

BMC AREA MEETING & AGM – Monday 20th November 2017

FOR SUBMISSION TO NATIONAL COUNCIL

AREA – North West

1. Location & Attendance: Anderton Centre, Rivington

2. **BMC staff & Officials in attendance:** Ray Wigglesworth, Rab Carrington, John Garside. Very good attendance – approximately 35 (vs. the normal 15+)

3. AGM Elections:

Carl Spencer & Andy Say re-elected as Chair & Secretary respectively

Carl Spencer & Andy Say re-elected as NC representatives

Les Ainsworth re-appointed as Access rep, Stuart Holmes as Youth rep and Stuart Igoe as Hillwalking rep

4. MTE

Subsequent to the ORG discussion Jon Garside introduced the issue of BMC representation on MTE Board / Council. Attendees felt there was insufficient information and time to reach a conclusion

After the meeting the Summary recommendation prepared by Jon Garside on behalf of MTE was circulated to all attendees. Email feedback indicates 80% recommending no action at present (I.e. retain 4 voting members whilst ORG is ongoing) and 20% recommending an acceptance of reduction.

5. General Notes

Local access issues dealt with first. Local AGM voted on bloc (lack of candidates to warrant a formal election). Carl Spencer & Andy Say elected to continue as Chair & Secretary as well as NC reps.

Prior to the meeting Carl specifically invited past attendees with real experience of BMC committees totalling some 100+ years' worth of experience across BMC ManCom/NC, executive, specialist & four past local area chairs.

6. ORGANISATION REVIEW

Rab chaired the main presentation of the organisation review allowing Carl & Andy to be part of the audience.

Despite what was stated on UKC there was lively debate with very pertinent questions from those in the audience and particularly those with experience of how the BMC functions (and where it doesn't). Several emails received by Carl thanking him for a well-run meeting.

Key issues raised in relation to the Organisation Review both during the meeting as well as since the meeting include:

1. Why the rush? Although the ToR suggested a date for end of review for the next AGM, it is far too radical to include a change of organisation from a members led body to a limited company operated by directors with little recourse to the members. Terms of reference too vague.
2. The membership survey did not address a need for primacy or governance (albeit most members might not understand such). So, why such emphasis on primacy and governance?
3. The partner's survey has addressed a need for primacy and governance but, where is the qualitative and quantitative information to support for this?
4. What are the options – what are implications of not pursuing grant funding and not having change the governance?
5. How can the governance be so bad in relation to company law given that the future policy review of 2007 which took place after the changes to the companies act in 2006? What does Martin Wragg have to say about this? And is there any plan to obtain a second opinion?
6. Should a risk management plan/register not be drawn up first i.e. before changes are made to the MAAA and how does the legal advice relate to the risks posed to the business?
7. Why so prescriptive i.e. not a “pick and mix” and (repeat) why the rush to adopt the document in whole?
8. Volunteer network may disappear and members assembly will consist of people with no experience and no qualifications are required.
9. Part of the future solution is implementation of improved technology and IT but... the BMC's track record on past IT projects is very poor and funding for such has been diverted elsewhere in the past (e.g. 2003).
10. Reserved matters – Question – if everything and the kitchen is sink is included in reserved matters then we have the status quo with a set of articles of association that comply with the law? Ray Wigglesworth confirmed such at the meeting. If the priority is to make the articles comply with the companies act then we could take this approach and then remove certain such reserved matters slowly and at each AGM going forward. However rumour has it that MTE have been told such an approach won't wash with Sport England, in fact any reserved matters of importance will not be allowed? Is this correct and has the legal advice addressed this?
11. Questionnaire was biased/loaded? And, why was the questionnaire released prior to December NC meeting. Should it not have been approved first?
12. The review proposes an expanded organisation. How does this fit with reduced funding from government and should there not be a business plan to accompany such expansion plans?

13. Should director roles not be limited to shorter terms / will staff have to re-apply for jobs in the new organisation as is common in commercial industry.
14. Is the BMC membership really asking for the BMC to become the governing body for competition climbing? Does the BMC really want to embrace the position of governing body for competition climbing? The BMC has a poor track record of managing competition climbing.