



Draft Minutes of the July 2020 extraordinary Council Meeting

Held by Zoom

Saturday 18th July 2020, 9:30am

Chair: P Rowsell (In the absence of L Williams)

Secretary: Russell Myers

Treasurer: Howard Jones

Recorder: Russell Myers

Meeting documentation

Version 2 of the Agenda was circulated by email to Council members on 6 July together with some reports. Version 3 was circulated on 17 July.

Various reports were circulate from the Secretary by email on various dates. These, together with a report circulated earlier by Rostam Namaghi, have been brought together into a single document, excepting two documents related to Radon which were too large to incorporate.

All four documents have been posted on the BCA web site after the meeting.

Attendance

Role (as at the start of the meeting)	Voting	Name	Present	Initials
BCA President	No	Mick Day	No	
BCA Executive				
Chairman	#1	Les Williams	No	
Secretary (Acting)	Yes	Russell Myers #2	Yes	RM
Treasurer	Yes	Howard Jones	Yes	HJ
Chairs of Standing Committees				
Training Officer	Yes	Nigel Atkins	Yes	NA
Conservation and Access Officer	Yes	Claire Ross #3	No	
Equipment and Techniques Officer	Yes	Mark Sims	No	
Youth and Development	No	Rostam Namaghi	Yes	RN
Officers Without Committees				
Publications & Information	Yes	Jane Allen #4	Yes	JA
Regional Council Representatives				
Cambrian Caving Council	Yes	Stuart France	Yes	SF
Council of Northern Caving Clubs	Yes	Tim Allen	Yes	TA
Council of Southern Caving Clubs	Yes	Alan Butcher	Yes	AB
Derbyshire Caving Association	Yes	Wayne Sheldon	Yes	WS
Devon and Cornwall Underground Council	Yes	David Jean	No	
Constituent Body Representatives				
William Pengelly Cave Studies Trust	Yes	Richard Vooght	No	
Association of Caving Instructors	Yes	Stephan Natynczuk	Yes	SN
National Caving Scout Active Support Unit	Yes	Tony Radmall	Yes	TR
British Cave Research Association	Yes	John Gunn	Yes	JG
National Association of Mining History Organisations	Yes	Steve Holding	Yes	SH
Council of Higher Education Caving Clubs	Yes	David Botcherby	Yes	DB
Cave Diving Group	Yes	Claire Cohen	No	
British Cave Rescue Council	Yes	Emma Porter	No	
Group/Club Representatives				
Position 1 - 2019-2021	Yes	Hellie Adams	No	
Position 2 - 2019-2021	Yes	Gary Douthwaite #5	No	
Position 3 - 2018-2020	Yes	Idris Williams	Yes	IW
Position 4 - 2018-2020	Yes	John Hine	No	

<u>Individual Member Representatives</u>				
Position 1 - 2019-2021	Yes	Phil Rowsell	Yes	PR
Position 2 - 2019-2021	Yes	Will Burn	Yes	WB
Position 3 - 2018-2020	Yes	Andrew McLeod	Yes	AM
Position 4 - 2018-2020	Yes	Jenny Potts	Yes	JP
<u>Working Party Convenors</u>				
IT Working Party Convenor (Acting)	No	Gary Douthwaite #5	No	
CRoW Working Party Convenor	No	David Rose	No	
Qualifications Management Committee (QMC)	No	Juliet Parker Smith	Yes	JPS
Vision Working Party Convenor	No	Hellie Adams	No	
Radon Working Party Convenor	No	Gethin Thomas	Yes	GT
Cave Registry	No	David Cooke	No	
<u>Additional BCA Appointments</u>				
Media Liaison	No	Andy Eavis	No	
Webmaster	No	Gary Douthwaite #5	No	
Web Services	No	David Cooke	No	
Insurance Manager	No	Howard Jones	Yes	HJ
Membership Administrator	No	Wendy Williams	No	
Safeguarding Officer	No	Chris Boardman	Yes	CB
Training Administrator	No	Mary Wilde	No	
Library Representative	No	Jenny Potts	Yes	
Newsletter Editor	No	David Rose	No	
UIS representative	No	Andy Eavis	No	
European Speleological Federation (FSE) rep	No	Ged Champion	Yes	GC
Rope Testing	No	Bob Mehew	Yes	BM
Artificial Cave	No	Katie Eavis	No	
<u>Observers</u>				
	No	Robert Scott	Yes	RS
	No	Josh White	Yes	JW
	No	Ari Cooper-Davis	Yes	ACD
Notes				
#1	The Chairman only has a casting vote only in event of a tie			
#2	Russell Myers had volunteered to take on the role of Acting Secretary which the Executive had accepted			
#3	Claire Ross had submitted her resignation prior to the meeting			
#4	Jane Alan had indicated that she would not re-stand for the P&I position at the AGM			
#5	Gary Douthwaite had indicated that he would not re-stand for the IT Working Group and the Web Master positions at the AGM.			

Item 0 Chair

PR noted that with absence of L Williams, a Chair needed to be agreed by Council.

HJ reported that he had taken a phone call from L Williams who was on holiday in a camper van and had found that his internet connection was not good enough to maintain a reliable link to chair the meeting. So following a discussion with RM, they agreed that PR should be nominated to chair the meeting. RM seconded the nomination. There were no voices against so PR accepted the role.

PR noted that several aspects of etiquette at Zoom meetings including muting one's microphone, use of the chat box, indicate a desire to speak by waving one's hand and keep one's contribution short.

PR went on to note that he felt BCA was in a real bad situation with an implosion due to infighting. He had some while ago written an email to Council members on the need to pull together to represent members. He hoped that Council could start to do that and be polite to other Council officers and try to understand what the other person is trying to say.

Item 1 Apologies for Absence

The following had been received:

L Williams, Chair
W Williams, Membership Administrator
R Vought, William Pengelly Cave Studies Trust
H Brooke / Adams, Group Representative
A Eavis, Media Liaison & UIS representative
D Cooke, Web Services

Item 2 Council Appointments

The agenda recorded the following proposals:

Secretary: Russell Myers (acting), no other applicants
P&I Officer: Rostam Namaghi, no other applicants
Y&D Officer: Josh White, no other applicants
Group Representatives: Josh White, Rostam Namaghi
Individual Representatives: No candidates
IT Working Group Convenor: Ari Cooper Davies, no other applicants

PR asked if there were any other applicants to these positions.

RM stated he had no other applications. He noted that the C&A position was also vacant following the resignation of Claire Ross, which he had only discovered the previous evening.

PR proposed that consideration of the C&A vacancy be deferred to the next meeting and that a notice of vacancy should be issued inviting applications. The proposal was accepted without comment.

Action 1 - Secretary to issue a notice of vacancy for the C&A role and invite applicants for consideration by the next meeting.

PR asked how the appointments to the other positions should be made.

RM indicated there needed to be a positive decision in order to confirm appointments.

RN noted that the practice of previous meetings was that unopposed persons were confirmed as a batch as taking up their posts. Although at the previous AGM there had been individual votes.

JA queried if a batch vote also include the individual representatives where there were no candidates. She indicated that she would be prepared to come forward as an Individual Representative.

PR asked if such a nomination was acceptable.

RN indicated that Council could accept such nominations.

CB noted that he felt somewhat frustrated in his role in not having a vote and expressed interest in applying for one of the Individual Representative posts.

PR proposed that the meeting should first consider the posts of Secretary, P&I, Y&D and IT Working Group Convenor. Following a request by PR for any objections and any abstentions, PR declared that

Secretary: Russell Myers

P&I Officer: Rostam Namaghi

Y&D Officer: Josh White

IT Working Group Convenor: Ari Cooper-Davies

had been unanimously appointed to their respective posts.

PR asked CB to explain how he had no vote.

CB noted that a previous Chair had pointed this out to him that he had no vote because he did not represent a particular organisation.

HJ stated he understood that certain positions on Council were non voting such as his Insurance Manager role but other roles were such as Treasurer.

BM noted that the constitution covered who had a vote and who did not.

JPS noted that heads of Working Groups (often called Working Parties) do not have a vote.

RN noted that Chair of Standing Committees do have a vote.

AB asked if the positions for Group and Individual Representatives been advertised.

RP thought they had not been advertised.

AB proposed that they should be advertised.

TA pointed out that the Agenda did advertise the posts, the previous Secretary had advertised the posts and he thought it would be worth checking how many post were vacant. He noted JP had been co-opted into one vacancy.

BM proposed the posts be advertised and the next meeting consider the appointments.

JP noted that the January Council meeting had elected her as an acting Individual Representative until the 2020 AGM.

RP noted that the planned next meeting would be the AGM.

AB stated that already two people had put their names forward at this meeting (JA and CB). He therefore proposed:

That an advertisement for the posts of Individual Representatives be reissued and that the next meeting consider those positions.

Proposed by AB, seconded by WB.

Following a request by PR for any objections and any abstentions, PR declared that the meeting had unanimously voted in favour of the motion.

Action 2 – Secretary to re-advertise the 2 posts of Individual Representatives and for the next meeting to consider those positions.

Item 3 Minutes of the last meeting on 11 January 2020

RM reported that he had only had one comment on the draft from Dave Cooke requesting that his report be inserted into the minutes as opposed to be a separate item on the web site. The Exec had agreed to it and it was being processed.

TR stated that his comment in Item 7 was incorrect. He had provided a suitable amendment. PR asked for TR to liaise with RM to incorporate them.

There were no objections in response to a request by PR to approve the minutes. TA, ACD and JW abstained since they had not been present. PR reported that the minutes were approved.

Action 3 – Secretary to reissue the minutes of the 11 January 2020 with the two discussed amendments.

Item 4.1 BCA Treasurer Report to BCA Council July 2020

HJ noted that since he wrote his report he had received a claim from CNCC for 2019 of just over £1100 which had been reviewed by Finance Committee, so he had paid the sum.

JG raised a point of clarification that the reported payment to BCRA was solely to cover costs of the British Caving Library (BCL).

HJ commented that he in future note that all of the sum paid to BCRA was to fund BCL.

JG accepted the wording.

TA asked that given the likely impact of Covid 19 on cancelling expeditions, was the £7,000 donation by BCA to Ghar Parau Foundation (GPF) going to be left in full to be distributed amongst the smaller number or whether it would be reduced to reflect the normal size of grant.

PR proposed that the topic be deferred to Any Other Business assuming time was available but noted that it was unlikely that any expeditions would take place this year.

HJ noted that he was in discussion with GPF over funding and would report back to Council in due course.

There were no objections to PR's suggestion that HJ's report was accepted.

Item 4.2 BCA Insurance Managers report to BCA Council July 2020

HJ had nothing to add to his report.

There was no response to a request by PR for comments.

Item 5 Discussion on Welsh Government Judicial Review submitted by David Rose

PR noted David Rose's absence due to him being on holiday and suggested that SF took the lead.

SF gave a short presentation on the current position amplifying on David Rose's document. In response to a query on the application of the result to England and Scotland, given the judgement was about Wales, SF noted that the law in England was essentially the same so the judgement would apply. However there was a different Act in Scotland and in any case, that act did recognise that it applied to caving.

AB asked for clarification on whether if the case was won, would the Welsh Government decision be nullified and they would have to reconsider it.

SF stated that what we were seeking was a decision that the Countryside and Rights of Way (CRoW) act did apply to caving. SF went onto note that the case did also touch on the 1925 Law of Property Act in respect of Urban Commons which might apply outside of Wales.

AB noted that the Judicial Review paper by Richard Buxton (being the solicitor being used by David Rose) on the web commented that even if the review overturned a decision, the decision could still come to the same conclusion. He asked what happens if the Welsh Government is required by the judgement to reconsider their decision but still came to the same decision?

SF expressed the view that because the basis of the Welsh Government's decision was CRoW did not apply to caving and if told it does, then it cannot come to the same decision.

PR asked if even if we won, could the Welsh Government tell us to 'go away'.

SF noted that the Welsh reform review of CRoW process which was ongoing, was to review and suggest reforms to the CRoW act. However, if we win, then the CRoW act does not need to be reformed with respect to caving. But there is a separate area of work where we come in late which is in respect of updating the Statutory Code of Conduct.

PR asked what did the phrase "permission without any need for an oral hearing" in David Rose's paper mean? Did it mean a decision on whether CRoW applied or not.

SF indicated that the three options mentioned related to a decision on whether there was a valid case to answer and also whether the Aarhus convention applies which would limit our expenses to £5,000.

PR asked as to how much it might cost going forward given we go through both a preliminary hearing and then the full hearing.

SF noted that we had already spend £12,000 including VAT to get to this stage. If we get cover from the Aarhus convention, then further costs are limited to £5,000. If we do not, then our costs could rise to as much as £60,000 if we loose.

AB asked what was the current estimate of success given David Rose's initial estimate back in March of 60 : 40 and if the solicitor had made any estimate. He suggested that we should hold off making a decision until we had an estimate in percentage terms from our solicitor, especially if the response suggested the percentages had fallen below 50%.

SF stated that he had not been party to any such discussion with the solicitor. He noted that since he was not the client, he would not expect to have been informed of such discussion.

HJ noted he had been copied some of the correspondence between the solicitor and the client which did comment about there being a good chance. However he would place little credence on such assessment based on his business experience of dealing with lawyers.

HJ also stated that he did intend to vote for the spend and that he felt BCA could afford to spend up to £60,000.

RM commented that he also had been privy to correspondence around the legal brief and recalled that there was a comment that there were no killer points to our argument.

RN asked when was approval for the spend required by?

SF indicated he would like a decision today on whether to continue support and funding or not.

HJ stated that it needed approval today as the court decision could come as early as Monday next.

SF noted that he considered the arguments being put forward by the Welsh Government and National Resources for Wales were descending to the trivial level, such as caves which undulated above and below the 600m height above sea level definition of access land.

PR summarised the situation that the feeling was there was a reasonable chance of success with no quantification. He sought and got no dissention from that view by the meeting.

PR went onto ask how quickly would the money be needed.

HJ stated that having paid one bill, David Rose had a line of credit with the solicitor. The time frame for further payments would depend on how long the solicitor would permit bills to remain outstanding.

TA noting his long involvement in this topic, he felt the case is as strong as it can be, that it is most unlikely that the Welsh Government could conjure any killer point, that BCA membership have voted

for a campaign as well as making it a policy and changing its constitution, so he would propose the meeting moved to a vote.

GC noted that David Rose's report did state *"it may be wise for Council to consider whether to grant an "in principle" extension to the legal budget at the forthcoming meeting"*.

HJ commented that he considered the £60,000 was a worse case scenario and felt Council needed to say that they would back a spend of up to £60,000 so it gave a clear message to get on with the work and avoid the need for subsequent intermediate decisions.

PR noted that £60,000 was a quarter of the BCA's funds and that would be a massive hit on BCA's funds.

TA noted that although he had previously proposed to move to a vote, he felt a need to reply to PR's point. The money in BCA's funds had come from its members and that CRoW has been the only thing in the past 6 years or so since he became involved with BCA that they had clearly voted for.

AB stated that *"I always have not been a great fan of CRoW. But the BCA made a democratic decision in 2018 and therefore I'm going with it"*. Even though he had slight reservations that further requests might arise.

Following a request by PR for any objections and any abstentions, PR declared that the meeting had unanimously voted in favour of authorising the potential spend of £60,000 on the Judicial Review case.

NA commented that a vote of thanks should go to SF and David Rose for all the work they had done on this topic.

TA noted that JA had left the meeting during the last discussion. He expressed frustration that the meeting had omitted to give a vote of thanks to the two resigning officers for their efforts. TA also noted that JA had volunteered to fill the Individual Representative post which had not been acknowledged.

PR responded by stating that he had not initially realised that JA had left the meeting as he had been focused on chairing the meeting rather than the chat facility. When he did realise, he had asked TA if he could ask JA to return. He also noted that as another person had also volunteered to fill the Individual Representative post which then made it difficult for the meeting to decide between the offers.

TA commented that the meeting had replaced her as P&I officer.

PR agreed that JA had done a fantastic job as P&I and asked that the Secretary should send a letter of thanks to JA for all her efforts as P&I.

RM noted that he would also send a letter of thanks to Claire Ross for all her efforts as P&I.

Item 6 Rostam Namaghi Proposals for Council

RN noted he had made three proposals relating to the operation of the Publications and Information (P&I), Youth and Development (Y&D) and Information technology (IT) Working Groups. The agenda summarised his proposals.

TA asked how RN had assessed the impact of doing away with the role of Media Liaison. RN replied by indicating that the function would remain within the P&I Working Group.

TA noted that given the P&I Standing Committee had never met until after JA had resigned as P&I Convenor when LW had held one meeting plus the role of P&I was more focused on marketing caving, why does RN consider a Working Group is going to be of value.

RN noted the flexibility of a Working Group compared to a Standing Committee structure. The breadth of the role of P&I would be hindered by a Standing Committee structure where as a Working Group structure would help it to function. He did note the need for proper and wide consultation before publishing a document. Also he would have to find the volunteers and adapt the infrastructure around them as well as bring in specialists to deal with some areas.

TA in accepting the argument, asked how the creation of a P&I Working Group would fit in with the decision of the 2019 AGM to do away with the Standing Committee and run the role with a single officer.

RN noted the main structural point would be whether the P&I Officer would have a vote on Council. That was up to BCA and could possibly be part of the consideration by the Vision Working Group. However, he had been nominated for a Group Representative and thus would have a vote.

JP noted that the title Publications and Information is a hang over from when BCA published books and she was the publications sales person. She suggested that perhaps the title should be changed to Information and Membership services.

BM asked where the Terms of Reference for the P&I Working Group were.

RN noted they had been published in an early email [see report circulated earlier by Rostam Namaghi in the Reports document] and circulated them via the Zoom chat facility. The proposed terms of reference for P&I Working Group were:

These terms of reference were drafted on the 08/05/2018 and comply to both the BCA Constitution and its Manual of Operations.

i. Purpose

- i. The aim of the group is to assist the BCA in; its self-promotion, engagement with its members and developing a clear media strategy.

ii. Membership

- i. Members are to be invited by the P&I Officer
- ii. The convenor of the group will be the P&I Officer.
- iii. Membership should be reviewed on an annual basis and its members re-invited
- iv. There will not be any restrictions on numbers in these terms of reference, to allow it to reach an organic operable size.

iii. Accountability

- i. The P&I Officer will report back to Council at meetings.
- ii. There will be an annual budget presented to the Association
- iii. There will be an annual report detailing the working group's activities and general strategic plan.
- iv. Complaints are to follow BCA procedure and brought to Council.

iv. Review

- i. This will be done annually and presented at the BCA AGM under the relevant subsection report.
- v. **Methods**
 - i. Official meetings will occur at least once yearly with regular discussions between members of the working group occurring in between.
 - ii. The minutes will be published on the BCA website promptly.
 - iii. The convenor of the group will prepare the agenda

PR said that if there were no other questions on P&I he would ask RN to clarify the Y&D Working Group position.

RN The manner of working of Y&D is to have a number of small meetings of relevant persons rather than on meeting of the whole Working Group. He noted that the Chair did not have a vote on Council since it was a Working Group.

The proposed Terms of Reference for the Y&D Working Group [see report circulated earlier by Rostam Namaghi in the Reports document] were:

- i. **Purpose**
 - i. The aim of the group is to assist with and promote BCA Youth and Development projects.
- ii. **Membership**
 - ii. Members are to be invited by the Youth and Development Officer
 - iii. Membership should be reviewed on an annual basis and its members re-invited
 - iv. The convenor of the group will be the Youth and Development Officer.
 - v. There will not be any restrictions on numbers in these terms of reference, to allow it to reach an organic operable size.
- iii. **Accountability**
 - i. The Youth and Development Officer will report back to Council at meetings.
 - ii. There will be an annual budget presented to the Association
 - iii. There will be an annual report detailing the working group's activities and general strategic plan.
 - iv. Complaints are to follow BCA procedure and brought to Council.
- iv. **Review**
 - i. This will be done annually and presented at the BCA AGM under the relevant subsection report.
- v. **Methods**
 - i. Official meetings will occur at least once yearly with regular discussions between members of the working group occurring in between.
 - ii. The minutes will be published on the BCA website promptly.
 - iii. The convenor of the group will prepare the agenda.

PR said that if there were no other questions on P&I he would ask RN to move onto the IT Working Group proposal.

RN commented that he wished to clear up the 'chain of command' on IT matters.

PR invited ACD to comment on the proposal.

ACD started by saying he was happy to take on the role of Chair of IT Working Group. He observed that there was a lot of IT features set up which needed to be maintained and there being a lack of persons to maintain it. He referred to his proposal under item 8.2 in the Agenda.

PR in response to a request noted that many people indicated they had read ACD's report. He felt that the paper did point to a way forward which people indicated agreement.

The proposed Terms of Reference for the IT Working Group [see report circulated earlier by Rostam Namaghi in the Reports document] were:

- I. These terms of reference were drafted on the 08/05/2018 and comply to both the BCA Constitution and its Manual of Operations.
 - i. **Purpose**
 - i. To manage and co-ordinate the BCA's IT infrastructure
 - ii. To maintain and develop the BCA's website
 - iii. To commission and implement IT projects as deemed desirable by BCA
 - iv. To provide technical advice to the BCA and its membership.
 - v. To maintain the National Cave Registry
 - ii. **Membership**
 - i. Members are to be invited by the IT working group
 - ii. The convenor of the group will be the P&I Officer.
 - iii. Membership should be reviewed on an annual basis and its members re-invited
 - iii. **Accountability**
 - i. The IT working group convenor will report back to Council at meetings.
 - ii. There will be an annual budget presented to the Association
 - iii. There will be an annual report detailing the working group's activities and general strategic plan.
 - iv. Complaints are to follow BCA procedure and brought to Council.
 - v. Access to critical resources that are password protected must be given to the executive of the National Council
 - iv. **Review**
 - i. This will be done annually and presented at the BCA AGM under the relevant subsection report.
 - v. **Methods**
 - i. Official meetings will occur at least once yearly with regular discussions between members of the working group occurring in between.
 - ii. The minutes will be published on the BCA website promptly.
 - iii. The convenor of the group will prepare the agenda.

II. IT Committee ToR

Its terms of reference shall be

- to manage and coordinate BCA's IT infrastructure.
- to commission and implement IT projects as deemed desirable for BCA.
- to provide a resource of expertise available to BCA.
- to provide Web Services to BCA members as seems desirable.

BM asked if RN's proposal was going to accept what ACD had put forward under item 8.2, thereby avoiding have a need to discuss item 8.2.

RN agreed.

BM asked if ACD was happy with the meeting not discussing his paper.

ACD indicated he was and went on to emphasise that the paper was to be seen as work in progress.

No one responded to PR asking if any further clarification was required on the P&I proposal. Similarly no one responded to him asking if people were happy with the Y&D proposal. However TA did have questions on the IT proposal in particular relating to ACD's paper.

PR proposed that the meeting accepted RN's proposals on the P&I and the Y&D Working Groups. NA seconded the proposal. PR noted that no one had objected or abstained from the proposal so it was unanimously carried.

PR suggested that the meeting now dealt with item 8.2 and also item 7, being RM's proposal to move to a new web site.

RN suggested that the item 7 proposal for a new web site should be passed to IT Working Group to consider and come back with a recommendation.

RM noted he raised the topic because he did not want to lose the good work of Gary Douthwaite but he accepted it was an IT Working Group matter.

ACD noted that his thinking was along lines which might complicate things if a professional web developer was used. He therefore asked for time to consider the proposal.

TA commented that it would be a significant loss to not pick up on Gary Douthwaite's work and sought some reassurance that it would not be lost.

CB asked if the IT Working Group could sort out the Council email circulation system.

PR voiced a concern over the potential for key features such as the web site becoming tied to one person and asked that the IT Working Group give consideration to that concern.

RN stated that he did not want to give the impression that he was against the new web site, rather he felt it was a matter for the IT Working Group.

ACD acknowledged that the work that Gary Douthwaite had done on the draft new web site was fantastic but he had in mind some changes to the infrastructure relating to membership matters which might clash with the infrastructure approach which a professional might use if they were not aware of his ideas. However he did intend to use as much of the draft new web site as was possible. He noted the need for resilience in the web site and the benefit of using a professional but he did not want the IT Working Group tied down at this stage.

AB felt that given the history, the new IT Working Group should be allowed time to come up with their ideas and bring them to a future meeting.

NA propose that the meeting accept RN's proposal on the IT Working Group.

ACD noted that TA had sought information on the membership of IT Working Group. He was of the opinion that the Working Group needed less defined roles and more collaborative effort in order to

provide the resilience that PR had mentioned. He understood the current membership included Dave Cooke, Aiden Mosye, Angus Sawyer, David Gibson, possibly Gary Douthwaite and Les Williams. He definitely wanted as a matter of priority to get more people involved. So he did not want the vote to affirm just those persons as members.

JP stated that she felt Council had in the past spent far too much time debating who should be on the IT Working Group. She wanted to allow the Working Group to get on with their work.

AB said he agreed with JP.

RN noted that the proposal was to form a new Working Group so the vote would enable ACD to invite who he felt were needed as members rather than be bound by previous membership.

In response to a query from PR, TA stated that he was not reassured. He considered the IT Working Group were fundamental to BCA improving in the future. His concern remained that could the newly reformed IT Working Group go forward in a direction which helped BCA. He wanted Council to continue to monitor the work of IT Working Group to ensure that the proposed new start did lead forward and not get bogged down as had occurred.

JW suggested that as Chair of a Working Group, if issues arise within the Working Group which need resolution, then they could be brought to Council.

TR proposed that the meeting accept RN's proposal on the IT Working Group. AM seconded the motion. PR that no one had objected or abstained from the proposal so it was unanimously carried.

Item 7 New Website

PR suggested that as discussed the topic should be given to ACD for the IT Working Group to come forward with proposals. ACD accepted the task

Action 4 – ACD to return to Council with proposals concerning the new BCA web site.

Item 8 Reports

RM noted that the intent of this item was to acknowledge that reports had been received but not to discuss them. If anyone had issues then they should go back to author. He proposed that the reports should be included for the record.

AoB

Having noted that the meeting had just overrun its allocated time, PR asked if there any other issues which needed to be discussed.

1. RM said that he had received a report from Dave Cooke on various IT activities which unfortunately had some issues within it which he was unable to resolve before the reports needed to be issued. He proposed that if resolved, he would bring the amended report to the next meeting.
2. DB expressed concern over a topic mentioned in the Training Officer's report related to national cover competencies. Having discussed the topic with NA, he still had concerns that

it might have significant consequences with university based caving clubs and would like to have the topic discussed a little more.

PR suggested it should be an agenda item for the next meeting.

NA reported that Training had pulled the plug on focusing on good and best practice to homing in on avoiding poor practice.

RN suggested that the reports should be acknowledged but not accepted so as to avoid problems if possible concerns arise.

3. JP was prompted by RN's document on voting that existing procedures were based on the premise of face to face meetings. That suggested all procedures could give rise to problems which in turn suggested that the whole of the Memorandum of Operations required a review.
4. AB reported that the last CSCC meeting had been considering the wisdom of holding the forthcoming BCA AGM at Priddy in October. The general view was that it seemed doubtful if the regulations would permit it to be held. The current position was that only one pub was open and already busy with people stopping at the camp site. Most caving club huts had restricted availability so people would have difficulty in finding somewhere to stop. Although the government was suggesting conferences could be held from October onwards, based on the 126 people who were reported present at the 2019 AGM, Priddy Village Hall could not safely accommodate such a number. He therefore suggest BCA should consider postponing the AGM.

PR suggested that in the first instance, the Executive should consider a way forward.

5. TA proposed that another Council meeting should be held using Zoom. There was a need to hold a number of meetings so as to catch up on other business not considered at this meeting. He expressed a concern over whether holding meetings via Zoom with shorter notice than normal might cause a weakness that pedants could exploit to upset BCA from making progress. But on balance it was far more efficient use of time.
6. PR concluded the meeting by observing that it had worked well, it has been very efficient although he suspected it would be difficult to write the minutes, although the recording should help. He felt that by targeting topics as had been done in this meeting, BCA could hold them once per month.
7. AB expressed the view that it would be no great shakes if the AGM was not held this year and he accepted that increasing the number of Council meetings would be of value in sorting out the issues which BCA was struggling to resolve.
8. PR noted that as there were no more comments and even though he had not succeeded in that the meeting had overrun by 10 minutes, he closed the meeting.

DRAFT