pascoe	52.5	55.5	53	2
1976	13.5	Price	14.69	15.4	60	1	48.93	Pascoe	52.32	55.15	62	3
1977	13.82	Price	14.7	15.4	50	2	49.65	Pascoe	52.55	55.3	61	4
1978	13.74	Price	14.7	15.3	67	2	49.63	Pascoe	52.4	54.9	71	3
1979	13.7	Holtom (13.91)	14.5	15.3	70	3	50.37	Oakes	52.3	54.9	75	2
	Best				<u>15.59/15.4</u>							
1980	13.71	Holtom	14.65	15.2	70	3	49.11	Oakes	51.92	54.4	83	3
1981	13.75	Holtom	14.58	15.2	73	2	49.69	Oakes	52.27	54.44	81	4
1982	13.43	Holtom	14.45	15.2	83	3	50.15	Oakes	51.57	54.4	89	4
1983	13.79	Holtom	14.72	15.1	82	1	49.95	Sole	51.6	54.5	99	3
1984	13.78	Walker	14.31	<u>15.07</u>	88	3	48.86	Briggs	51.20	54.3	96	4
1985	13.46	Ridgeon	14.34	15.46	94	4	49.49	Holtom	51.96	54.1	98	4
1986	13.44	Jackson	14.14	15.20	97	3	49.53	Robertson	51.8	54.10	108	4
1987	13.29	Ridgeon	14.11	15.28	91	5	48.64	Akabusi	51.43	54.1	c.100	4
1988	13.11A	Jackson	14.10	15.29	90	4	48.64	Akabusi	51.48	54.0	105	4
1989	13.11	Jackson	14.28	15.19	115	4	48.59	Akabusi	51.3	54.2	105	2
1990	13.08	Jackson	14.18	15.25	103	6	47.92	Akabusi	51.73	54.1	114	3
1991	13.09	Jackson	14.11	15.13	104	6	47.86	Akabusi	51.89	54.0	105	3
1992	13.04	Jackson	14.29	15.25	98	7	47.82	Akabusi	51.7	53.8	105	4
1993	12.91	Jackson	14.11	15.24	109	5	48.73	Akabusi	51.37	53.9	106	4
1994	12.98	Jackson	14.14	15.15	101	7	49.07	Cadogan	51.15	54.03	96	4
1995	13.11	Jarrett	14.29	15.27	80	4	49.58	Crampton	51.33	54.2	77	4
1996	13.13	Jackson	14.13	15.29	91	5	48.79	Ridgeon	50.97	54.2	88	5
1997	13.05	Jackson	14.32	15.23	81	3	49.69	Rawlinson	51.51	54.4	78	5
1998	13.02	Jackson	14.24	15.37	80	5	49.16	Gray	51.2	54.7	73	5
1999	13.04	Jackson	14.05	15.27	72	5	48.14	Rawlinson	51.04	54.8	80	4
2000	13.10	Jackson	14.05	15.47	71	3	48.22	Rawlinson	51.29	54.52	72	3
2001	13.32	Jackson	14.09	15.50	68	4	48.27	Rawlinson	51.69	54.97	66	5
2002	13.11	Jackson	13.95	15.39	71	3	48.21	Rawlinson	50.97	54.6	73	4
2003	13.36	Newton	13.97	15.35	75	4	48.44	Rawlinson	51.27	55.0	66	4
2004	13.47	Turner	13.94	15.18	72	3	48.19	Rawlinson	51.67	55.1	61	2
2005	13.59	Greaves	14.03	15.20	78	4	49.60	Williams	51.14	54.9	63	5
2006	13.38	Turner	14.12	15.29	72	5	49.09	Williams	51.52	54.60	66	6
2007	13.27	Turner	14.07	15.11	74	3	49.58	Greene	51.50	54.55	64	4
2008	13.41	Turner	14.09	15.20	75	3	49.06	Yates	51.71	54.92	70	4
2009	13.30	Turner	14.05	15.16	83	4	48.27	Greene	51.07	54.2	84	6
2010	13.28	Turner	14.19	15.29	76	3	47.88	Greene	50.56	54.07	79	6

1964: Parker, Morrod, Taitt 14.2

3000m STEEPLECHASE			10th	50th	ToWld	DECATHLON			10th	50th	ToWld	
	Best				9:20	Best			5200*			
1958	8:51.0	Shirley	9:11.2	9:45.6	15	8	6094	Andrews	((4547))	-	11	0
1959	8:48.6	Herriott	9:12.2	9:40.6	19	7	6181	Andrews	((4650))		16	0
1960	8:50.4	Palmer	9:12.4	9:37.6	19	9	6481	Andrews	((4758))		17	1
1961	8:42.0	Herriott	9:06.2	9:38.0	19	7	6198	McLachlan	((4920))		21	0
1962	8:43.8	Herriott	9:02.6	9:31.8	29	8	6404	McLachlan	(5710)		21	0
1963	8:35.4	Herriott	9:06.6	9:33.0	30	4	6344	Jones	((5134))		20	0
1964	8:32.4	Herriott	9:00.6	9:33.0	22	6	6558	Clarke	(6227)		27	0
1965	8:36.2	Herriott	9:02.0	9:31.0	21	3	6825	Clarke	(6031)	(5166)	40	2
1966	8:32.8	Herriott	8:54.6	9:28.8	31	8	6996	Longe	(6131)	(5048)	36	2
1967	8:33.0	Herriott	8:52.9	9:27.8	34	6	7234	Longe	(5997)	(4990e)	31	1
1968	8:36.2	Bryan-Jones	8:50.6	9:27.6	40	8	7240A	Longe	(6324)	(4950e)	28	2
1969	8:30.8	Stevens	8:53.6	9:21.6	44	7	7308	Longe	(6097)	(5031)	33	2
1970	8:33.8	Bryan-Jones	8:46.6	9:20.6	49	8	7333	King	(6263)	(5021)	33	2
1971	8:28.6	Bedford	8:47.4	9:16.2	64	6	7746	Gabbett	(6552)	(5004)	40	2
1972	8:26.4	Holden	8:48.0	9:13.8	65	6	7901	Gabbett	(6471)	(5083)	35	2
1973	8:26.6	Bicourt	8:43.78	9:11.6	67	7	7335	McCallum	(6419)	(4950)	33	0
1974	8:22.48	Davies	8:45.0	9:17.0	59	9	7363	Bull	(6400)	(5220)	39	0
1975	8:26.8	Davies	8:46.8	9:11.2	74	6	6988	Kidner	(6469)	(5282)	48	0
1976	8:18.95	Coates	8:50.2	9:14.8	66	6	7742	Thompson	(6712)	(5525)	69	2
1977	8:26.64	Coates	8:44.65	9:11.0	69	6	8082	Thompson	(6600)	(5494)	63	1
1978	8:25.98	Coates	8:48.12	9:10.0	86	5	8470w	Thompson	(6990)	(5603)	68	1
1979	8:29.46	Marsay	8:47.0	9:10.8	79	5	7484	McStravick	(7028)	(5616)	73	0
1980	8:26.6	Rimmer	8:40.73	9:11.2	80	8	8648	Thompson	(7002)	(5631)	74	2
1981	8:29.31	Reitz	8:41.33	9:09.6	77	5	7797	Thompson	(6846)	(5570)	74	1
1982	8:18.80	Reitz	8:43.6	9:07.2	91	7	8774	Thompson	(6907)	(5614)	69	3
1983	8:15.16	Fell	8:42.1	9:10.5	97	7	8714	Thompson	7061	(5779)	79	1
1984	8:13.78	Reitz	8:48.84	9:06.58	95	6	8847	Thompson	7120	(5793)	90	5
1985	8:13.50	Reitz	8:46.54	9:07.51	97	5	7752	Gilkes	6985	5720	91	2
1986	8:12.11	Reitz	8:38.97	9:10.56	98	5	8811	Thompson	6822	5713	97	2
1987	8:20.68	Hackney	8:45.4	9:05.9	109	7	8124	Thompson	6936	5746	87	2
1988	8:07.96	Rowland	8:42.52	9:05.2	92	6	8306	Thompson	6945	5886	97	2
1989	8:16.52	Hanlon	8:37.59	9:06.7	103	7	7646	Kruger	7186	6030	104	2
1990	8:13.27	Rowland	8:42.5	9:07.94	90	6	7705	Gilkes	7039	5752	98	2
1991	8:12.58	Hanlon	8:41.17	9:10.1	100	3	7656	Brannen	7044	5845	94	3
1992	8:13.65	Hanlon	8:40.87	9:10.5	69	6	7904	Bigham	7001	5668	88	4
1993	8:19.99	Hanlon	8:43.72	9:11.8	86	5	7986	Kruger	7076	5866	88	6
1994	8:20.04	Hanlon	8:42.44	9:07.64	84	6	8078	Kruger	7078	5752	68	3
1995	8:24.37	Hanlon	8:47.63	9:15.70	66	4	8131	Kruger	6925	5611	62	4
1996	8:26.33	Hough	8:48.60	9:12.82	65	3	7857	Shirley	6839	5506	62	2
1997	8:28.54	Hough	8:54.63	9:16.32	58	1	7647	Joseph	6810	5441	64	0
1998	8:32.76	Stephenson	8:55.74	9:19.8	50	1	7654w	Quarry	6696	5278	51	0
1999	8:29.01	Stephenson	8:54.46	9:17.8	52	2	8556	Macey	6774	5258	51	2
2000	8:25.37	Stephenson	8:44.18	9:20.89	48	2	8567	Macey	6720	5162	49	2
2001	8:32.68	Whitby	8:49.55	9:26.9	35	2	8603	Macey	6788	5387	59	2
2002	8:26.45	Stokes	8:49.33	9:25.3	37	1	7630	Quarry	6805	5102	48	1
2003	8:37.55	Stokes	8:51.09	9:31.2	36	0	7419	Heanley	6706	5073	44	0
2004	8:24.88	Chaston	8:48.99	9:29.88	37	1	8414	Macey	7024	4911	42	1
2005	8:30.12	Lemoncello	8:48.73	9:31.8	37	3	7384	Sharman	6962	5034	46	0
2006	8:28.43	Bowden	8:47.86	9:30.36	33	3	8143	Macey	6659	4727	36	2
2007	8:23.74	Lemoncello	8:57.42	9:32.2	31	3	7734	Dunford	6777	4350	34	2
2008	8:22.95	Lemoncello	8:58.74	9:32.6	27	4	7751	Awde	7016	4530	35	1
2009	8:35.49	Lisgo	9:04.25	9:33.87	25	0	7726	Hazell	7162	5062	45	2
2010	8:28.89	Gunn	8:53.75	9:36.39	29	2	7727	Guest	7194	4997	46	5

HIGH JUMP			10th	50th	OverWld	POLE VAULT			10th	50th	OverWld	
	Best				1.97	Best				4.10		
1958	2.01	Fairbrother	1.88	1.80	1	1	4.30	Elliott	3.81	3.35	3	1
1959	2.05	Fairbrother	1.88	1.80	3	2	4.30	Elliott	3.86	3.43	3	1
1960	2.05	Miller	1.90	1.80	4	2	4.26	Elliott	3.96	3.43	4	-
1961	2.06	Fairbrother	1.905	1.80	4	1	4.20	Porter	3.96	3.50	5	-
1962	2.06	Fairbrother	1.905	1.83	4	2	4.28	Stevenson/Porter	3.96	3.50	5	-
1963	2.03	Fairbrother	1.93	1.83	3	0	4.42	Stevenson	3.96	3.50	7	-
1964	2.08	Miller	1.905	1.83	3	2	4.61	Stevenson	3.96	3.58	6	1
1965	2.08i	Miller	1.91	1.83	4	1	4.57i	Stevenson	4.11	3.53	10	-
1966	2.01	Miller	1.93	1.83	3	0	4.72	Bull	4.11	3.50	10	1
1967	2.01	Campbell	1.91	1.83	5	0	4.80	Bull	4.17	3.50	14	1
1968	2.05	Campbell	1.92	1.83	3	0	5.06	Bull	4.27	3.50	15	1
1969	2.04	Campbell	1.93	1.84	4	0	5.05	Bull	4.30	3.66	17	1
1970	2.07	Campbell	1.94	1.84	8	0	5.10	Bull	4.40	3.66	17	1
1971	2.08	Campbell	1.96	1.85	9	0	5.05	Bull	4.40	3.66	19	1
1972	2.08	Livesey	1.98	1.88	11	0	5.21	Bull	4.50	3.70	22	2
1973	2.10	Lerwill	1.96	1.89	8	0	5.25	Bull	4.40	3.80	23	2
1974	2.11	Boreham	2.00	1.90	16	0	5.20	Bull/B Hooper	4.50	3.80	28	2
1975	2.15i	Butterfield	2.01	1.95	26	0	5.20	Hooper/Bull	4.52	4.00	33	2
1976	2.16i	Butterfield	2.03	1.95	31	0	5.32	Hooper	4.60	4.00	40	2
1977	2.14	Dainton	2.05	1.95	43	0	5.40	Hooper	4.70	4.00	33	3
1978	2.20	Burgess	2.10	1.97	51	2	5.42	Hooper	4.60	4.00	40	3
1979	2.22i	Naylor	2.10	2.00	66	1	5.40	Hooper	4.60	4.00	45	3
1980	2.24	Naylor	2.11	2.00	75	1	5.59	Hooper	4.75	4.00	45	3
1981	2.21	Naylor	2.11	2.01	73	1	5.65	K Stock	4.70	4.01	49	3
1982	2.23	Lakey	2.14	2.01	93	1	5.30	Stock/Gutteridge	4.70	4.10	54	0
1983	2.25	G Parsons	2.15	2.02	94	1	5.40	Gutteridge/Stock	4.66	4.10	52	2
1984	2.26	Parsons	2.16	2.03	112	1	5.42i	Stock	4.70	4.20	64	2
1985	2.25	Parsons	2.15	2.03	96	3	5.40	Hooper/G'dge/St'	4.85	4.20	76	3
1986	2.30i	Parsons	2.14	2.02	98	1	5.35	Keith Stock	4.86	4.20	69	-
1987	2.28i	Grant	2.13	2.05	112	2	5.40	Gutteridge	4.91	4.20	84	-
1988	2.31	Grant	2.15	2.03	90	3	5.40	Ashurst	4.80	4.30	94	-
1989	2.35i	Grant	2.16	2.03	96	3	5.40	Ashurst	4.90	4.40	96	-
1990	2.34	Grant	2.15i	2.02	91	4	5.31	M Edwards	4.90	4.40	105	-
1991	2.36	Grant	2.14	2.04	87	4	5.50	Edwards	5.00	4.50	101	1
1992	2.37	Smith	2.15	2.01	94	4	5.50	N Winter	5.00	4.40	98	1
1993	2.37i	Smith	2.15	2.03	102+	3	5.52	Edwards	5.00	4.50	97	1
1994	2.38i	Smith	2.14	2.01	93	4	5.50	Winter	5.11	4.40	114	1
1995	2.35	Grant/Smith	2.16	2.03	89	4	5.70	Buckfield	5.20	4.45	110	2
1996	2.36i	Smith	2.15	2.00	84	3	5.71	Buckfield	5.20	4.45	107	3
1997	2.34i	Smith	2.18i	2.00	88	3	5.75	Buckfield	5.10	4.40	93	1
1998	2.36i	Smith	2.15	2.01	70	4	5.80	Buckfield	5.16	4.40	101	3
1999	2.36	Smith	2.15	2.00	71	2	5.61	K Hughes	5.25	4.40	89	1
2000	2.25i	Grant/Ch'ger	2.14	2.00	82	2	5.55	Will'son/Hughes	5.10	4.40	92	2
2001	2.26	Grant/Ch'ger	2.13	2.00	60	3	5.75A	Buckfield	5.11	4.45	94	1
2002	2.26	Challenger	2.13	2.00	67	2	5.81i	Buckfield	5.10	4.32	88	1
2003	2.25i	Grant	2.13	2.00	63	2	5.70	Buckfield	5.10	4.30	89	2
2004	2.27	Bernard	2.15	2.00	58	3	5.70	Buckfield	5.05	4.30	78	3
2005	2.27	Challenger	2.15	2.00	62	3	5.60	Buckfield	5.10	4.35	86	1
2006	2.31	Mason	2.16	2.00	64	5	5.50	Lewis	5.10	4.30	96	1
2007	2.30i	Bernard	2.20	2.00	64	6	5.61	Lewis	5.00	4.30	89	1
2008	2.34	Mason	2.20	2.00	77	5	5.71	Lewis	5.10	4.40	108	2
2009	2.31	Mason	2.16	2.00	68	6	5.75i	Lewis	5.05	4.50	108	2
2010	2.31i	Oni	2.15	2.00	72	5	5.72i	Lewis	5.20	4.60	115	3

LONG JUMP			10th	50th	ToWld	TRIPLE JUMP			10th	50th	ToWld	
	Best				6.95	Best					14m	
1958	7.25	Woolley	7.07	6.73	18	0	15.40	Wilmshurst	14.35	13.52	32	1
1959	7.25	Whyte	7.05	6.72	21	0	15.50	Wilmshurst	14.43	13.66	27	3
1960	7.50	Alsop	7.03	6.75	15	1	15.66	Alsop	14.54	13.77	33	1
1961	7.49	Howell	7.12	6.82	31	2	15.78	Alsop	14.58	13.74	34	1
1962	7.72	Davies	7.17	6.83	36	3	16.03	Alsop	14.62	13.76	32	4
1963	7.72	Morbey	7.10	6.81	28	3	15.94	Alsop	14.62	13.85	36	3
1964	8.07	Davies	7.10	6.83	28	3	16.46	Alsop	14.58	13.89	41	3
1965	7.89	Davies	7.21	6.86	34	3	16.39	Alsop	14.55	13.93	45	1
1966	8.18	Davies	7.17	6.86	38	1	15.96	Alsop	14.80	13.99	49	2
1967	8.13	Davies	7.29	6.86	40	1	16.05	Alsop	14.97	14.04	53	2
1968	8.23	Davies	7.35	6.93	45	3	16.22	Boosey	14.96	14.21	72	5
1969	8.14	Davies	7.28	6.93	44	2	16.18	Wadhams	15.14	14.22	75	2
1970	7.91	Lerwill	7.29	6.95	51	3	15.93	Wadhams	15.01	14.17	66	2
1971	7.92	Davies	7.33	6.99	55	3	16.10	Lerwill	15.08	14.19	66	1
1972	7.91	Lerwill	7.40	6.96	55	2	16.07	Lerwill	15.44	14.12	61	1
1973	7.93	Lerwill	7.36	6.98	54	2	16.06	Wadhams	15.21	14.15	65	1
1974	7.98	Lerwill	7.34	6.98	55	1	15.78	Clark	15.35	14.18	62	0
1975	7.90	Mitchell	7.36	6.93	48	3	16.24	Moore	15.19	14.28	78	2
1976	7.98	Mitchell	7.32	6.99	59	2	16.52	Moore	15.11	14.26	74	1
1977	8.04	Mitchell	7.37	7.01	61	1	16.33	Connor	15.30	14.16	64	2
1978	7.93	Thompson	7.34	7.06	68	2	16.76	Connor	15.35	14.33	79	3
1979	7.87	Mitchell	7.45	7.02	64	1	16.60	Moore	15.28	14.36	94	2
1980	8.08	Mitchell	7.42	7.05	76	2	17.16	Connor	15.38	14.34	76	2
1981	8.07	Mitchell	7.50	7.05	79	2	17.31i	Connor	15.57	14.51	94	2
1982	7.95	Thompson	7.39	7.07	81	1	17.57A	Connor	15.40	14.46	95	4
1983	7.88	Thompson	7.53	7.14	92	1	17.26	Connor	15.63	14.60	97	2
1984	8.01	Thompson	7.45	7.12	86	1	17.01	McCalla	15.77	14.60	104	5
1985	8.00	Brown	7.50	7.10	89	2	17.41	Herbert	15.77	14.58	108	1
1986	7.97	Salle	7.59	7.15	94	2	16.87	Makin	15.84	14.72	99	3
1987	7.91	King	7.55	7.16	c.94	0	16.86	McCalla	15.84	14.67	c.110	2
1988	7.98	Faulkner	7.66	7.10	c.80	2	17.12	Herbert	15.90	14.68	97	4
1989	8.14	Faulkner	7.62	7.13	87	3	17.28	Edwards	15.89	14.65	91	3
1990	8.15	Faulkner	7.48	7.08	78	3	17.00	Herbert	15.86	14.40	84	2
1991	8.14	Forsythe	7.48	7.12	84	1	17.43	Edwards	15.91	14.64	99	3
1992	7.91	Forsythe	7.55	7.04	77	1	17.34	Edwards	15.84	14.49	86	5
1993	7.96i	Salle	7.47	7.07	83	1	17.44	Edwards	15.71	14.41	83	3
1994	8.10	Salle	7.48	7.09	78	1	17.39	Edwards	15.78	14.33	70	5
1995	7.90i	Salle	7.50	7.06	74	1	18.29	Edwards	15.91	14.40	70	3
1996	7.86	Ritchie	7.48	7.04	63	0	17.88	Edwards	15.63	14.34	73	3
1997	7.90	Morgan	7.45	7.01	59	0	17.74	Edwards	15.68	14.33	69	4
1998	8.11	Morgan	7.47	6.99	62	2	18.01	Edwards	15.82	14.39	70	2
1999	7.99	Morgan	7.40	6.96	56	1	17.52	Edwards	15.73	14.27	61	7
2000	8.00	Morgan	7.55	7.05	67	1	17.71	Edwards	15.99	14.07	55	4
2001	7.98	Moore	7.31	6.96	52	2	17.92	Edwards	15.59	14.08	51	5
2002	8.27	Tomlinson	7.44	6.97	58	4	17.86	Edwards	15.66	14.11	57	5
2003	8.26	Morgan	7.52	6.98	51	3	17.61	Edwards	15.50	14.13	58	5
2004	8.25	Tomlinson	7.50	6.98	54	3	17.47	Idowu	15.50	14.16	60	4
2005	8.14	Rutherford	7.46	6.97	57	3	17.64	Douglas	15.65	14.12	59	4
2006	8.26	Rutherford	7.40	7.02	56	3	17.50	Idowu	15.38	14.29	57	4
2007	8.29	Tomlinson	7.50	7.02	64	3	17.56i	Idowu	15.75	14.36	62	5
2008	8.20	Rutherford	7.47	7.00	61	5	17.75i	Idowu	15.39	14.22	66	3
2009	8.30	Rutherford	7.57	7.08	75	2	17.73	Idowu	15.44	14.32	76	3
2010	8.23	Tomlinson	7.60	7.13	80	2	17.81	Idowu	15.54	14.32	70	3

SHOT			10th	50th	ToWld	DISCUS			10th	50th	ToWld	
	Best				13.50	Best				41.50/136'2		
1958	17.96	Rowe	15.09	13.08	35	2	54.53	Carr	46.05	40.66	40	2
1959	17.96	Rowe	14.68	13.32	42	3	53.54	Lindsay	45.79	41.49	49	3
1960	19.11	Rowe	15.11	13.36	42	3	55.32	Lindsay	46.05	41.69	52	3
1961	19.56	Rowe	15.66	13.63	56	4	54.63	Carr	47.00	42.14	55	2
1962	19.49	Rowe	15.72	13.66	59	3	54.01	Cleaver	47.29	41.97	57	4
1963	18.50	Lindsay	15.64	13.75	59	2	56.71	Holl'worth	47.89	42.20	57	2
1964	18.25	Lucking	15.62	13.91	69	3	56.40	Carr	48.11	42.30	59	2
1965	18.59i	Carter	15.59	14.04	79	3	57.00	Carr	50.59	42.63	68	2
1966	17.23	Lucking	15.71	14.07	78	0	55.73	W Tancred	49.07	42.72	68	2
1967	17.44	Lucking	16.10	14.11	82	1	54.97	W Tancred	48.74	42.90	73	1
1968	19.18	Teale	15.99	14.17	82	5	57.78	Watts	50.64	43.36	78	3
1969	18.53	Teale	16.14	14.18	88	2	57.76	W Tancred	49.78	43.24	73	3
1970	18.43	Teale	16.37	14.08	77	1	56.67	W Tancred	51.04	43.52	82	1
1971	19.48	Capes	16.07	14.06	76	1	58.00	W Tancred	51.64	43.74	80	2
1972	20.18	Capes	16.18	13.96	70	3	61.94	W Tancred	51.64	43.30	69	2
1973	20.47	Capes	16.52	14.04	76	3	63.98	W Tancred	53.02	42.86	74	4
1974	21.37	Capes	16.38	14.20	73	3	64.94	W Tancred	54.02	43.80	82	5
1975	20.80	Capes	16.70	14.12	76	3	62.42	W Tancred	53.56	42.80	68	2
1976	21.55	Capes	16.71	14.05	71	3	62.14	W Tancred	53.08	43.50	85	3
1977	21.30	Capes	16.46	14.01	76	4	59.80	P Tancred	53.68	43.06	77	1
1978	20.68	Capes	16.53	14.17	70	2	59.84	Sutherland	53.16	43.68	76	1
1979	20.49i	Capes	16.45	14.09	81	2	57.00	Slaney	51.86	44.08	81	0
1980	21.68	Capes	16.40	14.19	83	1	62.36	P Tancred	53.02	44.48	84	1
1981	18.39i	Winch	16.37	14.28	81	0	59.28	Weir	52.04	43.96	93	0
1982	19.53i	Winch	17.01	14.23	81	1	64.64	Slaney	52.34	43.92	85	3
1983	18.99	Winch	16.58	14.20	87	0	62.66	Slaney	52.28	44.00	87	3
1984	18.75	Winch	16.31	14.41	87	0	64.68	Slaney	52.08	44.80	92	3
1985	18.63	Cole	16.78	14.56	95	0	65.16	Slaney	51.46	45.58	100	2
1986	19.01	Cole	16.74	14.38	100	0	62.74	Slaney	53.12	46.06	105	2
1987	17.90	Savory	16.49	14.45	84	0	60.64	Mardle	53.42	45.50	102	1
1988	19.81	P Edwards	17.04	14.71	90	1	61.16	Mardle	54.34	46.06	110	1
1989	19.85	P Edwards	16.83	14.72	102	2	60.36	Mardle	55.02	46.32	103	1
1990	19.77	P Edwards	16.63	14.74	99	2	60.42	Williams	54.40	45.86	96	2
1991	20.33	P Edwards	16.77	14.73	115e	3	61.62	Gordon	54.28	45.72	100	2
1992	20.33	P Edwards	16.81	14.42	100	3	61.14	Williams	54.06	45.88	95	1
1993	19.84	P Edwards	16.92	14.59	102	2	61.30	Weir	53.48	46.34	98	1
1994	19.49	Simson	17.29	14.58	104	2	61.06	Weir	54.50	45.00	92	5
1995	19.37	Proctor	16.74	14.52	96	3	63.56	Weir	54.36	45.36	93	2
1996	19.67	Proctor	17.21	14.43	94	4	62.40	Weir	54.42	45.46	99	2
1997	20.45	Pickering	17.14	14.33	89	3	65.22	Wilkins	55.22	44.62	87	5
1998	20.85i	Proctor	16.71	14.12	94	4	66.64	Wilkins	54.20	44.13	80	7
1999	20.40	Proctor	16.23	14.28	87	2	65.11	Smith	52.53	44.96	86	5
2000	20.57i	Proctor	16.69	14.32	86	2	65.08	Weir	53.28	44.64	87	5
2001	19.64	Mark Edwards	16.58	14.25	89	2	63.03	Weir	52.97	44.04	79	4
2002	21.26i	Myerscough	16.80	14.27	85	1	64.34	Wilkins	53.57	43.75	75	4
2003	21.92	Myerscough	16.37	14.07	68	2	61.85	Myerscough	51.99	44.00	74	2
2004	20.92	Myerscough	16.27	14.18	74	1	65.10	Myerscough	53.06	44.89	85	2
2005	20.62	Myerscough	16.78	14.11	69	2	61.53	Myerscough	52.74	43.98	83	2
2006	20.75i	Myerscough	16.78	13.90	61	1	61.11	Myerscough	52.71	44.59	85	2
2007	19.96	Myerscough	17.20	14.10	64	2	63.37	Udechuku	53.71	44.53	90	1
2008	20.38	Myerscough	16.44	13.79	56	2	61.92	Udechuku	54.12	44.28	81	2
2009	20.33	Myerscough	16.79	14.01	62	2	59.52	Morse	53.97	44.71	87	0
2010	20.44i	Myerscough	17.04	14.03	71	2	63.35	Morse	55.57	45.07	79	4

Note 1994: 19.94 drugs dq Paul Edwards

HAMMER			10th	50th	ToWld	JAVELIN			10th	50th	ToWld
	Best					Best					
				46m/150'11					59m/193'7		
1958	62.90	Ellis	51.54	41.75e	25 2	71.42	Smith	62.83	53.58	22 2	
1959	64.95	Ellis	51.58	41.33	26 1	72.01	Smith	63.71	54.58	23 1	
1960	64.29	Ellis	50.48	42.63	30 2	74.56	Kitching	64.80	55.88	31 2	
1961	62.56	Payne	51.34	43.79	31 1	73.71	Smith	66.98	56.72	34 1	
1962	63.65	Payne	52.47	44.33	35 1	79.25	McSorley	66.18	57.96	42 2	
1963	63.19	Payne	51.61	44.38	29 1	79.25	Greasley	64.65	58.19	44 2	
1964	63.10	Payne	52.94	43.34	32 1	75.55	FitzSimons	66.47	58.98	49 1	
1965	61.19	Payne	53.67	44.73	33 1	77.34	FitzSimons	68.36	59.62	58 2	
1966	63.19	Payne	53.90	44.02	37 1	79.78	FitzSimons	67.72	59.55	56 2	
1967	62.41	Payne	53.64	44.04	41 1	76.99	Travis	69.98	60.76	64 3	
1968	68.06	Payne	54.92	45.32	47 2	79.44	Travis	69.58	60.76	66 3	
1969	67.64	Payne	55.20	46.64	54 2	81.92	FitzSimons	69.32	61.62	68 3	
1970	69.24	Payne	57.16	46.12	52 1	83.44	Travis	70.22	61.34	70 3	
1971	68.20	Payne	57.56	46.66	57 2	81.76	Travis	71.16	61.46	69 2	
1972	69.42	Williams	57.24	47.38	60 3	80.70	Travis	70.44	62.40	76 2	
1973	71.26	Williams	58.30	46.80	58 3	81.06	Travis	68.44	61.14	67 1	
1974	71.00	Chipchase	60.66	47.52	65 5	84.92	Clover	70.38	61.36	64 4	
1975	70.16	Dick'sn/Black	60.42	47.78	61 2	77.40	Roberts	69.66	61.12	68 0	
1976	74.98	Black	59.22	47.76	64 5	80.08	Ottley	70.02	61.14	73 3	
1977	74.24	Black	56.90	47.80	65 3	81.50	Ottley	70.74	61.04	65 2	
1978	70.32	Dickenson	58.26	48.14	70 2	80.90	de Kremer	72.62	61.14	66 2	
1979	71.34	Black	63.24	48.82	70 3	81.86	Yates	72.08	61.64	72 3	
1980	72.48	Dickenson	62.58	49.00	76 2	85.52	Ottley	74.36	61.54	82 4	
1981	73.02	Weir	60.54	50.22	88 3	84.40	Ottley	74.14	62.74	81 3	
1982	75.08	Weir	62.82	50.74	84 2	85.36	Ottley	73.74	63.56	88 4	
1983	75.40	Black	62.28	50.80	85 5	85.34	Bradstock	72.78	62.60	74 4	
1984	77.54	Girvan	63.74	50.12	92 4	88.26	Bradstock	74.48	62.82	91 4	
1985	77.30	Smith	62.32	49.98	91 3	91.40	Bradstock	77.42	64.22	98 5	
1986	76.60	Smith	62.78	50.92	92 3	86.28	Brand	75.98	62.06	87 5	

new javelin specification introduced in 1986

									57m		
						81.74	Bradstock	69.80		
1987	74.50	Smith	62.60	51.68	115 2	85.24	Hill	73.26	60.16	89 6	
1988	75.00	Smith	63.12	52.20	112 2	81.30	Hill	72.58	60.20	76 5	
1989	71.32	Head	63.76	52.02	102 0	85.90	Backley	73.36	60.60	95 6	
1990	74.02	Head	62.82	50.74	100 4	90.98	Backley	73.80	60.08	94 5	
1991	73.64	Head	62.44	51.66	108 3	91.36	Backley	76.10	61.22	107 7	
1992	73.80	Byrne	62.92	52.00	117 2	91.46	Backley	71.86	61.04	101 5	
1993	73.44	Head	64.18	53.64	115 3	86.94	Hill	71.96	61.54	96 5	
1994	71.16	Head	65.24	54.12	115+ 1	86.36	Hill	70.54	60.34	91 7	
1995	71.52	D Smith II	62.96	53.04	110 2	88.54	Backley	68.34	61.14	87 6	
1996	75.10	D Smith II	63.54	52.50	104 3	87.44	Backley	70.38	60.06	87 7	
1997	73.88	D Smith II	63.72	52.24	107 2	89.02	Backley	70.82	60.42	84 5	
1998	74.02	Jones	66.35	52.74	106 3	89.89	Backley	71.14	59.65	74 6	
1999	75.20	Jones	64.96	52.11	98 2	87.59	Backley	68.80	58.09	63 5	
2000	75.94	Jones	64.39	53.07	100 2	89.85	Backley	68.27	58.91	66 5	
2001	76.43	Jones	63.83	52.50	94 3	90.81	Backley	68.08	58.64	60 5	
2002	73.99	Jones	63.83	50.48	78 1	88.54	Backley	69.56	58.84	68 4	
2003	73.16	Jones	63.57	50.22	77 2	85.69	Backley	68.22	58.04	58 4	
2004	73.63	Jones	63.85	50.17	81 2	84.13	Backley	69.14	58.97	63 3	
2005	72.09	Frost	63.88	50.12	81 1	79.56	Nieland	69.68	58.92	60 2	
2006	72.62	Frost	62.42	49.46	85 2	84.70	Nieland	67.94	57.20	52 2	
2007	72.27	Frost	63.06	50.54	82 1	79.04	Nieland	68.70	58.68	61 2	
2008	69.68	Floyd	64.29	50.49	83 0	76.38	Allen	70.64	58.85	62 1	
2009	70.81	Dry	65.01	52.19	96 1	81.05	Luckwell	70.75	59.06	61 1	
2010	72.95	A Smith	67.62	50.69	88 4	80.38	Campbell	71.10	59.88	65 2	

20 KILOMETRES WALK			10th	50th	ToWld	50KM WALK			10th	50th	ToWld
Best					1:40	Best					5:00
No. in brackets - in world top 50											
1958	1:32:38	Vickers	1:40:42		6	2	4:20:32	Misson	4:47:07		? (3)
1959	1:30:08	Matthews	1:41:42		7	3	4:12:19	Thompson	4:47:02		16 (2)
1960	1:28:15	Matthews	1:39:51		10	3	4:17:30	Thompson	5:00:08		9 (3)
1961	1:29:11	Matthews	1:41:21		8	5?	4:22:31	Thompson	4:48:14		19 (2)
1962	1:31:02	Matthews	1:38:02		13	1	4:27:26	Thompson	4:51:32		14 (2)
1963	1:30:10	Matthews	1:40:47		8	2	4:16:44	Middleton	4:41:59		20+ (5)
1964	1:28:46	Matthews	1:37:36		16	5	4:11:32	Nihill	4:41:55		25 (6)
1965	1:31:52	Fullager	1:38:15		13	3	4:17:23	Middleton	4:49:48		19 (3)
1966	1:31:35	Fullager	1:38:16		15	3	4:23:01	Middleton	4:56:25		14 4
1967	1:31:14	Nihill	1:38:24		16	3	4:25:21	Thompson	4:50:24		16 4
1968	1:29:59	Webb	1:34:51		27	4	4:18:59	Nihill	4:46:58		17 5
1969	1:28:29	Nihill	1:34:27		30+	7	4:19:13	Eley	4:37:03		29 (2)
1970	1:30:35	Fullager	1:34:13		30+	6	4:19:58	Middleton	4:41:20		22 (2)
1971	1:27:35	Nihill	1:34:08		30	4	4:15:05	Nihill	4:37:34		31+ (4)
1972	1:24:50	Nihill	1:33:50		36	4	4:12:37	Warhurst	4:34:08		34 (3)
1973	1:29:37	Warhurst	1:33:20		41	5	4:14:29	Dobson	4:32:39		38+ 7
1974	1:28:50	Seddon	1:33:26		37	6	4:11:22	Dobson	4:35:19		29 3
1975	1:27:46	Adams	1:34:07		36	4	4:14:35	Warhurst	4:39:56		35 2
1976	1:27:35	Flynn	1:33:50		46	4	4:09:39	Dobson	4:32:05		38 2
1977	1:28:42	Flynn	1:32:53	1:39:08	59	2	4:15:52	Dobson	4:34:05		41 2
1978	1:28:44	Flynn	1:33:47	1:40:02	49	3	4:08:39	Dobson	4:28:56		45 3
1979	1:27:25	Mills	1:33:23		43	0	4:07:23	Dobson	4:26:50		41 1
1980	1:27:00	Mills	1:30:22	1:38:46	55	0	4:05:14	Maddocks	4:24:13	4:58:17	50 2
1981	1:26:18	Barry	1:32:28	1:40:10e	48	1	4:10:46	Graham	4:25:45		46 3
1982	1:25:00	Barry	1:32:10	1:41e	45	2	4:12:27	Graham	4:31:14		31 0
1983	1:22:51	Barry	1:32:34	1:38:34	59	1	4:02:38	Maddocks	4:28:59		42 1
1984	1:24:14	McCombie	1:32:01	1:39:42	52	3	4:02:00	Maddocks	4:29:03	4:59:51	50 1
1985	1:22:37	McCombie	1:29:44	1:39:48	50	2	4:06:14	Graham	4:27:33		29 2
1986	1:23:24	McCombie	1:30:31	1:40:xx	45	2	4:03:08	Jackson	4:26:53		33 3
1987	1:23:26	McCombie	1:30:52		36	4	3:59:55	Vesty	4:28:24		28 2
1988	1:22:03	McCombie	1:29:48		37	2	3:58:25	Morton	4:30:19		26 2
1989	1:22:35	Maddocks	1:29:44		29	3	3:57:48	Morton	4:39:30		21 1
1990	1:23:27	McCombie	1:30:31		26	2	3:51:37	Maddocks	4:34:18		19 3
1991	1:24:06	Rush	1:31:21		33	0	4:02:11	Morton	4:32:17		20 2
1992	1:22:12	Maddocks	1:29:20		27	4	3:58:36	Morton	4:38:12		15 2
1993	1:25:57	Penn	1:34:28		29	0	4:03:55	Morton	4:48:51		14 1
1994	1:26:11	Bell	1:34:28		19	0	4:32:25	Morton	5:00:00+		9 0
1995	1:24:49	Stone	1:34:22		19	0	3:53:14	Maddocks	4:49:40		12 2
1996	1:23:58	Stone	1:34:27		21	0	4:18:41	Maddocks	4:48:01		17 0
1997	1:25:53	Stone	1:32:22		24	0	4:05:42	Maddocks	4:46:54		12 1
1998	1:26:37	Stone	1:33:00		22	0	4:03:53	Easton	4:55:36		11 1
1999	1:25:10	Stone	1:31:45		20	0	4:07:49	Cheeseman	--		6 0
2000	1:25:56	Drake	1:32:33		13	0	3:57:10	Maddocks	4:51:31		13 1
2001	1:28:18	Penn	1:35:03		14	0	4:09:27	Hollier	4:55:53		10 0
2002	1:24:43	Drake	1:33:11		16	0	4:11:29	Easton	4:56:55		11 0
2003	1:28:52	Penn	1:40:++		8	0	4:24:54	Penn	--		1 0
2004	1:27:51	Dan King	1:39:04		11	0	4:26:06	Partington	--		3 0
2005	1:29:13	Penn	1:40:+		8	0	4:17:40	Partington	--		4 0
2006	1:29:35	Partington	1:38:45		10	0	4:25:39	Partington	5:49:48		2 0
2007	1:28:26	Dan King	1:47:32		6	0	4:13:36	Dan King	5:37:01		2 0
2008	1:26:14	Dan King	1:42:19		7	0	4:04:49	Dan King	5:27:52		4 1
2009	1:28:31	Luke Finch	1:45:39		6	0	4:22:22	Davis	over 6hr		2 0
2010	1:25:46	Wright	1:35:29		10	0	4:28:29	Davis	5:57:25		3 0

50kmW: 1958- 10 men to 4:47:07, 1963 - 20 to 4:51:30, 1971- 31 to 4:56:20, 1973- 38 to 4:55

WOMEN

100 METRES			10th	50th	ToWld	200 METRES			10th	50th	ToWld
	Best				12.1	Best					25.1
1958	10.6y	Young	12.1	12.45	14 (3)	23.8*	Young	25.0	26.1	16 (6)	
1959	10.8y	three women!	12.0	12.45	22 (3)	23.9*	Hiscox	24.7	25.8	21(10)	
1960	11.5	Hyman	12.0	12.35	25 (2)	23.7	Hyman	24.9	25.9	17 (5)	
1961	11.5	Smart	12.0	12.35	25 (4)	23.7	Smart	24.9	26.0	15 (5)	
1962	11.5	Hyman	11.9	12.35	27 (3)	23.4	Hyman	24.9	25.9	14 (7)	
1963	11.3	Hyman	11.9	12.35	24 (4)	23.2	Hyman	24.9	25.9	16 (6)	
1964	11.5	Hyman	11.8	12.35	28 (5)	23.5*	Arden	24.6	25.5	29 (6)	
1965	11.6	three women!	11.9	12.35	24 (5)	23.8	Simpson/Tranter	24.5	25.8e	27 (5)	
1966	11.6	Tranter	12.0	12.35	26 5	23.94	Tranter	24.5	25.5	34 11	
1967	11.4	James	11.9	12.35	36 5	23.8	James/Tranter	24.4	25.5	26 9	
1968	11.3	Peat, James	11.8	12.2	42 8	23.42A	Board	24.2	25.2	48 11	
1969	11.5	Neil, Hyman	11.8	12.2	36 6	23.3	Peat	24.2	25.3	38 10	
1970	11.4	Pear	11.8	12.2	48 4	23.2	Critchley	24.1	25.1	50 8	
1971	11.3	Neil	12.0	12.2	38 1	23.7	Critchley	24.3	25.2	45 5	
1972	11.4	Neil/Lynch	11.7	12.2	40 4	23.4	Critchley	24.0	25.0	51 9	
1973	11.2	Lynch	11.8	12.2	35 3	23.14	Golden	24.0	25.2	48 6	
1974	11.1	Lynch (11.27)	11.8	12.1	51 4	23.0	Golden	23.8	25.0	59 7	
1975	11.1	Lynch (11.16)	11.7	12.1	56 3	23.1	Lannaman	24.0	25.0	70 5	
1976	11.22	Lynch	11.6	12.1	58 3	22.81	Lannaman	23.6	24.8	64 11	
1977	10.9	Lynch (11.22)	11.7	12.1	60 5	22.83	Lannaman	23.89	24.8	81 7	
1978	11.2	Lynch	11.7	12.1	56 7	22.75	Hartley	23.61	24.8	74 10	
1979	11.22A	Callender	11.7	12.1	56 5	22.70A	Smallwood	23.78	24.8	88 5	
	Best			12.19/12.0		Best				25.19/25.0	
1980	11.20	L'man/Hunte	11.75	12.1	51 6	22.31	Smallwood	23.71	24.8	84 8	
1981	11.10	Smallwood	11.78	12.1	43 4	22.58	Smallwood	23.94	24.8	91 7	
1982	11.31	Hoyte	11.63	12.0	60 9	22.13	Smallwood-Cook	23.46	24.6	99 10	
1983	11.13	Cook	11.63	12.0	60 8	22.26	Cook	23.55	24.6	108 8	
1984	11.24	Cook	11.57	12.0	69 8	22.10	Cook	23.50	24.62	118 7	
1985	11.33	Oakes (Hunte)	11.67	12.0	58 3	22.87	Cook	23.83	24.6	103 2	
1986	11.22	Oakes	11.74	12.0	65 4	22.92	Oakes	23.82	24.56	116 3	
1987	11.27	Dunn	11.63	12.0	65 4	23.17	Dunn	23.79	24.6	99 1	
1988	11.26	Dunn	11.71	12.25	64 2	22.79	Dunn	23.91	24.82	107 1	
1989	11.24	Dunn	11.76	12.18	67 3	23.27	Stoute	23.78	24.94	103 3	
1990	11.29	Kinch	11.66	12.17	70 5	23.07	Stoute	23.59	24.87	98 6	
1991	11.27	Douglas	11.67	12.22	55 5	23.12	Jacobs	23.70	24.82	100 3	
1992	11.39	Short	11.68	c.12.32	51 2	22.73	Stoute	23.88	25.04	83 4	
1993	11.37	Kinch	11.61	12.22	73 2	23.20	Merry	23.71	24.78	97 3	
1994	11.15	Thomas (Dunn)	11.78	12.14	63 5	22.69	Thomas (Dunn)	23.68	24.82	110 3	
1995	11.30	Douglas	11.69	12.22	58 4	22.89	Thomas	23.81	24.72	117 2	
1996	11.39	Jacobs	11.68	12.16	65 2	22.88	Merry	23.75	24.81	91 2	
1997	11.43	Merry	11.66	12.14	62 0	22.77	Merry	23.71	24.69	95 4	
1998	11.32	Maduaka	11.71	12.19	58 2	22.93	Merry	23.94	24.73	87 3	
1999	11.24	Maduaka	11.66	12.17	62 2	22.83	Maduaka	23.59	24.83	109 5	
2000	11.34	Anderson	11.58	12.11	59 2	22.76	Merry	23.59	24.61	113 5	
2001	11.29	Oyepitan	11.66	12.13	63 4	22.93	V James	23.66	24.80	104 4	
2002	11.31	Maduaka	11.66	12.14	66 5	22.93	V James	23.78	24.75	98 3	
2003	11.29	Maduaka	11.76	12.15	58 2	22.92	Maduaka	23.86	24.75	103 3	
2004	11.17	Oyepitan	11.68	12.16	59 2	22.50	Oyepitan	23.60	24.58	110 3	
2005	11.35	Ania	11.65	12.06	73 2	23.21	Fraser	23.86	24.59	117 2	
2006	11.23	Maduaka	11.57	12.04	83 5	23.08	Oyepitan	23.56	24.64	115 3	
2007	11.19	Turner	11.59	12.09	75 6	23.05	Kwakyie	23.38	24.54	102 4	
2008	11.05	Douglas	11.41	12.06	79 5	22.72	Freeman	23.42	24.51	114 4	
2009	11.33	Freeman	11.51	12.03	75 6	22.64	Freeman	23.38	24.55	120 6	
2010	11.11	Turner	11.46	12.02	77 5	22.79	Williams	23.48	24.77	110 4	

! 1959: 10.8y Hyman, Quinton, Hoskin, 1965 11.6 Simpson, Gill, Hall; 200m: 1999 - also Merry 22.83i

400 METRES			10th	50th	ToWld	800 METRES			10th	50th	ToWld
	Best				57.0	Best				2:12.0	
1958	55.3*	Hiscox	57.8	61.6	7 (7)	2:06.6	Leather	2:17.3	c.2:28	5 (5)	
1959	54.0	Hiscox	57.7	61.5	5 (5)	2:07.3*	Jordan	2:16.4	c.2:29	3 (3)	
1960	55.3	Jordan	58.1	61.6e	5 (4)	2:05.3*	Jordan	2:15.8	2:28.6e	6 (3)	
1961	54.6	Dunbar	57.8	61.0e	5 (4)	2:06.6	Jordan	2:14.5	2:25.3e	3 (3)	
1962	53.9	Grieveson	57.7	60.8	7 (6)	2:05.0	Jordan	2:14.5	2:25.6	7 (6)	
1963	53.2	Grieveson	57.1	60.3	9 (4)	2:07.0	A Smith	2:14.3	2:23.4	5 (3)	
1964	52.2	Packer	56.7	59.7	12 (5)	2:01.1	Packer	2:12.3	2:22.1	9 (6)	
1965	54.1	Grieveson	56.8	59.7	16 (4)	2:05.3	A Smith	2:11.6	2:19.7	11 (5)	
1966	53.8*	Watkinson	55.8	59.0	17 13	2:03.2	A Smith	2:08.8	2:19.3	19 14	
1967	52.8	Board	56.2	58.5	24 9	2:03.6	A Smith	2:09.8*	2:18.0	15 10	
1968	52.12A	Board	55.6	58.3	25 10	2:02.0	Board	2:08.0	2:17.6	17 12	
1969	53.6	Simpson	55.7	58.1	27 9	2:01.50	Board	2:07.9	2:16.3	16 12	
1970	53.6	Board	55.0	57.8	31 10	2:03.6	Carey	2:07.1	2:16.0	25 13	
1971	53.2	Stirling	55.2	58.1	32 6	2:01.66	Cropper	2:06.4	2:15.0	28 14	
1972	52.9	Bernard	55.3	57.7	34 5	2:00.15	Stirling	2:07.7	2:15.0	24 7	
1973	52.1	Bernard	55.2	57.4	41 2	2:01.2	Allison	2:06.50	2:13.0	34 9	
1974	51.77	Murray	54.88	57.3	43 7	2:02.8	Kiernan	2:08.5	2:13.5	34 4	
1975	51.28	Murray	54.68	57.1	45 5	2:03.53	C McMeekin	2:07.4	2:12.8	44 7	
1976	51.4	Elder (Bernard)	54.09	57.2	44 6	2:01.35	Barnes	2:06.94	2:12.4	48 6	
1977	51.5	Murray-Hartley	54.2	57.0	52 6	2:00.6	J Colebrook	2:04.68	2:10.8	65 12	
1978	51.2	Hartley	53.98	56.5	73 5	2:01.2	C McMeekin	2:03.69	2:10.2	68 10	
1979	51.47	Hartley	54.09	56.20	75 7	1:59.05	Boxer	2:04.15	2:10.44	81 6	
1980	50.88	Hoyte-Smith	53.9	56.2	86 5	1:59.53	Boxer	2:03.68	2:09.7	82 6	
1981	51.08	Smallwood	53.76	56.1	90 7	2:00.02	Boxer	2:04.25	2:10.1	89 5	
1982	50.46	Cook	53.0	55.8	105+ 7	1:59.93	Boxer	2:03.14	2:09.6	87 6	
1983	50.95	Cook	53.4	56.1	90 4	1:59.54	Bailey	2:04.73	2:09.9	90 7	
1984	49.43	Cook	53.46	55.84	110 5	2:00.03	Baker	2:02.75	2:09.6	93 4	
1985	51.36	Cook	53.53	55.9	100 4	1:57.42	McDermott	2:05.2	2:09.5	90 4	
1986	51.88	Cook	53.65	55.7	100+ 2	1:59.67	Baker	2:02.25	2:09.1	112 7	
1987	52.74	Hall	53.68	55.6	98 0	1:58.45	Wade	2:03.44	2:09.45	105 5	
1988	51.65	Keough	53.57	55.7	99 3	1:59.66	Edwards	2:03.49	2:09.5	90 5	
1989	51.09	Keough	53.73	56.0	91 4	1:59.71	Edwards	2:02.87	2:09.00	96 9	
1990	51.20	Keough	53.97	56.53	76 5	1:58.65	Modahl	2:04.31	2:09.26	93 5	
1991	50.93	Hanson	53.9	55.86	94 7	1:59.76	Fryer	2:02.99	2:09.51	95 8	
1992	50.40	P Smith	53.76	56.2	78 5	1:59.96	Modahl	2:03.5	2:09.80	91 7	
1993	51.29	Gunnell	54.1	56.45	73 3	1:58.64	Holmes	2:04.17	2:09.7	80 3	
1994	51.04	Gunnell	53.9	55.83	84 3	1:59.43	Holmes	2:03.75	2:09.5	80 4	
1995	51.18	Neef	53.58	56.02	87 5	1:56.21	Holmes	2:05.3	2:10.37	73 5	
1996	51.29	P Smith	53.52	56.35	84 3	1:57.84	Holmes	2:04.87	2:09.5	88 5	
1997	50.78	Curbishley	54.17	56.4	83 4	1:57.14	Holmes	2:04.2	2:09.71	82 4	
1998	50.71	Curbishley	53.79	56.17	83 3	1:58.81	Modahl	2:04.98	2:10.5	72 5	
1999	50.21	Merry	53.81	55.99	80 5	1:58.24	Holmes	2:06.1	2:10.33	79 3	
2000	49.72	Merry	53.41	55.8	89 3	1:56.80	Holmes	2:04.15	2:09.78	89 4	
2001	49.59	Merry	53.29	55.79	84 7	1:57.88	Holmes	2:04.70	2:09.3	90 3	
2002	50.82	McConnell	53.84	56.01	82 4	1:59.30	Scott	2:03.86	2:10.2	76 5	
2003	51.06	McConnell	53.78	55.91	77 3	1:58.69	Holmes	2:03.93	2:08.9	91 6	
2004	50.50	Ohuruogu	53.10	56.07	82 4	1:56.38	Holmes	2:03.71	2:09.0	100 4	
2005	50.73	Ohuruogu	53.01	55.86	95 5	2:01.17	Scott	2:03.53	2:08.7	105 5	
2006	50.28	Ohuruogu	53.46	56.07	81 3	1:58.20	Lyne	2:02.79	2:08.53	102 8	
2007	49.61	Ohuruogu	53.09	55.43	90 4	1:58.76	Okoro	2:01.78	2:08.2	104 11	
2008	49.62	Ohuruogu	53.11	55.82	92 3	1:58.45	Okoro	2:03.27	2:08.20	125 8	
2009	50.21	Ohuruogu	53.53	55.74	96 5	1:57.93	Meadows	2:02.70	2:07.40	123 8	
2010	50.88	Ohuruogu	53.11	55.74	91 5	1:58.53i	Meadows	2:01.88	2:08.49	110 11	

1500 METRES/1 MILE		10th	50th	ToWld	3000 METRES		10th	50th	ToWld
Best				4:32	Best				9:55
1958	5:02.6M M Smith	4:52.9		0	x				
1959	4:36.6 Byatt	4:54.1		0	x				
1960	4:54.2M Ashby	4:59.7		0	x				
1961	4:58.5M Joyce	4:57.6		0	x				
1962	4:57.8M Ibbotson	4:55.6		0	x				
1963	4:57.0M Perkins	4:53.1		0	x				
1964	4:56.0M Leggett	4:46.4		0	x				
1965	4:46.3M A Smith	4:43.7		3	x	11:14.0M Buchanan	(M = 2 miles time)		
1966	4:44.2M A Smith	4:44.2		3	x				
1967	4:37.0M A Smith	4:38.4		3	11				
1968	4:45.7M I Lincoln	4:40.6		4	9	9:59.6 R Lincoln			
1969	4:15.9 Ridley	4:30.3	4:57.8	10	11	9:54.4 Banks	10:54.2		1
1970	4:15.4 Ridley	4:23.8	4:46.2	15	12	9:52.2 J Smith	10:38.2		1
1971	4:12.7 Ridley	4:25.4	4:45.3	14	10	9:23.4 J Smith	10:04.2		5
1972	4:04.81 Carey	4:27.8	4:44.2	17	7	9:05.8 J Smith	9:45.2	10:49.2	12 13
1973	4:12.17 Allison	4:21.74	4:39.2	23	11	9:08.0 J Smith	9:48.2	10:30.2	14 8
1974	4:10.66 Allison	4:24.5	4:39.57	29	7	8:55.53 J Smith	9:39.49	10:27.0	12 9
1975	4:11.2 Allison	4:21.6	4:37.56	36	7	9:12.07 J Smith	9:32.84	10:10.0	24 7
1976	4:06.4 Stewart	4:19.74	4:37.0	30	5	9:06.70 Ford	9:40.6	10:18.0	25 4
1977	4:08.1i Stewart	4:17.9	4:32.7	47	10	8:52.79 Ford	9:24.64	10:03.0	41 10
1978	4:06.0 Stewart	4:14.58	4:29.8	56	11	8:48.74 Fudge	9:18.9	10:03.2	39 11
1979	4:01.53 Benning	4:15.45	4:28.4	69	7	9:00.14 Benning	9:19.17	10:00.0	40 5
1980	4:08.92 Marlow	4:16.42	4:29.7	64	6	8:53.78 W Smith	9:19.95	9:57.4	44 8
1981	4:09.57 Benning	4:12.71	4:26.7	75	10	8:54.59 Fudge	9:05.98	9:45.1	68 11
1982	4:04.48 Boxer	4:14.82	4:26.06	88	7	8:46.01 Smith-Sly	9:06.04	9:45.0	73 11
1983	4:04.14 Sly	4:14.47	4:26.30	85	5	8:37.06 Sly	9:11.8	9:43.2	65 8
1984	4:00.57 Boxer	4:10.76	4:26.25	91	7	8:40.22 Budd	8:58.54	9:41.1	77 11
1985	3:59.96 Budd	4:13.9	4:26.0	98	7	8:28.83 Budd	9:07.02	9:44.6	73 9
1986	4:01.93 Budd	4:11.48	4:25.9	98	10	8:38.20 Budd	9:07.91	9:43.9	92 8
1987	4:00.73 Wade	4:11.27	4:25.77	99	10	8:39.85 McColgan	9:06.37	9:36.54	99 7
1988	4:00.64 Boxer	4:12.72	4:26.4	96	7	8:29.02 Murray	9:02.23	9:36.8	100 8
1989	4:03.13 Murray	4:11.24	4:26.6	90	14	8:34.80i McColgan	9:08.96	9:39.0	91 7
1990	4:05.66 Nicholson	4:10.77	4:24.73	88	14	8:39.46 Murray	9:03.88	9:40.5	101 12
1991	4:05.16 Wade	4:12.6	4:25.81	97	11	8:36.05 Murray	9:03.12	9:37.0	105 8
1992	4:05.52 Wyeth	4:11.78	4:25.6	84	10	8:36.63 Murray	9:05.33	9:33.42	106 8
1993	4:03.17 Wyeth	4:14.33	4:27.40	79	7	8:30.30 Murray	9:15.08	9:41.3	92 3
1994	4:01.41 Holmes	4:13.50	4:25.9	78	10	<u>8:29.60 Murray</u>	<u>9:17.4</u>	<u>9:42.1</u>	<u>78 4</u>
1995	4:03.04 Holmes	4:14.42	4:29.09	64	9	8:40.82 Radcliffe	9:17.19	9:51.1	57 x
1996	4:01.13 Holmes	4:15.68	4:27.13	73	5	8:37.07 Radcliffe	9:22.2	9:47.9	62 x
1997	3:58.07 Holmes	4:15.92	4:26.35	74	4	8:35.28 Radcliffe	9:25.1	9:49.50	66 x
1998	4:05.81 Radcliffe	4:18.24	4:27.44	72	4	8:38.84 Radcliffe	9:17.03	9:40.6	81 x
1999	4:04.58 Holmes	4:16.64	4:27.6	74	5	8:27.40 Radcliffe	9:19.52	9:52.4	59 x
2000	4:01.23 Tullett	4:17.45	4:25.5	85	4	8:28.85 Radcliffe	9:12.45	9:36.98	83 x
2001	4:03.54 Tullett	4:14.14	4:27.45	79	5	8:26.97 Radcliffe	9:08.7	9:45.5	74 x
2002	4:01.10 Pattinson	4:13.0	4:28.07	83	8	8:22.20 Radcliffe	9:18.11	9:46.3	68 x
2003	3:59.95 Tullett	4:14.10	4:27.38	80	4	8:37.89 Pavey	9:19.41	9:49.7	75 x
2004	3:57.90 Holmes	4:14.00	4:26.92	95	6	8:34.55i Pavey	9:15.18	9:43.1	73 x
2005	4:05.19 Clitheroe	4:15.00	4:25.39	96	5	8:33.79 Pavey	9:12.20	9:41.64	86 x
2006	4:05.46 Clitheroe	4:12.76	4:24.36	103	7	8:38.80 Pavey	9:10.54	9:39.36	86 x
2007	4:05.81i Clitheroe	4:11.96	4:23.34	114	9	8:31.50i Pavey	9:10.44	9:39.48	97 x
2008	4:00.64 Dobriskey	4:11.29	4:24.31	117	9	8:50.42i Dobriskey	9:06.78	9:39.22	99 x
2009	3:59.50 Dobriskey	4:12.01	4:23.50	114	9	8:50.37 Kenney	9:09.65	9:36.2	101 x
2010	3:59.79 Dobriskey	4:10.41	4:24.07	115	10	8:42.75 Twell	9:10.76	9:35.60	102 x

Mile equivalents: 5:02.6 to 4:39.9. Clitheroe (née Pattinson)

Note that the 5000m replaced the 3000m as the standard women's distance in 1995.

5000 METRES			10th	50th	ToWld	10000 METRES			10th	50th	ToWld
	Best				17:00	Best					36:30
1980	15:49.6	Binns			4	32:57.17	Binns				5
1981	15:14.51	Fudge			6	33:56.3	Binns				5
1982	15:19.63	Fudge	16:50.77		11 (3)	39:15.75	Boddy				0 0
1983	15:52.55	Murray	16:46.31		13 (3)	35:18.86	King				2 0
1984	15:22.50	A Tooby	16:31.0		14 (5)	32:58.07	A Tooby	36:36.0			8 3
1985	14:48.07	Budd	16:19.97		18 7	33:04.66	A Tooby	35:50.54 -			11 5
1986	15:28.16	A Tooby	16:28.32		15 3	31:41.42	Lynch	33:40.6			18 6
1987	15:01.08	McColgan	16:17.59		22 7	31:19.82	McColgan (Lynch)	35:01.92			12 4
1988	15:03.29	McColgan	16:19.93		23 5	31:06.99	McColgan	34:52.5			12 5
1989	15:14.54	McColgan	16:19.34		25 c.9	32:36.09	Titterington	34:00.4			23 5
1990	15:19.85	Hunter	16:36.1		21 7	31:55.80	Hunter	34:24.02			20 6
1991	15:26+	McColgan	16:44.15		15 2	30:57.07	McColgan	34:26.33			14 3
1992	15:01.86	McColgan	16:16.87		30 3	31:26.11	McColgan	34:07.24			16 4
1993	15:57.67	Rigg	16:53.1		14 2	32:32.42	McPherson	35:43.94			14 3
1994	15:10.38	Wyeth	16:23.85		27 1	31:56.97	Murray	33:57.86			23 3
1995	14:49.27	Radcliffe	16:14.00	17:23.8	32 5	31:40.14	McColgan	35:29.77			13 3
1996	14:46.76	Radcliffe	16:23.86	17:28.0	31 2	33:17.74	McPherson	34:30.5			16 0
1997	14:45.51	Radcliffe	16:16.01	17:21.5	30 3	32:51.02	McPherson	36:49.20			9 1
1998	14:51.27	Radcliffe	15:57.45	17:28.05	36 1	30:48.58	Radcliffe	34:38.11			23 2
1999	14:43.54	Radcliffe	16:02.66	17:35e	32 2	30:27.13	Radcliffe	34:59.7			16 1
2000	14:44.36	Radcliffe	15:56.64	17:25.69	40 2	30:26.97	Radcliffe	34:39.8			16 2
2001	14:32.44	Radcliffe	16:10.26	17:29.4	34 4	30:55.80	Radcliffe	34:52.41			15 2
2002	14:31.42	Radcliffe	15:59.54	17:15.82	36 4	30:01.09	Radcliffe	34:05.1			25 3
2003	15:09.04	Pavey	16:14.78	17:40e	28 3	32:02.09	H Yelling	34:29.6			13 2
2004	14:29.11	Radcliffe	16:00.62	17:28.43	38 6	30:17.15	Radcliffe	34:07.53			16 4
2005	14:40.71	Pavey	16:03.00	17:12.22	46 5	30:42.75	Radcliffe	34:21.51			23 3
2006	14:39.96	Pavey	15:53.9	17:29.64	34 3	31:49.40	Yamauchi	34:35.16			14 3
2007	15:04.77	Pavey	16:07.72	17:35.06	33 2	31:26.94	Pavey	35:11.30			17 3
2008	14:58.62	Pavey	16:04.65	17:22.20	38 2	31:12.30	Pavey	34:55.84			12 4
2009	15:18.47	Twell	16:04.25	17:33.41	36 3	33:10.73	Hallissey	36:02.73			13 0
2010	14:54.08	Twell	15:55.18	17:08.5	46 5	31:51.91	Pavey	34:17.71			18 4

MARATHON

			10th	50th	ToWld
	Best				3:00
1976	2:50:55	Readdy	3:14:31		3
1977	2:57:44	Adams	3:23:20		2
1978	2:50:54	Cox	3:16:19		5
1979	2:36:27	J Smith	2:55:02		15 7
1980	2:30:27	J Smith	2:53:15		14 6
1981	2:29:57	J Smith	2:45:46	3:06:38	29 10
1982	2:29:43	J Smith	2:45:32	2:59:32	33 4
1983	2:32:31	Welch	2:40:32	2:55:00	69 7
1984	2:28:54	Welch	2:41:41	2:55:01	76 9
1985	2:28:04	Marot	2:37:06	2:52:28	90 14
1986	2:31:33	Marot	2:39:20	2:54:45	70 8
1987	2:26:51	Welch	2:38:36	2:56:54	59 7
1988	2:29:47	Fudge	2:36:49	2:55:37	64 9
1989	2:25:56	Marot	2:36:32	2:54:01	73 10
1990	2:31:09	Marot	2:42:42	2:57:49	57 5
1991	2:27:32	McColgan	2:39:00	2:56:35	57 5
1992	2:27:38	McColgan	2:41:35	2:58:22	55 4
1993	2:29:37	McColgan	2:42:49	3:00:29	47 4
1994	2:32:24	Danson	2:40:09	2:56:56	61 2
1995	2:30:32	McColgan	2:39:59	3:02:03	44 3
1996	2:27:54	McColgan	2:45:12	3:04:49	38 2

							10th	50th	ToWld
1997	2:26:52	McColgan	2:43:20	2:59:28	53 2	3000m STEEPLE			
1998	2:26:54	McColgan	2:48:47	3:02:40	39 2				11:30
1999	2:28:42	Sutton	2:46:54	2:59:14	56 1				
2000	2:33:41	Reinsford	2:44:07	2:59:31	51 0	10:08.11			1 x
2001	2:34:43	Allott	2:45:23	2:59:39	50 0	9:52.71			6 2
2002	2:17:18	Radcliffe	2:42:30	3:00:22	48 1	10:23.21			6 1
2003	2:15:25	Radcliffe	2:45:48	3:00:54	45 2	10:13.69	Parker	11:12.10	11 3
2004	2:23:10	Radcliffe	2:41:44	2:58:41	59 1	10:00.89	T Brown	10:54.16	17 3
2005	2:17:42	Radcliffe	2:38:25	2:54:30	88 3	9:48.57	T Brown	10:33.06	19 4
2006	2:25:13	Yamauchi	2:41:48	2:55:58	87 2	9:48.51	Hall	10:24.29	17 6
2007	2:23:09	Radcliffe	2:45:54	2:56:28	72 4	9:38.56	Dean	10:24.34	20 4
2008	2:23:56	Radcliffe	2:43:12	2:55:28	76 4	9:29.14	Clitheroe	10:48.55	18 5
2009	2:23:12	Yamauchi	2:42:51	2:58:32	62 2	9:34.66	Clitheroe	10:38.37	15 4
2010	2:26:16	Yamauchi	2:38:45	2:55:19	94 1	9:30.19	Dean	10:28.29	24 5

80 METRES HURDLES

			10th	50th	ToWld
				11.7	50
1958	10.9	Quinton	11.6	12.5	15 (2)
1959	11.0	Bignal	11.5	12.5	15 (2)
1960	10.9	Quinton	11.6	12.5	14 (2)
1961	10.9	Charlesworth	11.7	12.4	13 (5)
1962	11.0*	Nutting	11.6	12.5	17 (2)
1963	10.8	Rand/Nutting	11.6	12.5	12 (2)
1964	10.7	Pryce	11.5	12.2	24 (3)
1965	10.9	Rand	11.5	12.2	19 (1)
1966	11.0	Rand	11.4	12.2	22 3
1967	10.6	P Jones	11.4	12.0	29 3
1968	10.7	Pryce	11.4	12.0	29 6

		10th	50th	ToWld			10th	50th	ToWld
100 METRES HURDLES				15.25/15.1	400 METRES HURDLES				65.0
1969	13.9	Perera/Garnett	14.5	15.7	26	4			
1970	13.4	Bell (Perrera)	14.3	15.6	37	6			
1971	13.7	A Wilson	14.4	15.6	37	2	61.1	Dyson	5 x
1972	13.2	Vernon	14.2	15.7	33	5		no races	
1973	13.34	Judy Vernon	14.3	15.5	28	2	59.87	Vernon	66.9
1974	13.0	Vernon/Thompson	14.1	15.4	38	6	58.0	Warden	64.3 70.0
1975	13.51	Colyear	14.2	15.4	43	5	58.31	Roscoe	62.69 66.5
1976	13.11	Colyear	14.14	15.4	37	5	57.84	Warden	63.04 67.1
1977	13.31	Colyear	14.15	15.1	53	6	57.59	Sutherland	61.36 65.9
1978	13.08	Boothe	13.99	14.9	67	7	57.0	Warden	60.5 64.2
1979	13.21	Strong	13.9	14.9	63	6	56.06	Warden	59.95 64.1
1980	13.06	Strong	14.19	14.8	81	6	56.76	Warden	59.7 63.5
1981	13.14	Strong	14.17	14.7	85	5	56.46	Wray	59.3 63.4
1982	13.07	Boothe	14.00	14.62	95	5	57.03	Morley	59.0 62.5
1983	12.87	Strong	13.62	14.6	97	6	56.04	Morley	59.14 63.32
1984	12.88	Strong	13.66	14.6	89	9	56.67	Morley	58.84 63.5
1985	13.09	Simpson	13.68	14.56	93	5	57.3	Wray	59.0 63.2
1986	13.05	Simpson	13.70	14.6	101	5	57.07	Wray	59.00 62.7
1987	13.01	Gunnell	13.62	14.7	102	4	57.48	McLaughlin	58.99 62.5
1988	12.82	Gunnell	13.68	14.7	80	4	54.03	Gunnell	58.60 62.64
1989	13.15	K Morley	13.66	14.6	104	6	54.64	Gunnell	59.12 63.4
1990	12.91	Morley	13.55	14.6	90	7	55.35	Gunnell	59.42 63.1
1991	13.02	Gunnell	13.47	14.9	69	9	53.16	Gunnell	59.61 63.31
1992	13.06	Morley-Brown	13.63	14.71	91	6	53.23	Gunnell	59.66 63.5
1993	13.03	Agyepong	13.65	14.72	96	7	52.74	Gunnell	59.46 63.1
1994	12.93	Agyepong	13.72	14.7	82	7	53.33	Gunnell	59.16 62.95
1995	12.90	Agyepong	13.62	14.84	98	5	56.50	Parker	59.9 63.2
1996	12.80	Thorpe	13.74	14.7	87	4	54.65	Gunnell	58.85 63.28
1997	13.03	Allahgreen	13.77	14.8	72	5	54.53	Gunnell	59.78 63.29
1998	13.11	Maddox	13.73	14.73	79	3	55.25	Retchakan	59.07 63.99
1999	12.95	Maddox	13.65	14.88	72	3	55.24	Dudgeon	60.1 64.19
2000	13.11	Allahgreen	13.55	14.78	82	5	54.95	Danvers	60.37 64.3
2001	13.08	Allahgreen	13.71	14.7	80	3	54.94	Danvers	60.28 63.96
2002	12.92	Allahgreen	13.72	14.55	87	5	55.68	Danvers	59.7 63.36
2003	12.96	Danvers	13.67	14.74	93	3	54.02	Danvers	59.29 64.35
2004	13.01	Claxton	13.54	14.71	78	3	56.73	Fairs	59.72 64.04
2005	12.96	Claxton	13.66	14.80	75	5	55.61	Sanders	58.62 64.02
2006	12.93	Claxton	13.79	14.86	80	5	54.82	Danvers	58.74 63.57
2007	12.97	Ennis	13.73	14.89	76	3	54.08	Danvers	58.38 63.67
2008	12.81	Claxton	13.68	14.79	77	3	53.84	Danvers	58.84 63.89
2009	12.81	Ennis	13.70	14.79	89	2	55.19	Danvers	58.72 64.03
2010	12.85	Ennis	13.68	14.87	85	2	54.18	Shakes-Drayton	59.18 63.91

* also 10.5 Betty Moore GB/AUS

Leaders at 100m hurdles: 1966 (2'6") Mary Rand 14.3, 1967 Christine Perera 13.7, 1968 Perera 13.5

HIGH JUMP			10th	50th	OverWld	1.66	LONG JUMP			10th	50th	ToWld
Best							Best					5.55
1958	1.676	Card	1.625	c.1.50	3(10)	5.99	Hoskin	5.43	?	6	(2)	
1959	1.676	Bignal/Shirley	1.60	1.50	2 (7)	6.20	Rand	5.61	5.13	11	(3)	
1960	1.71	Shirley	1.61	1.52	4 (7)	6.33	Rand	5.61	5.15	13	(1)	
1961	1.71	Hopkins	1.61	1.50e	3 (5)	6.11	Rand	5.70	5.23	20	(4)	
1962	1.73	Knowles	1.60	1.50e	4 (6)	6.29	Rand	5.73	5.20	17	(2)	
1963	1.73i	Knowles	1.625	1.524	6 (6)	6.44	Rand	5.70	5.28	19	(2)	
1964	1.76	Slaap	1.625	c.1.50	7 (7)	6.76	Rand	5.73	5.28	20	(3)	
1965	1.727	Knowles	1.625	1.524	3 (2)	6.40	Rand	5.76	5.33	21	2()	
1966	1.70	Shirley	1.625	1.524	6 8	6.53i	Rand	5.87	5.36	26	6	
1967	1.727	three women !	1.638	1.524	6 8	6.45	Rand	5.87	5.39	31	6	
1968	1.75	Inkpen	1.65	1.524	7 6	6.68	Sherwood	6.00	5.43	35	9	
1969	1.79	Hedmark	1.625	1.55	6 6	6.47	Sherwood	5.87	5.47	41	8	
1970	1.79	Inkpen	1.67	1.54	10 3	6.73	Sherwood	6.09	5.49	45	9	
1971	1.85	Inkpen	1.68	1.56	14 3	6.69	Sherwood	5.95	5.47	41	5	
1972	1.86	Inkpen	1.70	1.58	22 5	6.49	Martin-Jones	6.01	5.51	44	5	
1973	1.87	Lawton (l'pen)	1.75	1.61	30 7	6.43	Nimmo	5.98	5.56	52	3	
1974	1.86	Lawton	1.76	1.65	46 4	6.51i	Martin-Jones	6.01	5.60	65	5	
1975	1.83i	Few	1.75	1.66	51 5	6.37	Nimmo	6.10	5.62	64	2	
1976	1.82	Walls/Brown	1.75	1.68	61 3	6.46	Reeve	6.07	5.64	67	4	
1977	1.85	Gibbs	1.78	1.69	71 2	6.61	Reeve	6.06	5.66	72	5	
1978	1.85	Hitchen	1.79	1.70	85 3	6.59	Reeve	6.17	5.64	71	4	
1979	1.86	three women !	1.78	1.71	97 5	6.69	Reeve	6.18	5.70	82	2	
1980	1.94	Miller	1.82	1.73	102 3	6.68	Reeve	6.12	5.72	91	3	
1981	1.91	Cording	1.80	1.70	101 5	6.53	Hearnshaw	6.14	5.72	99	2	
1982	1.95	Elliott	1.83	1.71	106 4	6.52	Regan	6.10	5.77	101	4	
1983	1.92	Livermore	1.83	1.70	89 5	6.90	Kinch	6.20	5.71	91	2	
1984	1.92	Davies (Elliott)	1.83	1.71	105 5	6.83	Hearnshaw	6.30	5.74	93	5	
1985	1.91i	Davies	1.84	1.70	89 3	6.75	J Oladapo	6.22	5.68	74	2	
1986	1.93	Davies	1.83	1.71	87 6	6.70	Hagger	6.16	5.75	96	2	
1987	1.91i	Davies/Boyle	1.83	1.70	87 3	6.56	Hagger/J Oladapo	6.24	5.75	95	3	
1988	1.92	Davies/Boyle	1.84	1.70	90 5	6.82	May	6.13	5.79	c.98	3	
1989	1.91	Barnetson	1.83	1.71	103 2	6.80	May	6.14	5.72	97	4	
1990	1.92i	Bennett	1.81	1.71	92 4	6.88	May	6.11	5.71	89	2	
1991	1.94i	Marti	1.80	1.70	75 3	6.77	May	6.08	5.72	89	2	
1992	1.93	Marti	1.78	1.69	70 5	6.73	May	6.14	5.72	86	4	
1993	1.94i	Jennings	1.76	1.70	80 4	6.86A	May	6.03	5.70	81	3	
1994	1.91	Marti	1.81	1.70	80 3	6.73	Idowu	6.05	5.73	91	2	
1995	1.90	Haggett	1.81	1.70	81 4	6.67	Lewis	6.04	5.63	72	2	
1996	1.94	Marti	1.80	1.70	79 5	6.66	Lewis	6.08	5.66	77	1	
1997	1.95i	Marti	1.81	1.70	80 5	6.70i	Wise	6.10	5.62	73	2	
1998	1.92i	Jones	1.80	1.68	71 4	6.63	Wise	6.13	5.62	71	3	
1999	1.90	Marti/Jennings	1.81	1.70	66 4	6.76	Wise	6.00	5.61	64	4	
2000	1.93	S Jo/Dunkley	1.83	1.70	72 4	6.69	Lewis	6.16	5.65	72	4	
2001	1.95	S Jones	1.80	1.68	67 3	6.59	Johnson	6.10	5.67	80	2	
2002	1.92	S Jones	1.80	1.67	62 2	6.73	Johnson	6.14	5.67	79	1	
2003	1.93i	S Jones	1.78	1.68	64 1	6.69	Johnson	6.12	5.71	73	2	
2004	1.90i	Crane	1.81	1.68	67 4	6.80	Johnson	6.14	5.67	66	2	
2005	1.90i	Moncrieff/Crane	1.81	1.69	68 4	6.67	Sotherton	6.22	5.69	84	2	
2006	1.91	Ennis	1.80	1.68	77 3	6.67	Sotherton	6.24	5.70	89	2	
2007	1.95	Ennis	1.81	1.66	59 5	6.68	Sotherton	6.14	5.72	90	2	
2008	1.92i	Ennis	1.80	1.68	68 2	6.81	Johnson	6.18	5.70	87	2	
2009	1.92	Ennis	1.82	1.70	86 1	6.47	Agbo	6.15	5.65	75	0	
2010	1.94i	Ennis	1.78	1.70	93 3	6.51	Ennis	6.25	5.75	90	1	

! 1967: Shirley, Knowles, Inkpen (i), 1979: Devally/Cording, Simmonds, Walls-Maguire

SHOT			10th	50th	ToWld	DISCUS			10th	50th	ToWld
	Best				11.50	Best				37m/121'5	
1958	14.66	Allday	11.50	9.83	10	2	47.70	Allday	38.10	31.62	14 (1)
1959	14.96	Allday	11.94	9.99	17	1	46.75	Allday	39.34	32.72	21 1
1960	14.76	Allday	11.78	10.45(35)	11	1	47.37	Allday	39.37	33.53(35)	17 1
1961	14.68	Allday	11.80	10.21(42)	17	1	47.05	Allday	39.06	33.45(44)	17 1
1962	14.80	Allday	12.22	10.25(41)	16	1	47.38	Allday	40.99	33.45	20 1
1963	14.81	Allday	12.01	10.22	14	1	46.86	Allday	39.62	33.18	24 1
1964	15.18	Allday	11.99	10.46	16	2	48.24	Payne	40.69	34.02	27 1
1965	14.94i	Peters	12.33	10.67	23	1	50.68	Payne	40.52	33.95	26 (1)
1966	16.31	Peters	12.37	10.79	28	2	50.94	Payne	41.40	34.16	22 3
1967	15.58	Bedford	12.77	10.95	31	2	50.72	Payne	41.32	35.20	31 2
1968	15.75	Peters	12.55	10.81	28	2	50.58	Bedford	42.04	34.98	32 2
1969	15.52i	Peters	12.90	11.00	28	2	52.22	Payne	42.58	35.90	37 2
1970	16.40i	Peters	13.12	11.30	45	2	55.04	Payne	43.66	35.84	38 1
1971	14.93	Bedford	12.95	11.05	39	1	54.98	Payne	43.42	<35.58	34 1
1972	16.26i	Peters	12.97	11.15	38	1	58.02	Payne	43.00	<35.64	34 1
1973	16.15	Bedford	13.08	11.10	33	2	56.40	Payne	44.34	36.04	41 1
1974	15.40	Peters/B'ford	13.16	11.11	38	0	55.44	Payne	46.24	36.26	42 2
1975	15.29	Bedford	13.40	11.32	40	0	55.94	Ritchie	45.50	36.04	42 2
1976	16.29	Bedford	13.26	11.34	44	3	54.16	Thompson	45.62	36.88	46 2
1977	16.24i	Oakes	13.70	11.40	48	3	59.88	Ritchie	44.76	37.24	52 2
1978	16.74i	Oakes	14.23	11.66	57	3	60.80	Ritchie	45.76	37.80	55 1
1979	16.72	Oakes	13.91	11.74	62	3	58.62	Ritchie	46.24	38.02	59 1
1980	17.53	Littlewood	13.63	11.70	61	4	65.96	Ritchie	47.12	38.38	64 1
1981	17.84	Head	14.45	11.82	64	4	67.48	Ritchie	47.32	38.54	59 1
1982	17.93	Head	14.62	12.07	72	4	66.04	Ritchie	48.98	39.52	71 2
1983	18.99	Ritchie	14.16	11.96	70	3	67.44	Ritchie	46.66	39.40	74 2
1984	19.06i	Head	14.23	12.06	80	3	65.02	Ritchie	47.30	40.28	83 2
1985	18.10i	Oakes	14.18	12.19	91	2	56.40	Head	48.32	39.80	88 0
1986	19.00	Oakes	14.20	12.30	92	2	56.20	Head	50.34	39.54	88 0
1987	18.73	Oakes	14.34	12.39	90	2	57.50	Head	49.02	41.06	98 0
1988	19.36	Oakes	14.45	12.39	90	3	56.10	Head	49.34	40.78	106 0
1989	19.01	Oakes	14.33	12.30	92	4	57.86	McKernan	50.02	41.40	89 1
1990	19.03	Augee	14.44	12.25	74	3	55.52	Aucott	50.86	41.50	90 0
1991	18.86	Oakes	14.64	12.09	75	3	58.90	McKernan	49.94	40.68	91 1
1992	18.15	Augee	14.35	11.98	74	2	57.82	McKernan	49.56	40.54	94 1
1993	17.68	Augee	14.24	12.08	76	1	60.72	McKernan	51.26	40.40	89 1
1994	18.68	Oakes	14.31	12.11	83	4	58.56	McKernan	50.72	40.44	86 3
1995	18.44	Oakes	14.29	12.11	81	1	59.06	McKernan	50.56	39.72	87 2
1996	19.01	Oakes	14.43	11.99	80	2	60.04	McKernan	49.74	40.38	75 3
1997	18.42	Oakes	14.55	12.26	83	2	60.80	Drew	48.82	40.02	81 3
1998	18.83	Oakes	14.68	12.04	75	2	60.82	Drew	47.96	39.94	80 2
1999	18.26	Oakes	15.01	11.97	82	2	60.00	P Roles	49.21	38.72	67 3
2000	18.30i	Oakes	14.60	11.96	77	1	59.03	Drew	49.69	39.57	70 2
2001	17.08	Duncan	14.66	12.07	74	1	59.10	Drew	47.79	39.80	72 2
2002	16.73	Duncan	14.28	11.96	72	2	60.29	Newman (Drew)	49.14	38.94	74 3
2003	16.33	Duncan	14.07	11.80	62	0	62.89	Roles	48.85	39.57	82 2
2004	16.11	Duncan	13.71	11.72	60	0	60.34	Newman	46.41	38.18	63 2
2005	16.54	Duncan	14.52	11.90	77	1	58.07	Roles	47.25	39.08	74 3
2006	17.13	Duncan	14.27	12.03	77	1	59.56	Roles	47.64	38.91	79 3
2007	16.85	Duncan	14.57	11.89	71	2	59.08	Roles	47.59	38.63	63 1
2008	16.37	Duncan	14.39	11.90	69	0	61.41	Roles	45.39	38.05	59 3
2009	16.55	Peake	14.14	11.71	66	2	59.27	Francis	45.48	38.09	63 2
2010	16.78	Peake	14.41	11.97	75	1	58.99	Francis	47.13	38.38	65 3

JAVELIN

Best		10th	50th	ToWld	PENTATHLON		10th	50th	ToWld			
Pentathlon with 80mh to 1968 scored on 1954 tables, 100mh from 1969 on 1971 tables												
		39m/127'11			Best		3500 or 3000 ('71T)					
1958	48.17	Williams	40.27	32.19	13	(1)	4466	Signal	3648	-	14	1
1959	49.65	Platt	40.24	32.70	14	4?	4679	Signal	3832	3049	22	1
1960	51.60	Platt	40.00	34.28(35)	11	(2)	4641	Signal	3831		17	(2)
1961	54.45	Platt	40.50	c.33	15	(1)	4379	Hopkins	3828		21	(2)
1962	50.96	Platt	39.06	c.33	11	(2)	4586	Peters	3762		23	(2)
1963	52.58	Platt	39.66	c.33	11	3	4726w	Rand (Bignal)	3752		18	(2)
1964	54.81	Platt	41.07	33.73	13	2	5035	Rand	3749		23	(2)
1965	54.32	Platt	41.17	34.82	17	1	4785	Rand	3957	3329	38	(2)
1966	48.47	Morgan	40.93	34.50	18	1	4711	Rand	4056	3332	38	4
1967	51.08	Platt	42.44	34.68	15	2	4605	Wilson	4037	3551	50+	3
1968	55.60	Platt	43.92	34.88	24	2	4841	Wilson	4119	3504	50	4
1969	50.66	Platt	41.86	34.48	23	2	4141	Scott	3555		41	5
1970	50.82	Farquhar	41.22	c.35.00	21	1	4515w	Peters	3697		40	6
1971	47.70	Baker	44.28	35.84	27	0	4298	Wilson	3666		30	5
1972	51.56	Randall	44.40	36.90	32	2	4801	Peters	3538		36	4
1973	53.88	Corbett	44.28	36.58	29	2	4429	Peters	3632		36	5
1974	55.04	Sanderson	44.80	37.10	34	2	4455	Peters	3817	2900	41	6
1975	54.40	Sanderson	45.94	36.90	41	1	4275	Longden	3795		36	3
1976	57.20	Sanderson	47.24	37.88	44	2	4422	Longden	3849		36	4
Pentathlon with 800m rather than 200m from 1977												
1977	67.20	Sanderson	47.58	38.78	48	1	4385	Longden	3832	2972	47	6
1978	64.00	Sanderson	50.20	39.52	54	2	4292	Wray	3826	2890	46	3
1979	65.34	Sanderson	47.50	38.34	42	2	4325	Wray	3790	3042	54	4
1980	69.70	Sanderson	49.00	38.82	47	3	4409	Longden	3949	3022	50	6

HEPTATHLON

										3900		
1981	68.86	Sanderson	48.64	40.74	67	2	6125	Sanderson	4875	3100e	30	4
1982	66.98	Whitbread	49.24	41.44	69	4	6259	Simpson	5003	3300e	32	2
1983	73.58	Sanderson	51.54	40.88	75	4	6347	Simpson	5025	3730	40	3
1984	71.86	Whitbread	50.38	40.68	73	4	6264	Simpson	5172	3600e	39	2
1985	72.98	Whitbread	50.28	40.70	76	4	6098	Hagger	5116	3780	44	3
1986	77.44	Whitbread	51.10	41.94	86	5	6623	Simpson	5189	c.3800	41	3
1987	76.64	Whitbread	51.72	42.20	86	5	6167	Hagger	5065	3827	47	2
1988	71.70	Sanderson	50.58	41.62	89	3	5975	Hagger	5174	c.3780	44	3
1989	61.54	Gibson	49.48	42.28	97	2	6126	Hagger	5277	4064	56	1
1990	65.72	Sanderson	51.82	41.36	93	4	6085	Simpson	5191	3823	46	4
1991	65.18	Sanderson	50.20	41.84	82	3	6022	Court	5074	3878	47	1
1992	64.88	Sanderson	52.00	41.50	81	3	5994	Court	4914	3972	53	2
1993	60.10	Holroyd	50.76	41.52	77	3	5957	Court	5268	4160	63	2
1994	58.20	Gibson	52.14	41.32	95	2	6325	Lewis	5253	4144	59	3
1995	58.10	Gibson	48.82	42.06	82	1	6299	Lewis	5338	4001	52	3
1996	64.06	Sanderson	49.10	40.98	73	5	6645	Lewis	5213	3948	52	4
1997	58.30	Sanderson	51.14	40.46	69	1	6736	Lewis	5311	3823	45	4
1998	58.39	Jackson	50.34	42.16	81	3	6559	Lewis	5358	c.3880	48	6
New specification javelin introduced in 1999, from here no. over 37m each year												
1999	59.50	Martin	47.72	40.32	104	4	6724	Lewis	5239	3910	51	4
2000	58.54	Martin	48.77	39.74	88	3	6831	Lewis	5257	3819	47	3
2001	55.85	Martin	49.25	38.51	66	2	5933	Hollman	4969	c.3790	43	3
2002	64.87	Morgan	47.73	38.98	73	4	6135	Hollman	5176	3801	42	3
2003	56.29	Sayers	47.12	39.19	77	2	6282	Lewis	5013	3832	47	3
2004	60.85	Sayers	49.66	38.62	70	3	6424	Sotherton	5100	3937	51	3
2005	61.45	Sayers	46.71	38.88	84	2	6547	Sotherton	5138	3959	52	4
2006	60.41	Sayers	46.68	37.85	61	1	6396	Sotherton	5299	3866	44	4
2007	65.05	Sayers	45.23	39.37	80	1	6510	Sotherton	5319	4008	53	6
2008	65.75	Sayers	46.27	39.60	84	1	6517	Sotherton	5154	3839	46	4
2009	59.82	Sayers	47.85	39.48	78	1	6731	Ennis	5078	3824	45	5
2010	63.15	Sayers	48.79	40.83	91	2	6823	Ennis	5087	3806	48	5

Pentathlon to 1980, Heptathlon rescored from 1981

POLE VAULT		UK	UK	ToWld	TRIPLE JUMP		10th	50th	ToWld	
Best		10th	50th	2.80100	Best				11m100	
1986					12.28	Finikin			1	
1987					13.15	Finikin			1 x	
1988					12.75i	Finikin			1 x	
1989	2.50i?	Le Cocq		0	12.86	Finikin			2 x	
1990	2.70	Love		0	13.05	Griffith			8 1	
1991	2.80i	Morrison	-	1	13.46	Finikin	11.86		25 4	
1992	3.20	Staples	2.30 (9t h)	2	13.56	Berkeley	12.34		34 3	
1993	3.56	Staples	2.80	9	13.93w/13.75	Griffith	12.43	11.01	52 4	
1994	3.65	Staples	3.10	-	15	14.22	Hansen	12.31	11.16	70 4
1995	3.80	Staples	3.10	c2.20	25 7?	14.66	Hansen	12.42	11.24	71 3
1996	4.00	Whitlock	3.30	2.45	31 6	14.78	Hansen	12.49	11.26	76 3
1997	4.23	Whitlock	3.40	2.70	41 2	15.15	Hansen	12.26	11.20	71 2
1998	4.31	Whitlock	3.60	2.80	54 2	15.16i	Hansen	12.41	11.17	85 3
1999	4.29i	Whitlock	3.60	2.90	67 2	15.02i	Hansen	12.28	11.21	86 2
2000	4.35	Whitlock	3.70	3.00	78 3	14.29	Hansen	12.47	11.38	84 2
2001	4.40	Whitlock	3.75	3.10	81 2	14.51	Hansen	12.23	11.40	81 1
2002	4.44i	Whitlock ¶	3.90	3.06	75 4	14.86	Hansen	12.40	11.42	89 1
2003	4.15	T Grant	3.81	3.00	77 1	15.10i	Hansen	12.51	11.49	104 1
2004	4.25i	Z Brown	3.90	3.00	87 1	14.47i	Hansen	12.48	11.58	95 1
2005	4.47	Whitlock	3.80	3.11	91 2	13.31	Williams	12.57	11.54	107 0
2006	4.35	Wh'k/D'son	3.90	3.15	96 4	13.65	Hansen	12.82	11.59	101 0
2007	4.40i	Dennison	3.90	3.25	102 2	13.68i	Hansen	12.83	11.54	110 1
2008	4.40	Dennison	3.92	3.30	114 1	13.85A	Regis	12.86	11.52	93 1
2009	4.60	Dennison	4.02	3.30	119 2	13.75	Regis	12.67	11.55	95 2
2010	4.60i	Dennison	4.05	3.30	128 3	13.75	Samuel	12.77	11.46	96 2

HAMMER		10th	50th	ToWld	
				38m100	
1989	39.50	O'Connor		1	x
1990	42.32	O'Connor		6	x
1991	47:68	Holden	39.90	13	x
1992	51.00	Holden	41.72	17	x
1993	56.76	E Augee	47.10	30	(5)
1994	59.92	Shaw	46.88	36.88	43 (2)
1995	64.90	Shaw	47.74	38.92	51 5
1996	61.34	Shaw	49.52	40.40	59 3
1997	61.70	Sprules	50.62	39.70	66 4
1998	63.30	Shaw	50.35	40.45	66 4
1999	67.10	Shaw	53.60	41.69	75 4
2000	67.44	Shaw	54.68	42.43	94 3
2001	68.15	Shaw	56.06	42.95	96 3
2002	66.83	Shaw	57.47	42.41	86 3
2003	68.93	Shaw	54.51	41.24	85 2
2004	68.11	Shaw	55.28	42.76	92 2
2005	67.58	Webb	56.24	43.60	99 3
2006	66.42	Webb	57.31	43.78	104 3
2007	67.80	Derham	54.78	44.58	110 2
2008	68.63	Derham	55.45	44.69	107 2
2009	68.00	Derham	55.14	44.76	119 4
2010	66.89	Derham	55.76	45.64	130 5

Lorraine Shaw was world ranked at 5th in 1995, 9th 2000 and 6th 2001

10 KILOMETRES WALK				10th	50th	To	Wld	20 KM WALK					
Best						58:00	100		10th	50th	To	Wld	
									1:55		100		
1977	50:03t	Fawkes	57:33				10						
1978	49:27	Tyson	54:23				12						
1979	48:11.4	Fawkes	56:29				11						
1980	49:30.4	Tyson	57:17				11						
1981	48:34.5	Tyson	53:49			19	14	1:53:16	Corlett			1	
1982	48:57.6	Bateman	54:39			23	(2)	1:47:35	Millen			2	
1983	48:52.5	Bateman	53:58			22	5	1:40:45	Bateman			4	
1984	49:35	Millen	52:36			28	5	1:53:27	Brown			2	
1985	47:56.3	Birch	53:29			26	1	1:46:32	Millen			1	x
1986	47:58.3	Allen	53:00			25	1	1:56:29	B Lupton			0	x
1987	45:42	Langford	51:52			29	3	1:55:57	Millen			0	x
1988	47:52	Langford	53:55			28	1	1:43:50	Sworowski			3	
1989	46:02	Langford	52:18			26	2	1:54:38	Sandra Brown			2	
1990	45:53.9	Drake	50:51			28	2	1:53:16	Reader			1	
1991	45:59	Sworowski	50:56			28	1	1:48:29	S Brown			3	
1992	46:04	V Lupton	50:33			28	0	1:48:22	Reader			2	
1993	45:59	Drake	52:15			27	1	1:45:11	Callanin			7	
1994	45:48	Lupton	51:31			27	3	1:44:48	V Lupton			5	
1995	45:18.8	Lupton	51:09			28	2	1:42:47	Lupton			4	
1996	47:05	Lupton	52:23			21	0	1:43:57	Lupton			7	
1997	47:16	Lupton	52:49			29	0	1:43:52	Black			3	
1998	45:03	Kehler	51:20			24	1	1:44:25	Lupton			2	
1999	47:51.2	Charnock	52:37			21	0	1:37:44	Lupton	1:49:12		12	0
2000	45:09.57	Kehler	53:35			17	1	1:33:57	Kehler	1:54:46		10	1
2001	47:05	Cattermole	53:18			20	0	1:39:10	Cattermole	—		8	0
2002	45:53	Kehler	52:25			20	2	1:36:45	Kehler	1:51:12		10	1
2003	48:54	Cattermole	54:15			14	0	1:41:04	Cattermole	2:+		8	0
2004	49:19	Cattermole	54:19			14	x	1:42:02	Cattermole	2:+		5	0
2005	48:02	Cattermole	52:59			18	x	1:38:00	Cattermole	1:53:25		10	0
2006	47:25	Jackson	53:16			18	x	1:41:00	Jackson	2:07:16		5	0
2007	47:49	Jackson	56:46			11	x	1:36:28	Jackson	2:13:31		3	0
2008	44:52	Jackson	56:16			12	x	1:31:33	Jackson	2:15:26		3	1
2009	45:39	Jackson	56:57			11	x	1:31:16	Jackson	2:11:49		4	1
2010	43:53	Jackson	54:44			11	x	1:30:41	Jackson	2:05:20		5	1

Langford née Kehler.

Note: women's 20km walk replaced the 10 kilometres as the standard international distance in 1999. Uniquely for this period at any event: mother and daughter headed UK rankings with Brenda and Vicky Lupton at 20m walk.

Most years topping British lists

Men

100m: 12 Linford Christie, 8 Dwain Chambers, 6 Allan Wells
200m: 8 John Regis, 7 Allan Wells
400m: 9 David Jenkins, 6 Roger Black
800m: 7 Sebastian Coe
1500m/1M: 6 John Mayock
5000m: 6 Mo Farah
10000m: 4 Dave Bedford, Brendan Foster, Jon Brown
Marathon: 6 Jon Brown
3000mSt: 8 Maurice Herriott, 6 Tom Hanlon
110mh: 15 Colin Jackson
400mh: 7 Kriss Akabusi, 6 Alan Pascoe, Chris Rawlinson
HJ: 9 Dalton Grant, 8 Steve Smith
PV: 10 Mike Bull, 9 Nick Buckfield, 7 Brian Hooper
LJ: 8 Lynn Davies, 6 Roy Mitchell
TJ: 14 Jonathan Edwards, 8 Fred Alsop, 6 Keith Connor. Phillips Idowu
SP: 10 Geoff Capes, 9 Carl Myerscough, 6 Paul Edwards
DT: 10 Bill Tancred, 7 Robert Weir, 6 Richard Slaney
HT: 12 Howard Payne, 7 Mick Jones
JT: 14 Steve Backley, 6 David Travis
Decathlon: 11 Daley Thompson
20kmW: 6 Ken Matthews, Ian McCombie
50kmW: 8 Chris Maddocks, 6 Bob Dobson, L Morton

Women

100m: 7 Andrea Lynch
200m: 7 Kathy Smallwood/Cook
400m: 7 Christine Ohuruogu, 6 Kathy Smallwood/Cook
800m: 10 Kelly Holmes
1500m/1M: 6 Kelly Holmes
3000m: 8 Paula Radcliffe, 6 Joyce Smith, Yvonne Murray
5000m: 9 Paula Radcliffe
10000m: 7 Paula Radcliffe
Marathon: 7 Liz McColgan, 6 Paula Radcliffe
3000mSt: 3 Tara Kryzwicki
100mh: 5 Shirley Strong
400mh: 9 Sally Gunnell, 8 Natasha Danvers
HJ: 7 Barbara Inkpen/Lawton, 6 Diana Elliott/Davies, Debbi Marti
PV: 9 Janine Whitlock
LJ: 8 Mary Rand, 6 Fiona May
TJ: 13 Ashia Hansen
SP: 16 Judy Oakes, 8 Joanne Duncan, 7 Suzanne Allday, Mary Peters
DT: 10 Rosemary Payne, 9 Margaret Ritchie, 7 Jackie McKernan, 6 Suzanne Allday, S Drew/Newman, P Roles
HT: 10 Lorraine Shaw
JT: 15 Tessa Sanderson, 10 Susan Platt, 8 Goldie Sayers
Pen/Hep: 8 Denise Lewis, 7 Mary Bignal/Rand
10kmW: 6 Lisa Kehler/Langford
20kmW: 5 Vicky Lupton

British Athletes with Most World Number One Rankings

6 Sebastian Coe – 800m 1979, 1981, 1982, 1986; 1500m 1979, 1981 (and five 2nds, two 3rds)
6 Jonathan Edwards – TJ 1995-6, 1998-9, 2001-02 (also 2nd in 1997 and 3rd in 1993)
5 Steve Cram – 1500m 1982-3, 1985-6, 1988 (also 2nd at 800m in 1986 and 3rd at 1500m in 1984)
5 Daley Thompson – Decathlon 1980, 1982-4, 1986 (also 3rd in 1978)
4 Mary Bignal/Rand – LJ 1959-60, 1963-4 (and four 2nd places at pentathlon 1959, 1963-5)
4 Paula Radcliffe – 10000m 2002, Marathon 2002-3, 2005 (also a 2nd and five 3rds from 3000m 1997)
3 Steve Ovett (1500m 1977-8, 1981), Colin Jackson (110mh 1992-4), Steve Backley (JT 1989-90, 1998); Dorothy Hyman (100m 1962-3, 200m 1963), Sally Gunnell (400mh 1992-4).

Mr Michael A. Winch BSc

Legal Points:

- i) Detriment to the confider. To help establish that no item of information about legal activity would reveal secrets which would hinder the attempts of any British Athlete to win an international medal.
- ii) The growth in public funding for no benefit gives cause to a compelling public interest in disclosure.
- iii) To help establish that an action for Breach of Confidentiality against UK Sport by UK Athletics could not succeed, and would not be mounted because the relationship between the two organisations is a sham.

Athletics Biography:

Athlete

Mike started his athletic career at school in 1962 and made the English schools in 1964 for the first time. In 1966 he won the senior boys Shot Putt title with 57'2" a record at the time.

As a senior athlete Mike won two Commonwealth Games silver medals in the Shot Putt in 1974 in Christchurch, New Zealand, and 1982 in Brisbane, Australia. In 1974 Mike set his lifetime best of 20.43m in the Shot, and in 1975 he reached his lifetime best of 58.08m in the Discus. He finished competing in 1986 with fifty International Caps and numerous UK titles.

Athletics Coach

Since 1974 Mike has coached International athletes including Judy Oakes OBE, multiple sport gold medallist, Philippa Roles, Emeka Udechuku and many other stars of the throwing events. He has also worked as a Conditioning and Strength expert over that period and advised many of the Olympic Sports in their preparation training as well as the England Rugby team.

Mike was chief British throws coach at the World Championships in Gothenburg 1991, chief throws coach to the England team in Kuala Lumpur 1998 and overall chief coach of England's athletics team at the 2002 Manchester Commonwealth Games.

Athletics Administration

Mike has been involved in Athletics administration for 20 years in various capacities. He was UK Athletics Vice President for four years, stepping down in February 2008 for reasons outlined in his witness statement.

Mike Winch Witness Evidence

Mike Winch draws on 36 experience in athletics to address the concept of "secret" training methods, and how others who train harder, and train wiser have no such need for such a childish and defensive mindset.

NO SECRET TRAINING METHODS (THAT ARE LEGAL)

Introduction:

Having been elected as Vice-President of UK Athletics between 2004 and 2008, I am perhaps in a unique position in being able to give a judgement on the veil of secrecy that has descended on what was once an open and democratically run sport.

Since UKA was formed its performance has been demonstrably woeful, with the sport descending into near anarchy and ever more depressing declines in support and performance, despite huge amounts of money being pumped in by UK Sport and Sport England.

It is true to say that many of those involved on the Board of UKA Athletics have little or no knowledge of the sport at any other than a very basic level, having never been involved in the real action of coaching, officiating, administering or indeed competing at a high level. Simply put they are generic managers, and as such have but a small understanding of the subtleties of running such a complex sport. The policies of this regime, which have largely been dictated by UK Sport and Sport England, have lead to a major split between the many hundreds of athletics clubs, who are effectively the 'share holders' in the sport, and the executive of a self appointed governing body, which is unelected and unaccountable to anyone.

This is the situation that needs to be addressed by bringing the influences that have caused the demise of a once great sport in the UK, into the open so that changes for the good can be made.

The following statement has been given as a reason for not disclosing information flowing between UKA and UK Sport. I will address the basic issues that this relates to.

"It is accepted in the world of high performance sport that competitor nations will attempt to find out the sporting performance 'secrets' of other nations who are seen to be successful on the world stage." UK Athletics, in a letter to the public authority [UK Sport] dated 23rd March 2010, stated categorically that releasing the withheld information would be detrimental to its aims to create a competitive sporting advantage over other nations.

(Hearing bundle pages 1 to 14 - paragraph 22 of the decision notice and pages 143 to 147 - Additional Party letter)

In responding to the above I have drawn on my 36 years experience of athletics and sport in general at International Level. I will detail a number of arguments which will clearly counter the stated arguments.

- 1) "It is accepted in the world of high performance sport that competitor nations will attempt to find out the sporting performance 'secrets' of other nations who are seen to be successful on the world stage.

(Hearing bundle pages 1 to 14 - paragraph 22 of the decision notice and pages 143 to 147 - Additional Party letter)

i) What success?

This is a smoke screen to prevent openness and honesty in running the sport of athletics. In the next two exceptional years which will include the Olympic Games, the country would not like to see our athletes fail, as it would reflect badly on the reasoning behind spending huge sums of money to make the Games a success. To this end, athletics now has a performance director who is paid nearly twice the salary of our Prime Minister and who is responsible for only those few competitors who are deemed to have medal potential. This organisation has cost the tax payer approaching a hundred million pounds to produce the extraordinarily meagre medal haul at world level that it professes is a 'success story'. The statistics clearly bear this out.

In the view of many in the sport, this is completely scandalous and unacceptable, when before UKA came into existence, the sport produced better results with virtually no public funding at all.

ii) Empire building.

The Olympics in London have been cynically seized by UK Athletics to set up a system not far removed in its approach to support of athletes and coaches, from that last seen in Eastern Europe during the Soviet communist regime. It supports very few sports men and women outside potential medal winners, who are anyway capable of earning their living commercially and have little need of support. In my experience, Lottery funding is being used to 'bribe' athletes and their coaches into supporting 'the system', rather than supporting them in their endeavours.

iii) Control freakery.

There are well documented examples of this, such as the young world class discus thrower who was told that unless he accepted the way forward prescribed by UK Athletics, which would need a change from his current world class coach (who had refused to accept the way UKA were behaving), he would not receive any Lottery support. He had no choice but to leave his former coach, and move to one who was not even a discus specialist and who his himself coming under pressure from UKA.

There were also the much publicised cases of several sprinters, a young female endurance athlete, a long jumper and a triple jumper treated in the same way, as well as many others spoken of only in private for fear of retribution by UKA and their partners UK Sport.

Such a lack of understanding and huge arrogance simply exemplifies why UKA needs to keep its activities secret, rather than its 'secrets of success', secret; not through any measure of achievement, but through the need to hide failure, blundering incompetence and a lack of understanding of the sport and the huge number of volunteers who have underpinned its success in the past. This has wasted huge resources which should in preference have been going to the youngsters via the real workers in our sport, the clubs, who have been so badly served by our sporting administrators since UK Athletics was set up and its policies driven by UK Sport and Sport England.

- 2) UK Athletics, in a letter to the public authority [UK Sport] dated 23rd March 2010, stated categorically that releasing the withheld information would be detrimental to its aims to create a competitive sporting advantage over other nations.

(Hearing bundle pages 1 to 14 - paragraph 22 of the decision notice and pages 143 to 147 - Additional Party letter)

**i) “Competitive sporting advantage over other sporting nations”...
politically or sportingly desirable, or neither?**

In the real world, most of the two hundred and more sporting nations, despite enjoying their major successes, do not support their athletes in their endeavours to attain sporting excellence, let alone extravagantly fund the building of centralist bureaucratic organisations to oversee the process. They see no benefit in a strategy that will support only a few highly paid and privileged individuals, but not the majority of volunteer participants in the sport.

Contrary to implications of the UK Sport and UK Athletics submission, most countries are happy to share any success with others. Kenya for example has welcomed our athletes to train with their squads, which has resulted in the dramatic improvement of a number of our endurance athletes. Steve Backley trained with Jan Zelezny, the Olympic and World Champion, with no problems being created by the Czech authorities. There are many examples of this sharing of ideas between nations, coaches and athletes.

Indeed many British athletes have benefited from such associations, which despite its protestations of the need for secrecy in building success, UK Athletics has strongly encouraged. This organisation even brings foreign coaches to the UK to help improve the sport, in some cases because it has not been able to achieve substantial success on its own volition, having widely upset much of the sport by its arrogance and secrecy, and caused many top coaches to retire.

ii) What the eye doesn't see, the heart doesn't grieve over.

The only countries I am aware of over the last fifty years who have been remotely interested in 'sporting performance "secrets" ' have been the old Soviet Block countries and their allies who used sport as a political tool to bring a positive spin on their political regimes.

As is well known, these regimes, because of their ability to keep sporting endeavours and their training methods secret through the control of the KGB, Stasi and similar organisations, were able to institute drug administration to keep ahead of the field. It might be said that this would not happen here, but I do not think anyone who loves sport would like to give it the remotest chance of encouragement, just to prove the validity of their concept of 'sporting performance "secrets" '.

Indeed, the beginnings of such an aggressively secretive system can be seen in the perceived need by UK Athletics and Sport UK to prevent openness in their dealings with each other. This has clearly been exemplified when world renowned coaches who do not toe the line have been excluded from official involvement and publicly funded support, despite their measurably high success and ability in taking athletes to International and Olympic levels of performance.

In addition there is at least one case of a foreign coach who was suspended for a doping offence for two years as an competitor, being encouraged to work with UK athletes at this present time and apparently been paid well for his advice. Who knows how soon it could be before under the cloak of secrecy, this takes on a more sinister turn, all in the name of sporting success?

Conclusion:

The most cogent argument against suppressing information, is that UK Athletics have signally failed to create success since their inception, whilst spending huge amounts of public money on failed personnel, systems and schemes which have in the main been given the go ahead or at the least the nod of approval by UK Sport and/or Sport England. Looking back to David Moorcroft's regime and the Warner/De Vos one that continued from it, it is clear that such choices as David Collins as performance director and his continued abysmal results, other equally poor personnel choices (e.g. Robert Weir) as well as the championing of schemes which bore little or no fruit apart from further dividing the sport (eg coaching scheme which did not meet UKCC standards and still does not), it can be seen that there is clear institutional failure.

The continued insistence from UKA that all is well with the sport, and the failure of the so-called 'conscience of the sport', the UK Members Committee (a toothless body set up to rubber stamp UKA decisions in an apparent display of democracy) to bring the executive to heel over its failures, has meant that performances, coaching numbers and volunteer involvement, which after all are UK Sport's preferred outcome indicators, have been massaged to suit the needs of the moment to the extent of presenting a largely untrue picture.

By way of exemplifying this, consider one particular section of the sport, the throws. Where does it say in any report that these events have been reduced to such an extent that they are internationally at the worst level ever in the history of athletics. This can also be said in other individual events. Indeed, any current success in other events is at best only equivalent only to what has been achieved in the past with no UK Sport or Sport England help and no Lottery funding.

The statistics of this are irrefutable and are presented elsewhere in the overall submission.

Thus, rather than trying to protect success, it would seem that UK Athletics and UK Sport are trying to avoid their failures being exposed.