



MINUTES – MEETING OF THE USA CRICKET BOARD OF DIRECTORS

By Conference call – December 27, 2022

Attendance

USA Cricket Board Directors

Atul Rai, Interim Chair, Club Director (AR)

Avinash Gaje, Individual Director (AG), Venu Pisike, Individual Director (VP), Srinivas Salver, Player Director (SS), Sushil Nadkarni, League Director (SN), Kuljit Nijjar, Individual Director (KN)

USA Cricket Staff

Dhruvkumar Barot, Minute Taker (DB)

Vincent Adams, Chair – NGC (VA) – (Attendance for point 2 only)

1. Welcome Note

AR welcomes VA to the board call. AR updates the board on the current matter being discussed with the ICC pertaining to the venue discussions for the world cup. Fara Gorski confirmed USA Cricket's USOPC application was approved and is now a formally recognized member of their group. Meeting minutes from the previous meeting were shared for review and approval.

2. NGC nominees for Independent Directors

AR shared the NGC nominees for Independent Directors Position with the board. AG asked what process was followed, and VA confirmed the process defined in the constitution was followed, in the application form all requirements were clearly mentioned to consider the application complete. All applications were thoroughly screened, and eligible applications were shortlisted and filled based on their assessment. Shortlisted candidates were interviewed by the NGC and were voted upon before the final 3 nominations were submitted to the board. NGC unanimously voted on all the candidates. SN further asked if the NGC has evidential backing in case of any legal challenge the board or the NGC gets put up to? VA confirmed and said all reasonable challenges can be addressed as all decisions were backed by the constitutional guidelines. VP further asked for confirmation if all candidates were voted in unanimously by the NGC? VA described the process again to reassure them with confidence. VP further asked if the NGC considered the timeline of recommending the candidates to the board? VA confirmed this was in line with the members of the NGC and as discussed with the AR as a priority need to comply with the ICC requirements the NGC agreed and put the nomination forward to the board. SN further asked if the NGC has valid reasoning for rejecting an application if they are challenged for rejection? VA assured all the application was based on the requirements in the constitution and that there is no fear or concern whatsoever. KN further suggested adopting a system where interested candidates can apply through the link, which will help eliminate the issues where the candidates are disqualified based on not submitting a resume with the application. VA acknowledged and requested the board to provide the NGC with the necessary resources enabling them, as the advertisement clearly mentioned the requirement to submit the resume in bold, it's unfortunate some candidates failed to follow the necessary process and instructions, furthermore, NGC sent out a general reminder to the candidates via media announcement reminding candidates of the need to follow the process. VP asked if the NGC reviewed and considered all perceived or direct conflicts of interest for the positions that they applied



MINUTES – MEETING OF THE USA CRICKET BOARD OF DIRECTORS

for? VA confirmed all the applications were thoroughly reviewed based on the information they submitted on the application, and based on reviewing the application the NGC would flag anything they had doubts about and would clarify with the candidate during the interview process, hence they unanimously made the reaccommodation of the candidates. KN asked how did the NGC determine terms for the recommended candidates? VA further clarified that the application gave the opportunity to the candidates to identify their preferences and the NGC finally decided based on the best fit for the role based on their review. Nominations for the 3 individuals included their service terms as suggested by the NGC, Patricia Whittaker for a 3-year term, David Haubert for a 2-year term & Pintoo Shah for a 1-year term.

The Board resolved: AR proposed to accept the recommendation as put forward to the board by the NGC and accept the nominations to the board as independent directors.

In favor: AR, SS, VP, SN, KN, AG

Abstain: Nil

Against: Nil

Recused for this item: Nil

3. Peer review query (Membership – Election eligibility)

DB shared with the BOD, seeking a resolution for Minor League Cricket League, as there are multiple leagues registered for each conference where in reality all conferences play under one league, BOD was requested to resolve the issue. KN suggested considering these as one league as there is no competition between their conferences and they all play in one event. SS asked the BOD as MLC are commercial partners and for-profit entities, shall they be allowed to vote and interfere in governance matters? And furthermore, agreed with KN as they are single league, not multiple leagues. SN suggested abiding by the constitutional requirements and keeping the constitutional language consistent, as there have been instances in the past where there were issues with the league, where they met the constitutional requirements, and hence deemed as eligible leagues. VP further clarified that MLC was allowed to vote in the 2020 elections; hence, if the board decides for the current elections that would be temporary, further discussion is necessary, and they are a single league, not multiple leagues. VP questioned DB if MLC's multiple conferences qualify as eligible voters? DB clarified that based on the eligibility criteria they are not qualified but rather it is the league's claim through the peer review inquiry that they have enough members and hence they qualify. SN asked for the board to decide whether members or leagues can have one vote, or four votes based on what? In response, AR clarified that each tournament is not a league, and the constitution states that in a clear sense. VP further clarified that based on the eligibility data published for the previous elections, MLC does not have enough clubs in each league to qualify based on the 1-year eligibility cutoff criteria. VP asked DB to clarify the process followed for all the peer review inquiries and what the issue is with MLC and why was this referred to the board? Also, does it mean that except for the MLC, all the other leagues are certified? Who certified them? DB asked whom the board would like him to send the data to certify? AR clarified the data shall be sent to the NGC and on which if they have any question they can check with DB or the board for clarity and then send it over to the independent auditory who will review and certify the final list before it is published, SN and VP



MINUTES – MEETING OF THE USA CRICKET BOARD OF DIRECTORS

agreed that the data should not come to the board. VP and KN further clarified that as per constitutional requirements, both the individual member and the club must be a member for more than a year to qualify for the election eligibility. VP offered to help DB in a corresponding response to MLC based on the direction and discussion from the board, and DB was instructed to share the final eligibility list with the NGC and auditory for approval.

The Board resolved: VP to help DB draft a response to MLC based on the direction and discussion from the board, DB to share the final eligible voters list with the NGC and then with the auditors for review and approval.

In favor: AR, SS, VP, SN, KN, AG

Abstain: Nil

Against: Nil

Recused for this item: Nil

4. USA Cricket Member's Secondary Insurance Policy - Renewal

AR informed the board of the upcoming membership renewal and available quotes from vendors, and DB presented the quotes, conditions, and termination clause. DB stresses the need to avail the policy as member league administrators are in immediate need with the new year in effect soon to secure operational permits for the season. SS asked if there is a different policy in place or being looked into for the players? AR agreed and raised concerns that the national players don't have appropriate insurance coverage. AG and VP raised some concerns where the policy does not offer coverage relevant to each city/state's requirements and what is being done to offer favorable support to those leagues? Also, issues around the serviceability and due help processing the claim? AR asked KN and AG to help DB facilitate the conversation as they have reasonable experience in sourcing ideal insurance coverage options as they have managed for their respective leagues. DB confirmed the current policy caters to all the leagues across the nation, where there may be additional fees applicable for extended endorsement and that can be availed by the league directly through the same insurance company.

5. Other Business

SS updates the board on the process of interviewing for the Men's Head Coach position, working committee has shortlisted the candidates and soon then will begin the interview process. The board received an email from the manager of the women's head coach regarding not being interested in renewing the contract. SN asked the board based on the email from the manager, should the cricket committee reconsider its decision from the previous meeting where an apology matter was requested for the matter between Chief Selector and the Head Coach? SS responded on the fact that the decision was made by the board prior to the email and hence the apology letter must be submitted for the record. VA to send a follow-up email to the Head Coach seeking an overdue letter of apology, SN to follow up and close the matter before parting. AG suggested a response to the parents who are unhappy with the overall selection process, AR responded that rather a response from the cricket committee should be appropriate are they are closely working with relevant on-field



MINUTES – MEETING OF THE USA CRICKET BOARD OF DIRECTORS

and off-field cricketing activities. AG further suggested having a media representative from the board that has the potential to express the board's opinion to unify the community with the facts rather than misconceptions from the private media. AR suggested issues around player's selection process should rather be handled by the cricket committee, as the wider board is not involved in the process at any stage.

< END >