

National Caving Association / British Caving Association

Minutes of the Conjoint Meeting of NCA & BCA National Councils held on Saturday 9th October 2004 at the Alvechurch Baptist Church Hall, Alvechurch.

Mick Day	Chairman
Eddy Hill	Secretary
Bob Mehew	Treasurer
Jim Cochrane	News Letter Editor
Elsie Little	Conservation Officer
Davin Judson	Legal and Insurance Officer / BCRA Rep.
Les Williams	Publications and Information Officer
Alan Finch	Pengelly CST
David Jean	Pengelly CST
Sue Mabbett	Cambrian CC Chair
Glenn Jones	CNCC
Dave Cooke	CSCC
Steve Holding	NAMHO
Antoni Seddon	ACI
Patric Hall	SWCC
Jonathan Roberts	CSCC Obs.
Graham Mullan	UBSS Obs.

1. Chairman's welcome and address

The Chairman welcomed those present and declared proceedings open at 10:50am.

2. Apologies for absence

Apologies were received from Chris Broome, Owen Clark, Clark Friend, Jenny Potts, Nick Williams, Bob Dearman, Andy Pryke and Idris Williams.

3. Applications for Membership.

No new applications for membership were presented but it was noted that the Moles Caving Club, through the CSCC had renewed its membership of NCA after a year's absence.

4. Minutes of NCA/BCA Council Meeting of 22nd May 2004

These were accepted as a true record

5. Matters arising from minutes 22nd May 2004

- BM reported actions on points 5 and 7 are still to be completed. His action on point 11(a) is complete.
- EH reported actions on points 5 (d), 12 (c) and 18 (a) are fulfilled but action on point 12 (c) is still outstanding.

6. Chairman's Report

- MD updated the meeting on the Disability Discrimination Act 2001/2 which declares that from 1st October 2004 all premises should be constructed to be of benefit to the disabled.

BM proposed a briefing note should be included in the newsletter.

Action MD and DJ

EL pointed out that this is a public meeting place regulation and does not apply to private buildings.

- On the topic of influences to volunteers, MD reported that CCPR withdrew support to the Provision of Volunteering Bill due to its emasculation. CCPR will lobby government on this matter in other ways.

- CCPR is challenging government to support National Governing Bodies, Education sector, Local Authorities, Private and Community sport. A paper detailing their approach is added to the annex.
- The situation with Sheffield University SS is still unclear so CCPR involvement has as yet not been sought.
- CCPR is re-introducing the access forum after a period of abeyance.
- On the subject of UK Sport, MD announced that they are undergoing another modernisation program the long term result of which seems to be that money to none competitive sports will be redirected to competitive sports.
- Work at height. Health and Safety Executive are looking at the possibility of exemption on double rope technique but only if all aspects can be covered. Unofficially, regulations are not likely until next year.

7. Treasurer's Report

- The treasurer reported he had been approached by Pat Hall who volunteered to act as auditor of NCA / BCA accounts. He was duly proposed to council and accepted.

Proposed: BM Seconded: EH Carried

- BM presented a motion for BCA council to empower the BCA Executive together with the BCA insurance manager to negotiate a loan from BCRA to help cover the payment of the 2005 insurance premium.

Proposed: Nick Williams Seconded: BM Carried

EL expressed concerns that whilst the loan is a necessity, BCA should not indebt itself unduly. BM gave assurances that that the agreement would guarantee that any loss would be covered by NCA/BCA to the value of it's assets and the remainder would be born by BCRA. This is no different to the agreement for 2004.

- At this stage, BM declared that DCA would not be taking advantage of the membership benefit that is insurance, since Perkins Slade has offered to extend their policy by 14 months, albeit at an increased rate and with stricter limits to their cover.
- BM presented a further motion that BCA should employ a person to undertake administrative duties with regard to membership.

Proposed: Nick Williams Seconded: BM Carried

SH at this point queried if this would be sufficient to resolve the issues encountered when dealing with membership applications so far. It was expressed that the real problem had been getting the system in place and that it is hoped that the advances made will start to iron out problems and than the situation will improve over the coming year.

PH, as a sufferer of the problems experienced by many, indicated that acknowledgement of receipt of applications for membership would alleviate some of the apparent issues.

Following some discussion, **LW Proposed** that the employee should be provided with a clear and complete Job Description against which performance could be measured. BM declared he was reticent at this stage to commit to a set of words since he requires some flexibility in the wording. He agreed that a full job description would appear in the contract, covering all the points raised at the meeting.

Approved Unanimously

- BM introduced his paper proposing subscription levels for 2005 and the endorsement of Council of the Guidelines contained in Part 1 of the paper (see Annex 3). . The discussion ensued along two lines:

Insurance

GM commented that SUI committee are proposing 3 levels of insurance for 2005.

1. Cover for non-cavers.
2. Cavers BCA insured.
3. Cavers FSS insured.

Is there a case for BCA accepting other forms of insurance as valid?

BM indicated that BCA's position is that cavers must be insured.

The question was raised of whether individual members of clubs who have their own insurance cover, should be exempt of the insurance fraction of the BCA subscription and indeed, whether clubs should be able to obtain insurance for part of its membership as long as the rest of the members demonstrate valid insurance cover. JR suggested that these insured members should be able to simply join BCA as non-caving CIMs, since this would cover the corporate aspect of insurance.

As several points had arisen during the morning that required clarification from NW, the meeting broke for lunch to allow DJ time to consult with NW and obtain answers. On return, DJ declared:

1. NW agreed to removing the need for duplicate membership for different clubs for the coming year.
2. NW was unable to give admin costs at this stage but commented that costs of administering membership are likely to rise due to the expenditure involved in employing an administrator.
3. NW accepted that FFS insurance is acceptable in principle but that a person would need to join as a "non-caver".
4. NW feels that JR is correct in his assertion that CIMs with alternative cover should be able to join BCA as non-cavers as the benefits will include corporate cover.

BM once again proposed council accept the figures as laid out in the Budget Proposal. DC opposed the motion and introduced a paper from CSCC outlining their position; chiefly, CSCC is unhappy with the proposed £5 CIM subscription rate and with the tithing element of the subscription. Full details of CSCC's views are in Annex 2.

Administration costs

GM raised queries as to the necessity or justification of charging as high as a £5 per club member fee when the obvious benefits incur a lower cost. He went on to state that there were two aspects to the issue:

1. Tithing and how money is distributed.
2. Should CIMs pay admin?

If these issues are kept separate, then they are manageable. He proposed that tithing should be dealt with by the treasurers of the RCCs in a separate meeting to sort out the mechanism by which finance is distributed. He further proposed that CIMs pay £0 towards works costs as part of their sub.

A heated debate ensued in which many differing views were raised and discussed. CSCC's stance became clearer when AS postulated that CSCC needed to see its income guaranteed; that their running costs are met. Not that the money their clubs pay in comes straight back out from the centre to them. DC agreed with this statement.

Following the discussions BM proposed that a meeting of RCC treasurers should take place to either agree the figures proposed by BM or to agree new figures. This was agreed. The meeting would also agree on a mechanism for moneys to be paid out to RCCs.

Proposed BM

Agreed

The following list of subs, exclusive of the insurance element and dependent on ratification by the meeting of RCC treasurers, was agreed on.

	Insurance	Works	Tithe	Publications	Total sub excluding insurance element
DIMs	?	2	1	12	£15
Clubs	?	18	15	12	£45
Associates	?	18	15	12	£45
CIMs	?	0	0	0	£0
<u>National Bodies, Regional Caving Councils Cave Rescue Organisations</u>	0	0	0	0	£0
<u>Access Controlling Body</u>	?	0	0	12	£12
		Proposed BM		Seconded SM	Agreed

It was also agreed that a non member could take out a publications only subscription for £12 which provided no benefits of membership of BCA.

BM sought confirmation that the membership benefits and the guidance material were acceptable to Council. Council deliberated the membership benefits and made some amendments (the updated set is shown in Annex 3). Council accepted the statements in Annex 3, though it was noted that the intention to not send directly send an agenda to CIMs might be in contravention of Sub Section 8.5 of the constitution. BM argued that the duty had been delegated to clubs to forward the information onto CIMs. Council accepted that the point could be debated and it would be for a General meeting to come to a conclusion.

BM forewarned that he will present a motion at the next council meeting to require RCCs only accept members that are members of BCA.

8. Secretary's Report

The secretary reported that due to life circumstances he had forgotten to advertise council positions due for re-election in time for the deadline set at the AGM. He proposed that the deadline be moved to January.

Proposed EH

Agreed

9. Conservation Officers Report

- EL is concerned that communications to Arco Quarry on behalf of BCA/NCA have been ignored by the Yorkshire Dales National Park. She gives forewarning that she intends to take action on this.
- Tom Eyelif has contacted EL with regard to saving a cave in Bahamas. EL reports there is some ambiguity as to the true intent of the request and she is going to let it pass.
- EL has added her support to create a Geopark in South West Brecons.

10. Training Officer's Report

No report.

11. Equipment Officer's Report

No report.

12. Public and Information Officer's Report

- Poster design is coming along. Promotional leaflets can be produced as soon as the design is sanctioned.
- 'so you want to go caving' leaflet requires updating.
- Sticky labels to update publications from NCA to BCA may not be the best way forward. It may be better to scrap and restart.
- Dave Elliot cannot afford to publish his SRT book alone and is interested in a joint venture with BCRA. Talks to start including BM and DJ.

13. Webmaster

The new website is coming along well and will be ready in the New Year.
Web services will be advertised in the forthcoming newsletter.

14. Legal and Insurance Officer

The legal and insurance officer had nothing to add to the proceedings that had not already been discussed.

15. Convenor, Radon Working Party

EH reported the threat of an article regarding Radon and caving had not materialised. Together with CF and BM, correspondence had been entered to with the reporter. Since then, no further news had been heard. It is believed the article will now not materialise.

16. National Cave Registry Co-ordinator

Some progress has been made. This is an ongoing issue.

17. International Representative

No report

18. BCA Newsletter Editor

Reported the first issue went well and the second issue would have a larger run (1300 instead of 1200).

JC proposed a mandate detailing contributions to the newsletter and guidelines for the editor.

Proposed JC

Seconded EH

Following a written comment from JP it was agreed that she should look into the feasibility of printing extra copies for sale.

19. Any Other Business

NW nominated Dave StPierre as FSEU Vice-delegate. Council ratifies this.

Next meeting to be held on 8th January 2005 at Alvechurch Baptist Church Hall.

Annex 1

CCPR Challenge 2004-5

One voice for sport and recreation

The CCPR, Champion of the National Governing Bodies of Sport, Representing Voluntary Sector Sport and Recreation, Challenges the Next Government

The CCPR is back on the campaign trail. We want to see sport and recreation higher on the next Government's agenda, with genuine commitment to sustained investment in and support for this country's sports system. In this Challenge (1) we set out specifically what our sport system needs, and why, and the benefits for sport and recreation in this country, if these challenges are met.

"Game Plan", the Government's strategy for sport, acknowledged that Government itself did not deliver sport, and recognised the contributions made by the four major delivery sectors - education, local government, the commercial and voluntary sectors. The CCPR Challenge charges the next Government to take specific action, within its power and authority, to support all those working to provide "fair, accessible, high quality sport and recreation for all" (2).

NATIONAL GOVERNING BODIES OF SPORT AND THE VOLUNTARY SECTOR

- Recognise and celebrate the core provision and added value which national governing bodies and their clubs bring to the sports system
- Double the current Exchequer funding for sport and recreation
- invest in voluntary organisations and clubs and their volunteers and provide learning credits
- Protect volunteers and their organisations from trivial and unnecessary regulation and legislation

THE EDUCATION SECTOR

- Require a minimum 2 hours' high quality Physical Education per week for all children aged 5-16 within curriculum time
- Require schools to make provision for daily physical activity in schools, especially primary schools
- Require a minimum 30 hours' initial training in Physical Education for all primary school teachers
- Ensure that colleges and universities receive adequate resources to provide sport and recreation for all students

LOCAL AUTHORITIES

- Raise the profile of community sport and recreation services by strengthening the requirements for local authorities to report on progress against provision
- Encourage local authorities to apply their full powers in local area agreements to support sport and recreation delivery, especially for disadvantaged areas and communities

- Encourage local authorities to use their full powers to promote well being through physical activity programmes directed to the whole community - young and old

THE PRIVATE AND COMMERCIAL SECTOR

- Encourage the commercial sector to provide for people from all income ranges, through a systematic programme of fiscal and planning measures
- Recognise the contributions to sport at all levels, of private and corporate fiscal measures and systems of public recognition

There is much to celebrate in the progress which has been made over the last decade in British sport. Community Amateur Sports Clubs (CASCs) can now get tax and rate relief. There is a national programme to enhance and professionalise coaching as a career. And the long decline in school physical education and school sport has been reversed, through investment in specialist sports colleges, teachers and school sport coordinators, which is establishing a new support structure for raising quality and achievement, and forging links between schools and communities.

BUT our sport system is still fragile and under-resourced and there is still a long way to go ...

There is still a long way to go, if we are to achieve the Government's ambitious targets to increase levels of physical activity and international success, and to use sport and recreation to combat crime, social exclusion, poor health and educational attainment.

That is why this Challenge has been issued to support those who deliver sport

1. The national strategy for sport (3) has two overarching aims - more people in the population physically active and healthier, and better international success. They both should be supported by Exchequer funding (4), which must be doubled to achieve this.
2. Inactivity costs the NHS £8.2 billion pa, with obesity alone costing £2.5 billion pa (5). A shift of less than 0.5% from health would double the sport budget (6) and allow all those who deliver sport and recreation to promote healthy physical activity for more people.
3. International sport is increasingly competitive, as more and more countries invest in success at Olympic and World level. If this country is to improve on (or even sustain) our current status, we must devote long-term, sustained investment into the systems which enable our sporting heroes and heroines to succeed. Dependence for this key aim on shrinking Lottery funding must stop.
4. Too many communities still suffer from poor quality facilities and opportunities. Those working to promote opportunity within local government will benefit from new measures to require local authorities to make the provision of sport and recreation a much higher priority for all the people in their communities - both young and old.
5. For the first time in decades, between 1987 and 2002, the % of young people aged 16-19 participating in sport and recreation DROPPED, from 80% to 72% (7). Only 30% of young people in the UK continue to take part after leaving school, in contrast to 70% in France (8).
6. Time for physical education within curriculum time remains too low for too many children. Curriculum time, quality provision is the ONLY way of ensuring that ALL children get access to quality programmes in which they will learn the skills and confidence for life-long participation (9).

7. The crucial contribution of local authorities to the delivery of sport and recreation has been steadily threatened over the last two decades by successive central government interventions. More systematic support and leadership for local authority delivery will be repaid by high quality provision in local communities, where it is needed most, and in response to local need.

8. National governing bodies of sport and their clubs and local groups provide excellent value for money (10). With higher and longer term investment, NGBs and their clubs can help more people to enjoy happy, healthier lifestyles in strong, social communities. Local voluntary and community sector organisations can reach communities not traditionally reached by other providers (11).

9. Sport and recreation is dependent on the efforts of millions of volunteers who daily experience difficulties, frustrations, barriers and red tape (12). There needs to be clear Government commitment to act to reduce the effects of unnecessary bureaucracy, regulation and fear of litigation on volunteers and their organisations.

10. Too much time is spent chasing short-term funding. Sport needs a comprehensive package of fiscal measures to keep money in the sports system, including relief on corporation tax and VAT, tax relief on employer and employee health benefits, and learning credits for volunteers.

11. Commercial sector provision is, of course, led by the market. But there are massive gains which could be levered into the sports system, through fiscal and planning incentives.

12. Private "giving" in sport is more widespread than is often realised, but more could be encouraged, with creative fiscal measures and appropriate systems of public recognition (13).

13. This country depends on the four delivery systems for providing the sport and recreation we need for our country to be healthy, active, successful and sociable. Were the services of any of these providers to fail, expensive and less effective systems would have to be found instead. We must not take them for granted.

All these measures are within the power of Government - each would repay many times over, the investment required to strengthen the sport system. The CCPR hopes that the next Government can meet this Challenge.

Footnotes

1 The CCPR Challenge is supported by a full rationale, available from the CCPR website www.ccpr.org.uk

2 The CCPR's vision is "fair, accessible, high quality sport and recreation for all". It includes the whole range of sport and recreation, from high-achieving international athletes to those participating at grass-roots level; from competitive sport for teams and individuals, through outdoor and adventurous activities, to exercise, movement and dance. If we are to get the nation active, all levels and all activities will require the sustained support which the CCPR is challenging the next Government to provide.

3 Strategy Unit (2001) Game Plan London, DCMS

4 The UK invests less than 20% of France's investment in sport and recreation. Cited by Sport England in The Sunday Times 12 September 2004

5 Department of Health (2004) Choosing Health? Choosing Activity London, National Health Service

6 CCPR (2002) Saving Lives, Saving Money London - see www.ccpr.org.uk

7 CCPR (2001) Charter for Physical Education and School Sport London - see www.ccpr.org.uk

8 Rt Hon Tessa Jowell MP (2004) Tackling Obesity in Young People Conference London, DCMS.

9 General Household Survey (2004) Sport and leisure module of the 2002 survey London, ONS.

10 The Office of the Deputy Prime Minister estimates that the voluntary sector provides £30 worth of return for every £1 invested.

11 Home Office (2002) Private Action, Public Benefit London

12 Nicholls, Geoff (2003) Citizenship in Action: The Role of Voluntary Sector Sport and Recreation London, CCPR

13 See British Equestrian Federation, in CCPR Voice, forthcoming

Annex 2

CSCC's Representatives report to BCA National Council meeting 9th Oct. 2004

CSCC held a hastily called meeting on the 26th Sept. to discuss the issue two issues:

1. The proposed £5 CIM subscription rate.
2. The proposed tithing element of the subscriptions.

A large club of 200 members would be looking for an extra £1000 that they didn't have to pay before. Small clubs would have to hike their members subscription by £5. With the club subscription proposed at £30, the only potential saving to a typical CSCC member is a £15 subscription to CNCC. Only clubs with less than 3 (£15/£5) members would be ahead – Oh, wait a minute, the minimum number of members to be a club is 4!

Confronted with ridiculous figures like these, with no proper explanation, the CSCC has quite naturally dug its heels in and wants the status-quo to remain. I.e. for the BCA to be funded as it was last year by the Club and Group members. It passed this resolution at its meeting **“The CSCC believes that the cost of the BCA Administration should be borne by Clubs and Groups”**

The CSCC proposes the CIM subscription to be set at £0.

- Club's finances are still reeling from the insurance. Many have had to fund insurance, at least in part, from reserves rather than the subscription.
- BCA insured clubs and their members feel that the insurance is being used as a gun against their head to force payment of an un-justified subscription. What recourse do they have? Where are the agreed guidelines for setting a subscription?
- There is a black-hole somewhere. The money to be raised by these proposals far exceeds the current subscription income of the BCA & RCs combined.
 - Approx projected income = 3000 CIMs*£5 + 300 Clubs *£30 = £16500. Current subscription income = £2500 (for BCA, figures personal communication Bob Mehew 2/10/04) + £3300 (Appendix 3, BCA Subscriptions for 2005 Proposal by Bob Mehew) = £5800. Well over £10,000 greater!!
 - Part of the black-hole is the 100% increase of the Hubs best calculations to provide 'a cushion for uncertainties'.
 - The remaining is the shortfall between the NCAs current subscription income (£2500) and its BCAs predicted administrative overheads (£5000.)
- The calculations to arrive at £5 are flawed.
 - We are setting a subscription to replace the current BCA and RCs combined subscription.
 - The BCA membership was taken as 3500. It has subsequently risen to 4170 subscription paying members (Appendix 3, BCA Subscriptions for 2005 Proposal by BM)
 - Current BCA Subs. Income = £2500. Therefore sub should be £2500/4170 = £0.60
 - Current RC Subs. Income = £3300. Therefore sub should be £3300/4170 = £0.80
 - Therefore the total sub should be 60p + 80p = £1.40
 - If you remove the RC element, as proposed by the CSCC, we are down to 60p

Whilst in defiant mood the CSCC also asserted its desire for continued autonomy by passing the following motion. **“That the CSCC should continue to set its own subscription to be collected locally.”**

The CSCC doesn't want to be funded from a centralised pot. It wants to set a subscription that is collected from its members so that subscription income equals number of members times its subscription. I.e. as is done now and pretty much as per the original tithing proposals (formula rather than grant). If C&A grants were available it would be happy to apply for them as now. In other words it believes the current situation works well and feels that the onus is upon the BCA to put forward a convincing case that a 'central planning' approach is better.

The CSCC proposes the RC tithe element (Club and Individual) be set at £0.

- The process of integrating the Regional Councils is happening too fast without proper explanation or consultation.
- No justification has been provided as to why the new system is better than the old.
- There is uncertainty about spending the tithe element. Is it by formula or by grant? If by grant as seems likely, the recent CSCC experience of NCA grants hasn't been entirely happy. There are cash-flow implications to grants. How would the shortfall be made-up if a full grant wasn't forthcoming?

- If Regional Councils are to be fully funded from the centre, where are the controls on a profligate spending council? The RC members spending the money are insulated from the BCA members providing the money.

CSCC proposed subscription would be as follows:

Using the membership and publication figures from 'BCA Subscriptions for 2005 Proposal' by Bob Mehew

	Insurance	BCA Admin	Publications	Tithe	Total	Rounded Total
£ To Raise		£5000		£0.00		
Individuals						
Direct Individual Member (DIM) (56)	Not known	Should contribute but much lower than a club. Say £2.00	£11.78	£0.00	£13.78	£14
Club Individual Member (CIM)(3817)	Not known	£0.00	None	£0.00	£0.00	£0
Group						
Club with BCA Insurance(86)	Not known	=£5000/(56+86+196+20) =£14.01	£11.78	£0.00	£25.79	£27
Club without BCA insurance(194)	Excluded	£14.01	£11.78	£0.00	£25.79	£27
Associates(20)	Excluded	£14.01	£11.78	£0.00	£25.79	£27

David G Cooke
CSCC's BCA Rep.
8th Oct. 2004

Annex 3

Part 1 – Subscriptions & Benefits

Direct Individual & Joint Membership

A Direct Individual Member (DIM) is a person who joins BCA directly, as an individual. A Club Individual Member (CIM) is a person who joins BCA through a club, see Clubs for further information.

The Hub did not consider joint membership. I suggest the cost of Joint DIM is simply based on the cost of a DIM plus a CIM. Joint members must use a common address and will be eligible to all of BCA membership rights, including insurance cover, but they will only receive one copy of publications issued by BCA.

Prior discussions concerning the subscription rate have not touched on the complexity of the insurance element. The cost of the insurance element will reflect whether an individual is an active caver or not. In addition, individuals joining later in the year will pay a reduced subscription. The Insurance element will be reduced each quarter, as was offered for 2004.

Club & Club Individual Membership

Confusion still surrounds the club subscription. A club may join BCA with or without taking out insurance. If no insurance is required, the proposed subscription is £30. Clubs will need to indicate which Regional Caving Council (RCC) they wished to be linked to and it will be up to the RCC to confirm club membership of BCA.

If a club wishes to obtain BCA insurance, all club members must join BCA as Club Individual Members (CIM). In doing so, a club must agree to convey to all its members (who are now CIM members of BCA) information on what BCA is doing and, in particular, the dates of BCA meetings as BCA does not supply this information directly to CIMs. This is because CIMs do not receive publications from BCA, thus reducing their membership subscription. The only direct communication which BCA will make with CIMs is to send them ballot papers, if a BCA General Meeting requires a motion be ratified by postal ballot. (Clubs are not empowered to vote on behalf of their CIM members in the House of Individual and Honorary members, see Section 8 of the Constitution.)

BCA's Insurance Manager is looking into removing the need for persons who are members of more than one club paying duplicate CIM subscriptions to BCA.

Clubs with huts and / or which are access controlling bodies and require insurance must pay, in addition to their normal insurance, an additional sum reflecting this additional risk.

There are specific arrangements for members of two clubs (the CDG and EUG). These clubs will directly inform their members on behalf of BCA.

National Body Membership

National Bodies do not need to pay a subscription. Apart from the Association of Caving Instructors (ACI), all other accepted National Body members are covered for their activities by BCA's insurance. Regrettably, BCA is unable to provide insurance cover to ACI due to ACI's professional indemnity risk.

So far, no National Bodies have been formally considered for membership of BCA (see Section 5.3 of the Constitution). Given there is no subscription, National Bodies should write each to indicate their continued desire to remain a member of BCA.

Regional Caving Councils

Regional Caving Councils (RCCs) do not need to pay a subscription. Accepted RCC members are covered for their activities by BCA's insurance, including their access controlling body functions where the RCC has a need for such cover. (The title is a mechanism by which RCCs receive funds from BCA to cover their core functions in place of

directly seeking subscriptions from their members, the core of the One Stop Shop Concept. RCCs can obtain additional funds from their members to cover non core work.)

So far, no RCCs have been formally considered for membership of BCA (see Section 5.3 of the Constitution). Given there is no subscription, RCCs should write each year to indicate their continued desire to remain a member of BCA and that the letter should state if access controlling body insurance cover is required. (This requirement is included to cover DCA which have separate insurance cover.)

Cave Rescue Organisations

Cave Rescue Organisations (CROs) do not need to pay a subscription. Accepted CRO members are covered for their activities by BCA's insurance. For the sake of completeness, this insurance cover will include any access controlling body functions that the Cave Rescue Organisation may undertake but does not cover "Call Out Activities" where insurance is provided by the initiating body (c.f. Police / Home Office / Scottish Office).

So far, no Cave Rescue Organisation has been formally considered for membership of BCA (see Section 5.3 of the Constitution). Given there is no subscription, CROs should write each year to indicate their continued desire to remain a member of BCA.

Access Controlling Bodies

The subscription for Access Controlling Bodies is yet to be set. (Clubs, RCCs or CROs which undertake access controlling functions will need to tell BCA so as to acquire additional insurance cover for access control functions.) In return for obtaining insurance, the Access Controlling Body is required to recognise all BCA members as being eligible for access to the caves they control, subject to specific access requirements such as mandatory leaders, clubs only access etc.

Associate Membership

Associates are those Outdoor Activity Providers, Businesses and other groups which have an interest in caving. Their subscription is the same as for Clubs: i.e. £30.

Membership Benefits

BCA provides a range of membership benefits, some being intangible. These include representing cavers to Government and others as well as liaising with other sport governing bodies. Tangible membership benefits are outlined in the following table:

Benefits	Direct Individual	Club Individual	Group	Associate
Access to caves (1) (Subject to cave specific restrictions)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Insurance	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Members Handbook	Yes		Yes	Yes
Membership Card	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
BCA Newsletter	Yes		Yes	Yes
Journal	Yes		Yes	Yes
Conservation & Access info	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Access to grants (Training, Expedition, Equipment)	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Voting	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Library	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Conferences& Meetings (Discounted rate)	Yes			
Technical Information	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Training Awards (LCMLA, CIC)	Yes	Yes		
Low Cost Web Hosting Service (2)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Information and Advice (equipment, safety, legal, techniques)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
BCRA Activities (3)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Notes

1 Many cave access agreements are based on the land owner only permitting “clubs” to descend.

2 Rates will vary

3 BCA is also negotiating with BCRA to provide free or reduced price access to functions which BCRA will retain.

Postscript

When the full subscription is known application forms for each type of membership will be placed on BCA’s web site.