

Minutes MC Meeting 19th March 7.30pm Zoom

| No | Item | Lead | Time | Action |
|----|--|-------------|--------|---|
| 1 | Welcome and Apologies | Sean Milner | 5 mins | |
| | Apologies received from: Andy Syme Roger Murray Ian Wyatt Sam Harris Jon Punshon | | | |
| 2 | Note any Col | Sean Milner | 1 mins | |
| | None | | | |
| 3 | Urgent issues for AOB (unless incredibly urgent most likely items will be added to 6 th April meeting Agenda) | Sean Milner | 5 mins | |
| | None | | | |
| 4 | Minutes of previous meetings and outstanding actions | Sean Milner | 5 mins | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NEC and Indoor Climbing report is with Paul Ratcliffe – PR unsure as to what this is, no one else seemed to know, AS to identify what the report was regarding and whether any additional follow up is required • Gavin to produce membership development progress in due course (aimed for 6 April meeting) • MC to review its ToR in 2024(to be discussed 6 April) • Andy Syme to write to the Board requesting that they investigate engaging an external consultant to expedite overspend detailed investigation – if this happened or not, now superceded • PR - Still processes going on with auditors, pay for some support from separate team in auditors ongoing until complete minor word of caution for end of year action update 6th April • JW - Alan being off, challenging time, bring in staff to support? • PR trying to get in interim CFO, specialist in grant funding, Thursday afternoon in negotiation with British Judo, TS involved in initial meeting. Aim is to keep Interim CFO in place even when Alan back, we need leadership, processes, transparency, this will take time, not in a great shape, needs a new approach. Update on 6th April • JW – I know it'll cost more money in budget but essential, critical need MC support? • PR it would be welcome • TS took part in conversation with PR last week, impressed with plans and people he spoke to, good choice, great help to BMC • DB – 1/3 way through year, some suggestion of idea of budget being progressed? | | | <p>AS</p> <p>GF AS/SM</p> <p>PR</p> <p>PR</p> |

| | | | | |
|--|---|-------------|---------|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PR – since 28 Feb, back to board, agreed budget with Personal Accident cover in, communicated back through SMT and budgets, struggling to wrap up monthly accounts, SMT holding own accounts and reviewing spend, difficult landscape, manages to close January, within Budget to around £5k, Feb looking a little bit over, insurance and membership down, Mar may be back up. Worrying thing is the grant funding side, PR need to get fully into that area, overspend in grants, left tight this year with UK Sport tomorrow. Further update on 6th April • Andy Syme to send out a note via Teamwork to assess views of Councilors on whether or not to hold an extraordinary council meeting to consider the budget <i>etc.</i> in a single agenda item meeting (completed on 28 Feb – further discussion required once 2023 Accounts finalised) • Sean Milner to ensure that membership is a discrete item on the next agenda (complete) • Sean Milner to add mountaineering update to future agenda (will be added to 6 April – apologies for not getting it onto this Agenda) | PR | | |
| | Membership Data a. Membership growth ideas (all) | Paul Justin | 20 mins | |
| | <p>Key headlines: need to be aware of difference between members and memberships. Club members that have upgraded to full membership are counted in full memberships. There is also additional double counting in clubs, for members of more than one club even though they are only one member. Best guess is that there are about 3.5k double counted members. So we are probably showing 3.5k higher than actual physical members.</p> <p>Individual memberships: steady decline for last 8 months about 150/month, gut feel, is it the bad press BMC has been getting? This is a reason given for not renewing when asked. Other sports are also seeing the same trend - not being able to grow their membership either – participation in our sport is growing, so why isn't membership? It's a trend, PR may well have better understanding than I (PJ) have, briefly club members resets to zero every Jan, it'll be April possibly May before we get full picture.</p> <p>TS – did Arun see dips and rises? PJ - Yes, no trends Meeting on 6th, session to cover growth SM – suggested a referral scheme PJ – best membership campaign we ever had 50% membership for first year if signed up to DD, 80-85% retention, non DD about 30%, recoup low cost first year by having them for a few years SC – I wanted to say a few things, don't panic the cost of living crisis is hitting people hard, membership has actually held up well. Weird thing going on with inflation, talking to members, costs going up everywhere, lots of extra things, members hit heavily with mortgages, insurance, fuel, are members giving up full membership to become club membership? On deals, DD deals are the only way to go, unless they stay, we won't get return. Focus should be on full individual members, we should all try to recruit, BMC are doing excellent work</p> | SM | | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|----------------|------------------------|
| | <p>and we should sell that, areas like access increased staff since pre-covid.</p> <p>JW – note from IW on membership growth, we pick this up in more detail on 6th April, due to it being such an important area, we should pool all ideas, use the group to channel all ideas. IW says they met once in the last year, now the memberships committee has reconvened, one/year is aiming to become once/week, there is renewed focus, absolutely need all ideas in to give some structure to going forward, great ideas form GF back in June, need to run what we can run with and get them moving and then get other ideas going. There is some disappointment on the plug being pulled on club growth. Aghast at AGM not having recruitment campaign, and we're now in March already.</p> <p>PJ – Quick comment on club members, membership went up by about 2k over last 6 months of last year, more than individual members gone down could reflect people moving from full to club because it's cheaper. Looking at upgrades, no reduction in upgrades PR – in addition at April meeting future of insurance, significant increase in costs, proportionately up another 10% next year, cost based far too high to. MC to discuss on 6th April</p> <p>DB – thanks to PJ, can we add an extra column for membership showing members as individuals not people who pay multiple times – is it going up or down</p> <p>PJ – it's coming, just haven't got round to chasing it yet</p> <p>DB – firm believer must rely on individual volunteer members to push membership whenever we attend meetings with non-members around, people in Peak and Lakes Area do this already, I'm sure others do too, we should all try and get members, we (BMC) should work on way of promoting itself through volunteers</p> <p>AS – minor point, linking this to the AGM and arrangements on how members can raise resolutions. They require 0.5% of membership, looking at articles, it's actually 0.5% of membership as reported at previous AGM, therefore we need to be accurate, reflecting people rather than membership.</p> | | | <p>SM/AS</p> <p>PJ</p> |
| 6 | <p>Area Reports (various – if available)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Peak Area – AGM Proposal Process b. SW Area Access Reps c. Others? – defer to 6th April? | <p>Sean Milner Stuart Holmes Trevor Smith</p> | <p>20 mins</p> | |
| | <p>SM - invited SH to lead on Simon Lee (SL) resolutions before covering the proposal process</p> <p>SH – SL has not specifically asked me to raise this. It's less about the resolution, more about process clarification. The basic mechanism is, if a member has a view, approach staff, take to council. SL put resolution on social media, and has generated some discussion. Anyone can see it, we need to get the mechanism to work. My view is, as soon as SL put forward the resolutions it's likely that they won't be needed as we could deal with them beforehand, Resolution 1 – more transparency required – why not just feed this to the board and the board can agree / disagree.</p> | | | |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>SM – SL has specifically asked me if there is a mechanism for him to be able to email BMC members using the mailing list, so that he can explain his argument for the Resolutions.</p> <p>SH – how unbiased is mechanism, have we done same process before, is it / in agreement with articles?</p> <p>SC – there is a massive cost of change and the disruption due to change, there needs to be an incredibly good reason for change, if we had a response to the 2nd motion (<i>GBC split from BMC</i>) it's likely to be no. Res 1, more open and transparent likely to occur, I support SH view, pick it up in MC quickly and get it formalised. We need a BMC viewpoint on these. SL has a right to follow through, 0.5% was a bit arbitrary, but it doesn't kill democracy. It is supposed to be difficult. SL is worried about double jeopardy, they think our governance compliance officer may be misinterpreting the articles. The legal view is he thinks if SL brings the Resolutions to MC he can't bring it back to MC with a year, doesn't mean can't take it to members. If he's close to the required roughly 400 members then we should be allowing him to go. It's really important to have a BMC viewpoint, 2nd motion will be expensive, risky, disruptive, we don't have the leeway, the staff, the time so it should be rejected</p> <p>JW – SC said most of what I was going to say. Never meant to be double jeopardy, should be able to take things to MC if there is weight, should bring to MC and we form our view. If MC is against something, irrespective of being brought formally or informally, SL should still able to bring it to the AGM with 0.5% of members support. BMC needs to be neutral and allow equal access to communication channels for both sides of the argument.</p> <p>TS – two things, 1. Checking members are members, is why he was asked to go through process, if he's refused to do that then he's making it difficult for himself</p> <p>DB – SL has not asked a Q, he's told us the answer, he wants financial detail to be sent out, he's not asked for it he just wants it, he doesn't want it to be kept internal, he wants it externally forcing people to be either for or against, somehow this needs to be addressed, there's no argument for/against. It's not in a fair playing space at present, he wants details info, he's basically saying MC are not capable of looking at it, only he can and see where GBC stands. The real process we're looking at, is that we need to find a mechanism for the counter argument, I hope he'll withdraw it (<i>Res 1</i>) and let MC deal with it.</p> <p>SC – specifically on process, what everyone got excited about is the web form. It is onerous, I agree, but that was on purpose, it's meant to be, the process was deliberately onerous. BMC shouldn't be too strict on edge cases, as a membership organisation we're being foolish on being too picky. I feel exposed as I feel I'm the only member putting argument against it, he (<i>SL</i>) has refused to say anything about the costs associated with separating GBC, he's being political as he's always believed in the subsidiary model. The problem is changing from one solution to another, not that one is better than another.</p> <p>SH – can I really quickly 1.5min for res 1 and res 2, Res 1 – more transparency regarding finances, SL staff wages, I'm against it, last</p> | |
|---|--|

| | |
|---|------------------|
| <p>meeting I thought that was amazing, compared to last 18 months amazing, if we can share that it does improve transparency and res 1 doesn't need to go forward. If enough board members present minute it and agree it.</p> <p>AS – all for transparency, I would echo SH comments on info at last meeting, very full disclosure of the financial situation as we then knew it. I've put a couple of proposals forward, around sharing financial info down the chain to MC then to Area Meetings. Things that would undercut res 1 is that the members see that they are finally getting the info that their reps feel is appropriate, pointing at PR metaphorically as I don't know how he sees reporting and financial info sharing down chain of command</p> <p>PR – in ideal world if accounts are set up the way I'd like them to be, we go out to MC and board, 1/4ly or monthly at a level of detail showing we're on track and in a decent format to understand, not every penny and wage but similar level we shared on 28 Feb, I'd be very happy to agree format and then agree to res 1, not the full annual accounts, not every penny – probably middle ground.</p> <p>TS - I'll endorse that, give us a bit of time PR working on it, talked earlier, interim CFO, couple days/week, this is something that can be sorted out</p> <p>SM - Do we agree with PR view – yes</p> <p>SC – some members unhappy at level of detail presented at MC, perhaps too much detail, main thing agitated about is GBC spend, I, not a new thing, 3 years ago when I arrived its one of the things I asked to see</p> <p>SM – ask PR to present in Apr financial report, working towards something</p> <p>SH – yes</p> <p>PR – Board are meeting on 27th Apr, once audit done, I'll happily provide it, but there'll be an extra level of detail around GBC</p> <p>SM – could we have a statement to that effect, something out through area reps, discussion about transparency, MC agree, we'll happy move it forward good timescale and level of detail</p> <p>PR - Board papers 20th, AS</p> <p>SH – happy discussion with SL to give brief outcome – yes. Regarding Res 2, again, I'm not here to express my feeling, it's going to be down to the members, personally I'm against Res 2, due to the cost, time and money, what I do believe is whatever is best for climbers, is what we should do. It's a good time to have full review, now that Lorraine has departed, rather than do a full in depth review there are lots of ways we could do it, do we want to go down that rabbit hole or have a review – working group to look at options?</p> <p>JW – We did carry out formal review in 2022. The Board decided not to go down for separate entity route. But it was a split vote 6:6 intially and then there was another hour discussion before a final decision was made. They absolutely did not recommend splitting off, not least because we needed to sort it out, separating it, loses control, it must be in a position to run itself. We need to capture that a load of reviews have already taken place.</p> | <p>AS SH</p> |
|---|------------------|

| | | | | |
|---|---|----------------|--------|-------------------------------|
| | <p>TS – SW Access Reps, there is a lack of them, we have miles and miles of climbing costal crags, inland crags, granite, slate, and about 4 people trying to look after it. Philip will know, SW is trying to put a programme in place to recruit more reps, negotiate with NT, RSPB keeping RAD up to date, is it just a SW problem or do we need to broaden it?</p> <p>SC – I think we’ve been lucky in the Peak Area. Henry has been leading a team of about 15 names, local access reps to specific groups of crags, there are about 14 guides covering the Peak Area, that team built up access meetings in Peak pre-covid where around 30 people would turn up and discuss it. Henry is getting close to retirement, perhaps we need to grab him to move to a national presence, find out what he did, what worked and what didn’t? What I can see is SW do seem to appear worse off in Access, I think from a process side, we had a good system in the Peak Area and maybe good to get that out, share Good Practice. And, the Peak Area can pick up from others too, but we had a big team so someone could step up</p> <p>JW - not a problem for NE</p> <p>TS - Any other areas?</p> <p>AS - similar situation to Peak, access rep close to retirement, in NW small manageable area of limestone, people more likely to step forward if given a small piece to look after</p> <p>TS – we have a recruitment campaign, do other areas want to share or it just SW</p> <p>DB - it’s worth extending beyond SW we do have access reps in Peak and Lakes, we do have problems and we do like new blood anywhere</p> <p>TS - a lot of geography</p> <p>PW – it would be good to get some mentoring of volunteers, more experienced volunteers taking someone under their wing before they retire, we should have a mechanism to enable that</p> <p>MC – Is it that access work is done 9-5 during the week, so generally retired people have the time?</p> <p>PW - possible people have more time if retired, but it would be good to have youngsters on as it well</p> <p><i>Afternote – TS to offer (via TeamWorks) to extend access recruitment drive to other areas and arrange this if required. In addition, prepare a short paper regarding setting up Knowledge Transfer Access Committee in conjunction with BMC staff (could we ask opinion of BMC Access Staff too?)</i></p> <p><i>Afternote – SC to approach Henry to find out if he’s willing to be part of (lead?) a national “knowledge transfer” access group with a view of setting up mentoring for newer reps if MC agree this would worth while</i></p> <p><i>Afternote – SM to add onto 6th April meeting</i></p> | | | <p>TS</p> <p>SC</p> <p>SM</p> |
| 7 | BMC Voting Age | Jonathan White | 5 mins | |
| | <p>Do council want to progress the U18 voting T&F Group https://britishmountaineeringcouncil.teamwork.com/#/messages/1224244.</p> <p>JW – a member of Team GB who represents the country, came to the AGM, found he couldn’t vote (16 at the time), is there a good reason why</p> | | | |

| | | | |
|---|--|-------------|--------|
| | <p>he couldn't. There was a request for a working group, I put my name forward as did Fred Williams (the member who raised it). I don't have a lot of time, it's not controversial, we probably need Director to sponsor, I suggest TS as an articles geek, TN as our Governance and Compliance Officer, I suggest should be involved, also Safeguarding young people's knowledge I was going to ask Lynsey McAuley whether you'd be willing, plus a legal perspective. Also Lucy at Sport England, it would be useful to know if other sports let 16 year olds vote? Likely to recommend 16 or 14, not any younger.</p> <p>DB – can I make a suggestion, in addition look at voting age, we should look to involve an under 25 year old national councillor, voted on by under 25's.</p> <p>JW - Not aware of any other Articles changes proposed this year</p> <p>PR – I've thought same as DB, we need a Youth Rep on the Board, we'd get different view</p> <p>JW – we did have young guys in 20's 30's previously</p> <p>JW to put paper together for 6th April meeting</p> | | JW |
| 8 | NomCom Update | Sean Milner | 10 ins |
| | <p>There is a recruitment plan for Independent Director as follows</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information Pack / advert etc went live on 8th March • Closing Date for applications is 8th April • Short List Applications between 9th and 12th April • First Round Interviews by Zoom / Teams between 22nd and 26th April • Second Round interviews in the BMC Office in Manchester on one or more dates between 29th April and 3rd May • Martyn Hurn is stepping down at the AGM and we need to agree the specification for our next nominated director (draft Role Description will be shared) • Agreement to Terms of Reference - updated after the meeting held on the 26th September 2023, beign reviewed by the Board for Approval (hopefully) • With the recent additions of CND and CEO we've updated the Skills Matrix to identify the gaps we need to fill <p>In creating the draft Role Description, we considered the Skills Matrix with the addition recent appointments included. The Role Description is based on those we have used when appointing Laura as a Nominated Director and the current Information pack for the vacant Independent Director position.</p> <p>With both Caroline and Martyn stepping down we are losing the 2 directors with the following experience and capabilities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Marketing • Membership Organisations | | |

| | | | | | |
|------------------|---|---------------------|-------------|--------|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very strong Interpersonal Skills and High Emotional Intelligence <p>In addition looking at the Skills Matrix, and even with Laura and Paul Ratcliffe we are still a weaked than we'd like on competitive sport</p> <p>JW – It's good to know thigs are moving, couple of other position that come up this year, President up for election (outside NomCom's remit) certainly would be helpful if NomCom gave a steer for president skills required, may help steer people, if there is a need to us to get word out to look for a new President if MC doesn't do it, MC will suffer, so we need to get that out. I'm also conscious that we're half way through year PS's extra year, not seeing much of him as CND at MC, mindful that Pete's time coming up, also RM comes to the end of his first term in Nov, a lot to be done there on NomCom front. From MC perspective we need to have at least one person standing for President, we need to get the word out, and advertise if necessary. We may need to do some twisting of arms to get people to stand, I don't expect we'll be flooded with people wanting to do role.</p> <p>SC – JW covered almost everything, apart from after AGM EDI, prob Mohammed only one left , need to do something about it. We can't just have older white men. Also, can the housekeeping be kept up to date on the Council pages? Only 7 directors mentioned at least one missing, council and NomCOM need to make sure webpages up to date.</p> <p>PR - send to Greg, new website 3-4 weeks (but he's been saying that for 3-4 weeks?) names telephone numbers front of house system will be adjusted.</p> <p>TS – Could the Council contact list also get up to date?</p> | <p>SM</p> <p>SM</p> | | | |
| 9 | <table border="1"> <tr> <td data-bbox="360 1368 831 1406">Volunteer Awards</td> <td data-bbox="831 1368 1098 1406">Sean Milner</td> <td data-bbox="1098 1368 1275 1406">5 mins</td> </tr> </table> | Volunteer Awards | Sean Milner | 5 mins | |
| Volunteer Awards | Sean Milner | 5 mins | | | |
| | <p>Mariella is leaving the BMC to work and travel in Japan. Her last day will be the 10th of April 2024. I'd like MC to extend their thanks to her for the work she has done.</p> <p>We've already started the process for volunteer awards already. The relevant articles have been updated and the marketing team will be promoting these (see links below). The deadline for nominations is set for midday on the 15th April.</p> <p>BMC Volunteer Awards Nominate a Volunteer</p> <p>Dan Middleton will be sending me the anonymised results of any nominations on the 15th. I'll be organising a meeting shortly after this date to decide the winners so that they can be notified and sent invitations well in advance of the AGM in June.</p> <p>I do need some volunteers to assist me with this.</p> <p>Mohammed</p> | <p>SM</p> <p>M</p> | | | |

| | | | | |
|----|---|-------------|---------|--------------|
| | <p><i>Afternote: Lynn Robinson has volunteered to assist</i></p> <p>DB – sort of related, what’s happening about patrons? We’re losing some, not getting new ones, not retiring old ones.</p> <p>SC - AS parked it, to pick again after AGM</p> <p>SM – check and pick up patrons when reignited</p> | | | SM |
| 10 | Roles for Election at AGM | Sean Milner | 10 mins | |
| | <p>President – role description – sent to AS</p> <p>Any others</p> <p>JW - At least two constituency roles, NEC job descriptions</p> <p>Hillwalking, Club Members, Training, Rock Climbing ask PR to ask Helen Newton to dust them off from three years ago</p> <p>SM – President Role Description</p> <p><i>Afternote: received from Lynn Robinson</i></p> <p>PW – to get Job Descriptions and post into TeamWork</p> <p>SC - Stuart, yourself and Arun, I think we all agreed to stand again</p> <p>TS – for PR, are you aware how difficult it is to find these things, job descriptions, process docs, governance?</p> <p><i>Afternote: easier searching on the revamped website?</i></p> | | | SM PW |
| 11 | Meeting Attendee Communication | Sean Milner | 10 mins | |
| | <p>AGM – reporting only, voting in advance, discussion take place after AGM – not compliant.</p> <p>Need ability for member to communicate with each other</p> <p>Compliant with articles. JW I know you’ve been copied in to some of the emails floating about, can you please expand on this.</p> <p>JW – copied in to a lot of emails, there is a requirement in the Articles for BMC to be able to have online AGM or a Hybrid, under the proviso that people can communicate with Office holders and each other as could occur in a face to face AGM. The 2022 AGM didn’t comply and if 2024 followed suite we know of one individual who would challenge it legally. Members of MC were aghast at a reporting only AGM. What has been advertised isn’t compliant, it has been raised with RM and AS. RM is open to adjustments to be more interactive. SC will remember 2019. There is a voting element that will be doable, could do but maybe not at such short notice, if the AGM stands as it is then it could be nul and void, members may push immediately for an EGM. Therefore the BMC needs to go forward with compliant AGM.</p> <p>AS – I know of a midweek venue, an office on Burton Road. But we need a minimum of 50. Would be feasible for a hybrid AGM to use main conference room in BMC office?</p> <p>JW - AGM can take whole range of forms</p> <p>SH - AGM needs to be compliant, this was my Item 4. I think there’s £12k in the budget I read? There’s an outdoor centre near me, for £12k you could have accommodation, 5 casks of beer, Costco sandwiches</p> | | | |

| | | | | |
|----|--|----------------|---------|----|
| | <p>JW - Plas y Brenin whole place 12.5k, 12 years ago TS – as part of that there’s the compliance issue. A large part of the £12k is for Civitas Electoral online voting, it’s not a cheap exercise. There’s security, impartiality, reporting that’s where a big chunk of that comes from, PR – the online AGM was decided before I came in post. It is my understanding that if we went to a hybrid AGM then the Civitas charges would go up, as they’d have to manage supervision of show of hands as well as online voting. TS - Compliance, needs to be specific, what do we need to do? SM to address with AS and Thom</p> | | | SM |
| 12 | <p>CEO a. GBC / Finances update i. 2024 Q1 Finance Performance (£125k saving?) on track b. CCPG Feedback update</p> | Paul Ratcliffe | 20 mins | |
| | <p><i>Afternote: brought item forward to follow discussion around the SL Resolutions as it seemed the natural place to have it</i> I understand what SL is putting forward, the reasoning behind it, the (GBC) admin is not good enough, they have not been Governed well enough and not had clarity, my take is we need to ringfence off the performance department. The funded end, talent and UKS programme and national teams and that’s the only investment that goes in from funding agencies, everything else is BMC funded – para, ski, ice. National teams, UK Sport, Sport England - talent funding needs to be clearly ringfenced and they need to recharge back into BMC 8-15% for overheads, finance of my (CEO) time all costed in properly, that’s how I’d like to set it up. (PR shared screen) I want to get the cadence right, I’d like to come to MC first, then take things to the Board. So, this is how I think other funded sports work, eg British Cycling, Sailing, they have a performance department, it doesn’t cover competitions, grass roots, that’s the steps I would propose. We need an advisory group oversight by the performance lead on the Board, a specialist group, checking and challenging oversight with CEO acting as the overseeing officer, so I sign off grants. We need better involvement with ABC and Climbing Walls in general. There’s no BMC presence at walls, no reason to join There’d be a new financial structure, proposed, with grant charge back I’d like to see things under BMC more closely, maybe remove brand GBC climbing could be BMC Sport Climbing / BMC Para Climbing and we’d need to consult with Mountaineering Scotland as well. We get a planning figure from UK Sport this month. We go back to UK Sport in May. We’ll be talking at the to board in April, proposing a different budgeting approach, separate accounts, set up like that in that sort of format, that’s the main piece.</p> | | | |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | <p>SC – I think I spoke about this briefly as I happened to be at that meeting, I think that’s a sensible approach, we have to be careful about unnecessary Governance changes</p> <p>PR - it’s still part of an internal BMC department and as such will fit what my model is</p> <p>SC - I absolutely support recognition of indoor competition climbers situation these are important things that we haven’t been doing, listening to Lynn and JW it was sort of set up when GBC was progressing and then it stopped, the Board didn’t know things and MC started asking questions as they were worried that it seemed like Governance structures were broken regarding communications. The context needs to be taken into account when we discuss this. We had a problematic time on MC, we can make changes if supported but much harder if need to change Articles as it opens it up to AGM votes. It’s a sensible approach with partners and funding bodies, but I’m still slightly worried.</p> <p>AS – Question for PR, it is a strong case, one thing lacking is overarching management and view of the Competition framework from Grass Roots to Performance Teams. AM I misunderstanding you? Are you reenforcing separation of BMC and future squads from the rest of the competition landscape or looking to try and look at holistic management of whole area of competitions?</p> <p>PR - good question, one is an elite pathway, the other is competitions. At present all competitions are funded by the BMC. We support everything from Grassroots to major events, we need to find a way of funding it. Some are cost neutral. Mapping out an elite pathway talent programme through to Toby Roberts, including a competition structure has to support all that. We need to design that better but not funded by UK Sport. We have to find a mechanism to do that</p> <p>AS - multiple funding streams into one department isn’t rocket science, there’s a strong case to be made for an overarching department for competitions.</p> <p>JW - what AS just said. That is what we sort of envisaged in 2019, an overall department of which high performance was part. There was a concern raised that there was too much focus on elite indoors and not on the rest of it. It was raised at Board in September 2019, before a vote in November 2019. CCPG were tasked to come up with a better name for itself as “P” would make people think of just performance. There were various discussions with people challenging whether grass roots was part of their remit. It’s not just domestic competition that was “part” of their remit, it was right up front on their ToR. At the time Shauna Coxey was funded by EIS. How it would all be tied together would be good, GBC back into BMC I do like that, I am wary of more and more of BMC just seeing it as agent for competitions The Clubs Officer is now working on comps, less and less on clubs.</p> <p><i>Afternote: returned to PR as per Agenda order to cover the rest of his items</i></p> <p>PR – how best does the MC want to work with me, as I’m starting out as CEO?</p> | |
|--|--|--|

| | | | | |
|----|---|--|--|----|
| | <p>SM – I like what you’ve already said, coming to MC first, as a sounding board</p> <p>JW – Board is there to run business, MC is a conduit to membership and the custodian of the sport, make full use of us, for somethings ethics and ethos make full use of us, if you want to use us as a sounding board along the way, great</p> <p>PJ – we’re a membership organisation, we represent the membership, we’re a conduit to membership, talk to us</p> <p>PR – I appreciate that, next meeting 6th April, maybe at that point, I’ll share my thinking, how this year’s looking , small slot on 6th</p> <p>JW – we have loads of connections, if you want help come to us, we’re all happy to help, we all reach a point of overload, personal overload, and we’ll do it for free as well, the knowledge we have is our greatest strength</p> <p>DT – 6th option for dial in as well?</p> <p>SC – thank everyone over last month, so much better than what’s happened in last year, MC is important and it’s great we’re working together for the benefit of the organisation</p> <p>JW - yes, I’ll second that, don’t forget, there’s an open forum, tomorrow, only 6 registered so far, not well advertised, last open forum before AGM, probably get as many Google BMC open forum, link on how to register,</p> <p>There is a third scheduled prior to AGM</p> <p>SH – SM can you add my item 4 for today’s Agenda on 6th</p> <p>PR – we’re in a slightly different place with GBC now, we’re inviting Leah Crane to that group to meet community and parents I’d like to get that set up and invite SH as well</p> | | | SM |
| | | | | SM |
| | | | | SM |
| | | | | PR |
| 13 | AOB | | | |
| | Nothing for this meeting, items carried over to 6 th April as noted for SM actions above | | | |

The above is accepted as an accurate record of the meeting:

16/4/24

Signed _____

Date _____

Andy Syme, Chair