

BMC North West Area Meeting
3 April 2017, The Black Dog, Belmont

MINUTES

Attendance – 17

BMC Officer in attendance – Dave Turnbull (CEO), Simon Lee (commercial partnerships manager)

Chair – Carl Spencer

Apologies.

Tim Greenhalgh; Mike Hounsley.

1. Minutes accepted.

2. Matters arising from the minutes.

- a. Shivers Arete peg. NB waiting for dry weather to make replacement.

3. Area Rep reports.

- a. **Access and guidebooks.** LA circulated a written report. Lancs guidebook selling well and booklet with new climbs + first ascent details planned. A Wired Guide planned for N of England including Lancs.

N.B. Montcliffe should be avoided whilst ownership is clarified. Warton Main should not have sport routes added without approval. Unusually high water levels at Brownstones were noted.

As a response to a query forwarded to us by Martin Kocsis about guidebook policy re. inclusion of first ascent details It was reported that Guidebook Committee has agreed to put first ascent details in the forthcoming Peak Limestone South guide.

- b. **Clubs.** No report. DT suggested that Jane Thompson could send out a clubs email on our behalf.
- c. **Youth.** SH circulated a written report. Youth Series of combined NW and Lakes areas had proved a great success and would be repeated next year. An average of 85 competitors at each event. He also reported a surge in walls running their own competition squads which has dramatically improved the quality of coaching. There was still some concern about the nature of, and selection for, the BMC Development Squad. The way that testing was carried out for selection, with no prior information, was not understood by applicants with some successful competitors not being selected. There was even a £20 fee for consideration. Local expertise and knowledge had not been sought. It also seems that the

'Development Squad' has become the de facto 'Competition Squad'; they should be different things. The report that J Garside gave at the January meeting did not seem to match local feedback. DT undertook to investigate on behalf of the area.

- 4. Motion of No Confidence.** DT gave a report on the background to the motion and the decision making timeline. DT knew of the possibility of the MoNC 2 days before last National Council meeting but at that stage there was no formal submission. Subsequently there had been two invitations to publish material in Summit and Martin Wragg had been involved, with considerable volunteer effort, in producing his report. DT reported that the process was legitimate but that he suspected that there were underlying concerns motivating it. The Alpine Club had called a SGM, National Council had called for a governance review and all national work had been largely stalled. It was quite possible that the Sport England grant funding might be affected.

CS summarised that there had been problems in communication etc and that the BMC is not perfect but that the MoNC was too strong a reaction. Lyndon Gill suggested that the lack of information of the rebrand had aggrieved the supporters who were in favour of the primacy of the membership. It would have been possible to call an EGM. There was a feeling that Area meetings had been disenfranchised with membership not engaged in the decision making process and a relatively weak National Council.

It seemed that Bob Pettigrew had been poorly advised and his intention was unclear. CS asked if the BMC had any contingency plans for this threat and how they were moving towards governing body status. It was generally felt that the membership have confidence in the BMC and the openness of this debate instilled more confidence. However it was clear that this motion could seriously affect funding; Sport England were taking a real interest.

Nick Bond indicated that he supported the idea that a motion had been put forward as he felt that there was a need for serious questions to be asked at area level and above about the governance of the BMC. He would, however, be voting against at the AGM as this motion was the wrong way to go about it.

All attendees indicated that they would be voting against the MoNC.

- 5. BMC Commercial Partnerships.** SL gave an introduction to his role, funded by Sport England, in the BMC supported by a circulated paper. Essentially the idea was to select preferred partners who the BMC could subsequently say 'the BMC recommend/support/use.....'. He has investigated the potential and held an informal workshop prior to the last National Council meeting. He is now engaged in consulting with areas to gauge opinion and support.

CS suggested that there did need to be a watertight licensing agreement in place. AS asked about the risk of perceived favouritism from a 'neutral representative body' especially when undertaking equipment testing/reviewing and suggested that specific sponsorship of events/projects was a way to reduce any apparent conflict. LA asked if British firms would be prioritised. Concern was also expressed around the possibility of reputational risks with association with a failing company and that of the

alienation of existing supporters who were not selected. It was asked if the expenditure on this project will balance with the income.

The meeting felt that the message had to be carried to National Council that any developments needed to be low risk and undertaken with care with regard to existing supporters of the BMC.

A vote was held and 5 were for the policy document with 2 against (the rest abstaining or having left during a long meeting).

Date of next meeting

Monday 5th June 2017, Venue TBC.

Minutes taken by Andy Say