

BRITISH MOUNTAINEERING COUNCIL

177-179 Burton Road
Manchester M20 2BB

Tel: 0161 445 6111
www.thebmc.co.uk
email: lucy@thebmc.co.uk

Board of Directors

Redacted minutes of the Board meeting held as a hybrid meeting using Zoom, on Wednesday 22 March 2023 at 6pm

Directors Present:	Roger Murray (RM)	Chair
	Flavia Alzetta (FA)	Independent Director
	Paul Davies (PD)	CEO
	Neal Hockley (NH)	Nominated Director
	Martyn Hurn (MH)	Nominated Director
	Peter Salenieks (PS)	Council Nominated Director (CND)
	Fiona Sanders (FS)	CND <small>left at the end of minute 9.3</small>
	Carl Spencer (CS)	CND
	Andy Syme (AS)	President
	John Willmott (JW)	Independent Director
	Caroline Worboys (CW)	Senior Independent Director (SID)
In attendance:	Lucy Valerio (LV)	Company Secretary (CoSec)
	Joelie Chisholm (JC)	Chief Financial Officer (CFO)
	Gavin Finch (GF)	Chief Commercial Officer (CCO)
	Alex West (AW)	Diversity & Inclusivity Manager (D&IM) <small>for item 4 only</small>
	Mohammed Dhalech (MD)	Chair of the Equity Steering Group (ESG Chair) <small>for item 4 only</small>
	Rod Carr (RC)	Chair of the CCPG Review Task & Finish Group <small>for item 6 only</small>
	Paul Ratcliffe (PR)	Chair of the Competition Climbing Performance Group (CCPG Chair) <small>for item 6 only</small>

* denotes supporting paper(s) circulated prior to meeting

Item	Topic and Main Aspects Considered	Decision / Action
1	Welcome, apologies & declaration of interests	
1.1	<p>The Chair reported that due notice of the meeting had been given. He noted that there were no apologies, the meeting was therefore quorate and he declared it open.</p> <p>The following conflicts of interest were declared:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">CS – a family member is a member of a GB Climbing development squadCFO – she was previously chair of the Climbing Competition Performance Group (CCPG)Four members of staff present – in relation to any staffing issues	

Item	Topic and Main Aspects Considered	Decision / Action
	The Chair said the meeting would be recorded to assist the CoSec with preparing the minutes.	
1.2	The Chair then made some introductory remarks: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• There was an AOB on guidebooks, the paper was not provided a week before the meeting but a response was required• He believed in good governance, but he wanted the Board to remember that they were there to lead the BMC and provide a better future for climbers, hill walkers and mountaineers so he did not want the next 12 months to be dominated by dealing with governance issues	
2	Approval of previous meeting's minutes*	
2.1	The Chair referred to the paper uploaded to Teamwork called 'Item 2_Board mins 9 Feb 2023 for board approval'. The Chair asked if the Board approved the minutes, the minutes were unanimously approved. The CoSec would provide a set of minutes for redaction to the Chair and CEO.	Board minutes from 9 February approved. CoSec to prepare set of minutes for redaction and send them to the Chair and CEO.
3	Outstanding Actions Review	
3.1	The Chair said that he had met with the CEO and CoSec and they had been through and triaged the list from the last meeting. The CoSec reminded directors to tick an action if they had completed it, and it was noted that anyone could comment on an action so they could ask why it had not been completed at any time. The Chair referred to one action he had in respect of going back to Christine Scarborough and he said he was meeting with her the following week, so he would report back on the action after this meeting. It was then suggested that moving forward it would be useful to have a paper at each meeting which summarised any outstanding actions and the position of those. The Board agreed this would be useful and asked the CoSec to prepare such a paper.	CoSec to prepare a paper on outstanding actions for each Board meeting moving forward.
4	Equality Diversity and Inclusivity (EDI) Review and Diversity and Inclusivity Action Plan (DIAP) approval*	
4.1	The Chair welcomed the D&IM and the ESG Chair to the meeting. He was recommending to the Board that the DIAP be approved and so he proposed that the meeting asked the D&IM and the ESG Chair questions. The meeting then discussed the DIAP and EDI generally, the main points which arose were:	

Item	Topic and Main Aspects Considered	Decision / Action
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff had been engaged in the preparation of the DIAP and any individuals named in the DIAP had been provided with the outcomes to add to their Strategic Action Plans (SAPs) Consideration needed to be given as to whether additional resources of staff time was required The Senior Leadership Team (SLT) had reviewed the DIAP to ensure it was aligned to the BMC strategy The guidance on dress related to professional dress for staff and also religious/faith-based clothing e.g. some religious clothing could be dangerous when wet so it could be the guidance suggested a neoprene hijab was more appropriate for use in certain conditions/situations A lot of volunteers were involved in the work to increase participation and so they needed to be involved or aware of any EDI requirements to ensure that language/advice on local area Facebook pages was in line with the BMC's Some people participated in BMC activities to get away from it all and not be part of a mass participation event, this was something which would be picked up in later iterations of the DIAP Now the D&IM was in place, it was for the BMC to get into a routine of ensuring that policies/role descriptions were reviewed from an EDI perspective Socio-economic background was not specifically mentioned and this was an area where the BMC was not diverse, but the five groups that were being focused on were statistically from a lower socio-economic background and so it was being addressed this way In respect of Wales, it would be good if data could be collected on whether people were Welsh speakers or not 	
4.2	<p>It was asked if the policies and role descriptions to be approved at the meeting had been reviewed by the D&IM or the ESG. It was noted they had not formally been reviewed, but the D&IM was in regular conversations with the policy writers and so best practice would have filtered through.</p> <p>The D&IM noted he was setting up a process to be followed which would help all those who wrote role descriptions and policies, so they could ensure that any EDI angles were dealt with in the documents they were drafting.</p> <p>The Chair thanked the D&IM and the ESG for their work and asked the Board if they were happy to approve the DIAP.</p> <p>The Board unanimously approved the DIAP.</p>	DIAP approved.
5	BDO Responses*	
5.1	<p>The Chair referred to the documents uploaded to Teamwork, which included the proposed responses (the Draft Responses) to the recommendations made by BDO following their audit of the BMC in respect of its governance standards and compliance with the Code for Sports Governance (the Code).</p>	

Item	Topic and Main Aspects Considered	Decision / Action
	<p>He said he was recommending that the Board approved the Draft Responses, but that he had reservations, based on experience, about the proposed timelines, they needed to be more realistic, particularly as his name appeared numerous times and as he said earlier, he did not want the Board to be clogged up with governance issues for the year ahead.</p> <p>He then handed over to JW who had chaired the Task & Finish Group (the BDO Group) which prepared the Draft Responses. JW noted the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• He thanked all of those on the BDO Group for their comments and contributions• The Draft Responses set out actions which the BMC should be doing anyway, as it was just good governance, the BDO Group had looked at business as usual and practical issues when drafting them• He also recommended the Draft Responses were approved but noted there were concerns over workloads and timelines, so the meeting should discuss these	
5.2	<p>The meeting discussed the Draft Responses, the main points noted were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Good governance was a key part of holding the Board to account and should be seen as a benefit to the members as it protects them from any directors failing to follow correct procedures• The majority of the recommendations made in the BDO Audit have come up before and they are in relation to getting the Board working effectively and so this should be done in a timely manner, and once this is done then some of the other issues would naturally fall away• If the Board operated in accordance with the articles of association (the Articles) then the BMC was following the Code, it was just that when the BMC was audited, it was not operating in full compliance with the Articles• There was a cursory response in respect of the risk management recommendations, the Chair had some suggested proposals in this regard• Attention should be focused on what the BMC needed to do to make it perform better i.e. maintaining membership and diversifying income streams than on trying to achieve perfect governance, it needed to find the right size of governance that worked for it• The Draft Responses should be viewed through a BMC lens, which is what the BDO Group had done, so they had looked for practical ways to ensure that the governance standards required by the Sports Councils were being met• Concern over the wording of the Draft Responses 1B-F, in particular if there was to be a suggestion there should be one fewer elected director on the Board so that an additional independent director position was available – this would create a huge backlash from members and involve a lot of work with open forums etc. more appropriate language would be to state that Board composition would be kept under review	

Item	Topic and Main Aspects Considered	Decision / Action
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Instead of the current wording at 1F the better starting point would be to ensure the Board was of an appropriate size, meetings were an appropriate length and the discussions had were of the nature they should be for a non-executive board • There was a need to do what was necessary to satisfy the Sport England and UK Sport (the Sports Councils) but the language at 1B-F should be more neutral and it should be recognised the Sports Councils do not have a monopoly over good governance standards and that they would have their own agenda, which might be different to that of climbers, hill walkers and mountaineers • The timelines should be pushed back to force a conversation with about the governance that worked for the BMC as it was not like other National Governing Bodies (NGBs) 	
5.3	<p>The Chair brought the discussion to a close and suggested the following actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The BDO Group reconvene to review the language of the Draft Responses for 1B-F and all the timelines • The amended Draft Responses should come back to the Board at the meeting on 11 May • He would provide the BDO Group with some further wording to assist with the response to the risk management recommendations <p>He asked if the Board were happy with the proposals, the Board approved the proposals above. He expressed his gratitude to all those on the BDO Group for their work on the Draft Responses.</p>	<p>BDO Group to reconvene and review the Draft Responses in respect of language at 1B-F and timelines</p> <p>Amended Draft Responses to be presented back to the Board on 11 May</p> <p>Chair to provide wording for the responses to the risk management recommendations.</p>
6	CCPG Responses*	
6.1	<p>The Chair welcomed RC and the CCPG Chair to the meeting. He informed the meeting that RC had chaired the CCPG Review Task & Finish Group (the CCPG Group) and together with the other members of the CCPG Group, the CCPG Chair, the President and the CCO, they had prepared a report which set out detailed recommendations in response to the review which had taken place of the CCPG (the CCPG Paper).</p> <p>RC introduced himself, noting he had been to eight Olympic Games with his sport, sailing. He had also been Olympic Performance Director and then CEO of the Royal Yachting Association and then chair of UK Sport.</p> <p>The Chair thanked the CCPG Group, in particular the CCO for the sheer amount of work he had undertaken in respect of the CCPG Paper. He had reviewed the paper prepared in 2019 which set out what the BMC would do in respect of competition climbing via GB Climbing – it said it would cover all competition activity from grassroots to elite and for all activities in terms of indoor climbing, para, skimo and ice. He felt it had been overly optimistic in what it anticipated could be achieved.</p>	

Item	Topic and Main Aspects Considered	Decision / Action
	<p>He recommended the Board approved the CCPG Paper adding that a detailed plan about how to handle the 'high performance' elements and everything else was required. It was highly likely this meant the BMC needed more resources which would mean going back to the Sports Councils for further funding to say that unless the BMC got more funding it would likely fail in setting up and maintaining the pathways necessary for competition climbing.</p> <p>He then handed over to RC.</p>	
6.2	<p>RC provided further details in respect of CCPG Paper, in particular he noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The CCPG Group prepared a first draft of the CCPG Paper and they then contacted those involved in the review of CCPG, being the CEO, the BMC's Head of Performance and Colin Knowles. This was on a check and challenge basis and most of their input was incorporated into the CCPG Paper. • RC had a high-level informal chat with the relevant people at the Sports Councils to check that the direction being proposed by the CCPG Group was the right one, they said it was • The recommendations made as part of the CCPG review in respect of how CCPG should work moving forward were valid and they agreed with them • The safeguarding and financial risks needed to be addressed, but these were BMC wide risks and so should be dealt with on a BMC wide basis • CCPG should be much better at communications both upwards to the Board and SLT and the Sports Councils, and downwards to athletes and parents, coaches etc. because if issues were not communicated appropriately to highly competitive people, then you would quickly run into trouble. • There was insufficient clarity in the roles of CCPG, the Board and GB Climbing. CCPG's terms of reference should be amended to ensure that the lines of responsibility were clearly set out • Reporting should be kept as simple as possible and should be managed so that duplication is avoided. The CCPG had to report into the Sports Councils every year and a big one every 4 years, so this should be interleaved with the reporting process of the CCPG into the Board • Reporting to the Sports Councils should be frank and honest • CCPG should be responsible for all competitive climbing disciplines and it should be looking 8 years ahead as there may well paraclimbing in future para games, and ice climbing could go in to winter games • Focus was essential if the CCPG was to succeed, and sailing was similar to climbing in that recreational participants might not get it or want anything to do with it, but that was for other parts of the BMC to deal with, CCPG had to focus on performance • Experts in performance should be recruited – it was remarkable how many areas of performance were cross-sport • CCPG should not be afraid to copy successful systems, ask other nations how they do it, and just copy the system, there was no need to reinvent the wheel • An important part of seeking further funding from Sports Councils would be to get a successful competition system in place, so that there would be some scores on the doors to go to them with 	

Item	Topic and Main Aspects Considered	Decision / Action
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The Board should try not to micro manage the CCPG, but recruit the best people and then trust them and the staff to do the job• The BMC had a real opportunity in front of it to grow the sport and put its stamp on it moving forward	
6.3	<p>RC then handed over to the CCPG Chair who added the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The CCPG Group recognised that if the Board accepted the CCPG Paper it was a shift for the CCPG to focus on performance only for the sport across all the disciplines, and the BMC was competing against the rest of the world in this respect• Performance meant from the start of the talent programme all the way to the top e.g. building an academy or a podium programme• This left work on the grassroots competitions side, which would need to gel with the performance side in a better way in the long term, it was for the CEO and CCPG Chair to look at this• Recruitment on to the CCPG was crucial, and for the Board to trust them and check and challenge them in the right areas• There was an opportunity to engage with the wider community as competitions are reliant on volunteers to run them, so the performance programme should link in with this and work hand in hand with it. There would need to be guidance for youngsters and recognition for volunteers.	
6.4	<p>The Chair then opened the discussion up to the rest of the meeting. The following points were raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The question of who would deal with the non-performance areas, it was noted that CCPG was not covering all the work anyway to best effect and the CCPG Group recognised a wider piece of work needed doing in respect of this area.• The BMC should work with key people from each discipline to help take care of all pathways similar to in other sports e.g. in canoeing – groups on sprint canoe and slalom – a staff member would be responsible for each group and link in with them• This would be the same with competitions where there would be a link between the staff member and the volunteers who would run competitions• The Sports Councils review funding every 4 years, and they will look at what the BMC applied for and how well they had done against it and if the answer was it had not been able to do X because there was so much going on with general competitions that would not come up to expectations, so it would be important not to load this work onto the CCPG moving forward• It was valid to back a few competitors for 2024, this would provide credibility to have a wider group going forwards, work would be ongoing with those who would compete in 2028• The BMC was looking at a journey of up to 6 years to have everything in place for a credible performance system, the reality was it would not be in place for 2024	

Item	Topic and Main Aspects Considered	Decision / Action
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Board could help by shielding the performance department so that their focus was on Paris, this would then ensure they could build a bigger programme for LA, and by allowing time and support for wider programmes to be built There was a lack of club competitions, so club-based competitions should be considered as this allowed competitions to be held in regions instead of throughout the country, which reduced the cost for parents and engaged the athletes. The challenge for the BMC was that it does not have indoor climbing clubs. A credible plan was needed in place before the AGM, as it was important to show members not involved in performance that the BMC was not abandoning them, as this was how those members would feel, this should include details of how the BMC would support grassroots competition climbing <p>The Chair reiterated it was crucial that the CEO and CCPG Chair prepared a plan which set out how the BMC would deal with performance, and the grassroots side, and that this was in place prior to the AGM.</p>	<p>CEO and CCPG Chair to prepare a plan on how BMC to deal with performance and grassroots side of competition climbing for the May meeting.</p>
6.5	<p>There then followed a discussion about safeguarding as a CND was aware of some concerns at the recent selection event for bouldering. The main points were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The BMC was in a better place now due to the hire of Helen Murphy as Safeguarding Manager The biggest safeguarding risk at the BMC was GB Climbing The Chair was able to reassure the Board that the work ongoing in respect of safeguarding would mitigate the risks The Board needed to know what risk was being carried in respect of safeguarding, both politically and economically The reason the BMC had a full time Safeguarding Manager was because of Sport England funding, which helped answer the question 'what have the Sports Councils ever done for us?' The issues raised from the selection event, and other concerns raised prior to this, were being looked at by the Safeguarding Manager If any director had a safeguarding concern they should pass it on to the Safeguarding Manager along with full details so that they could deal with it properly, it was really important that information was provided with all concerns <p>The Chair agreed he would work with the Safeguarding Manager and others on the Safeguarding Group as necessary, to prepare a report for the Board to be presented at the meeting on 11 May setting out the position on safeguarding issues, which would include risks to the BMC.</p>	<p>Report to be prepared on safeguarding issues affecting the BMC and brought to the Board meeting on 11 May.</p>
6.6	<p>The Chair then asked if the Board approved the CCPG Paper, and it was suggested that the wording in the CCPG Paper about the need to have an underpinning pathway under the top-level performance focus required be strengthened.</p> <p>RC said he was happy to strengthen the wording as requested.</p>	<p>CCPG Paper wording to be strengthened in respect of the need to underpin the top-level performance focus.</p>

Item	Topic and Main Aspects Considered	Decision / Action
	On this basis the Board approved the CCPG Paper.	CCPG Paper approved.
7	Sport England Compliance Statement*	
7.1	<p>The Chair requested that this document, which was a statement setting out details of the Code requirements the BMC was not compliant with, together with proposed actions (the Statement) be revised as a number of the timelines were to mirror those of the Draft Responses, and as agreed at Item 5.3 above these were to be amended. He asked that the Statement be brought back to the Board at the 11 May meeting. This led to a discussion as the Sports Councils had requested the Statement be filed by 30 April 2023.</p> <p>The meeting discussed possible ways forward, with the following points noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Draft documents should not be provided to the Sports Councils as they would have not have gone to the Board beforehand• A conversation should be had with the Sports Councils to promise them that the Statement would be with them on 12 May, as this was after the Board meeting, but the BMC would try and get it approved by the Board ex-committee before 30 April, but they could not promise this• It was not credible for all the items set out in the Statement to be completed by the end of 2023• If a tactic to deal with grassroots to elite competition climbing was to ask the Sports Councils for funding, there was a risk of this if the Board did not meet deadlines set by the Sports Councils• This would be mitigated by the fact that the Board would try to meet the deadline, and would promise to file the Statement by 12 May• That it would not be sensible to push back all the deadlines in the Statement and file it before 30 April, because reasonable timelines were required which the whole Board were happy to sign up to as they would collectively be held account to any actions not completed by a deadline• It should be noted that the BMC had been told of this deadline in November 2022 and considerable work had already been done to help us meet the 30 April deadline	
7.2	<p>The Chair brought the discussion to a close and asked the Board to approve the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Work would be done to try and get the Statement agreed ex-committee prior to 30 April, included in this would also be the BDO Responses as the timelines in those impacted on the Statement• The Sports Councils would be contacted and told that the BMC could not promise 30 April, this was due to the cadence of its board meeting schedule, it could promise 12 May• If the Statement was not approved ex-committee it would be brought back to the Board on 11 May <p>The Board approved the above.</p>	Statement to be amended and dealt with as set out opposite.

Item	Topic and Main Aspects Considered	Decision / Action
8	Operational Measures*	
8.1	<p>The Chair referred to the document that had been uploaded to Teamwork which provided a set of operational measures (the Measures). He noted that the Measures would not be perfect now, they would evolve from year to year, but the Measures provided were a great start, and progress against them could be reviewed by the Board at each quarter.</p> <p>The meeting discussed the Measures with the following points noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It needed to be realistic about what could be delivered and it would be useful to have a calendar overview so the Board could see if items were on track • The staff had been involved in process, as line managers had been asked to speak to staff and review their SAPs so that these formed part of the Measures 	
8.2	<p>The Chair recommended the Board approved Measures, and that if any director had any specific comments they should send those to the SLT – check defined.</p> <p>The Board approved the Measures.</p>	<p>Board to send comments to the SLT.</p> <p>The Measures were approved.</p>
9	Governance Matters	
9.1	Nominated Director role descriptions*	
9.1.1	<p>The Chair referred to the two nominated director role descriptions which had been uploaded to Teamwork, he made the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One was for a director to have an understanding and knowledge of Wales (Wales Role) • The other was for a director to have an understanding and knowledge of competitive sport together with more generic director skills (Sports Role) <p>The meeting discussed them and noted the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There were some minor amendments to make to the Wales Role, otherwise the Board were happy with this • The Sports Role needed to be more specific, otherwise it ran the risk of being too generic and it would therefore be difficult to short list candidates before their names were put on the ballot paper, as the only way to vet candidates was against the role description • The Sports Role was a bit more generic as previous role descriptions had been too narrow which resulted in a very small number of applications • The Sports Role referred to the experience of competition climbing as being 'essential' it was felt this could limit the number of applicants 	

Item	Topic and Main Aspects Considered	Decision / Action
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">As RC pointed out in Item 6.2 there was cross over with other sports, so maybe the Sports Role should not refer specifically to competition climbing, but to sport systemsWhether there was specific reference to clubs required, it was felt there was not as most other sports have clubs as an integral part of them, so they would come with that experience	
9.1.2	<p>The Chair asked the Board if, subject to the minor amendments being made to the Wales Role they approved it – the Board approved the Wales Role.</p> <p>The Chair asked if the Board were happy for him to amend the Sports Role so that it referred to sport systems and ideally an understanding of competition climbing, and if so that they were then happy to approve it.</p> <p>The Board agreed with the above, so subject to the required amendment the Sports Role was approved.</p>	<p>Wales Role approved – CoSec to make necessary amendments to it so it is ready for advertising.</p> <p>Sports Role approved – Chair to make necessary amendments to it so it is ready for advertising.</p>
9.2	Board Code of Conduct*	
9.2.1	<p>The Chair referred to the draft Board Code of Conduct (the Board Code) which had been uploaded to Teamwork. He said that MH had put a lot of work into the issue of Board behaviour and in to the Board Code, together with the SID, CoSec and himself.</p> <p>He made the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">The Board needed an updated conduct code, and a lot of thought had gone into the Board CodeSome concerns the Chair had had been dealt with, and in particular the disciplinary part had been moved to an appendix, this was because it required a bit more workThe Chair was strongly recommending that the Board approved the Board Code, which would not include the appendix at this stage	
9.2.2	<p>The meeting discussed this and the following points were raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">The Board Code was to replace the Code of Practice agreed in March 2021The appendix did need more work, in particular to ensure that the disciplinary process could not be abusedClause 1.2 should also refer to the MoU between the Board and Members' CouncilThe Board should have a set of behaviours it agrees to abide by to demonstrate good governance and also because of the directors' duties in the Companies Act 2006 which meant directors had to be held to a higher standard than everyone elseThe appendix dealt with what would happen if directors did not adhere to the Board Code, but the Board Code just set out how the Board should be doing thingsThere should be an amendment in 3.3, the protected characteristic was sex, not gender	

Item	Topic and Main Aspects Considered	Decision / Action
9.2.3	The Chair asked the Board if, subject to the specific amendments noted above, they approved the Board Code, which did not include the appendix. A majority of the Board approved the Board Code and one director voted against it.	CoSec to amend the Board Code as set out, and to upload it to Teamwork so all the directors had access to it. Board Code approved.
9.3	Documents for approval*	
9.3.1	The Chair stated there were three policies for approval: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Lone Working Policy• Hybrid Working Policy• Flexible Working Policy <p>He said that he had checked in with Mike Rosser, chair of the Health & Safety Group to ensure that the points raised on the Lone Working Policy at the Board meeting in November 2022 had been dealt with.</p>	
9.3.2	The meeting discussed the policies with the following points raised: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• In the Flexible Working Policy, under the heading 'Procedure for handling an application', this should refer to an employee discussing it with their line manager and HR• The Lone Working Policy was still worded to suggest the directors should know where all employees and volunteers were during working/volunteering hours, it should be that the management structure knows where employees are• There was a need to ensure the Board were meeting their duty of care to staff and volunteers, but this should not lead to an unrealistic administrative burden• Whether the Lone Working Policy should refer to staff and volunteers, or just staff. It was decided that the policy should refer to both, as the duty of care was owed to staff and volunteers	
9.3.3	The Chair drew the discussion to a close and asked the Board if they approved: <ul style="list-style-type: none">1) The Flexible Working Policy – subject to the amendment above being made – the Board unanimously approved this2) The Hybrid Working Policy – the Board unanimously approved this <p>In respect of the Lone Working Policy the Chair suggested that this be returned to the Health & Safety Group so that they could review it in light of the comments above, the Board agreed with this.</p>	Flexible Working Policy to be amended as set out in minutes 9.3.2 and it was then approved. Hybrid Working Policy approved. Lone Working Policy to be reviewed as per comments in minutes 9.3.2.

Item	Topic and Main Aspects Considered	Decision / Action
9.4	Financial Conduct Authority (FCA) Consumer Duty*	
9.4.1	<p>The Chair referred to the paper uploaded to Teamwork which contained an implementation plan for the BMC to meet the FCA's Consumer Duty (the Plan). This was a new duty which the FCA had introduced and it was applicable to the BMC because of the travel insurance it sold. The purpose of the duty was to protect consumers and ensure they were treated fairly and the Plan set out the steps the BMC would take to ensure this.</p> <p>The Chair also thanked JW for agreeing to be the Board's Consumer Duty champion. JW noted that the Plan did not contain anything onerous and was all about protecting consumers and ensuring complaints were dealt with appropriately.</p> <p>He recommended that the Board approved the Plan and JW being the Consumer Duty champion. The Board unanimously approved both of these items.</p>	<p>The Plan and JW being the Consumer Duty champion were approved.</p>
9.5	Youth Club Dates*	
9.5.1	<p>The Chair referred to the paper uploaded to Teamwork which asked the Board to approve the dates for the new Youth Clubs year, which was to run from 1 September to 31 August so that it coincided with the school year. He added that Council had already approved this.</p> <p>The Board unanimously approved the Youth Club Dates.</p>	<p>Youth Club Dates approved.</p>
10	AOB and Feedback of Meeting	
10.1	<p>The Chair said there was one piece of AOB which was the work CS had been doing in respect of guidebooks. He noted a paper had been uploaded to Teamwork, but that the Board would not have had time to read it as it was only uploaded that day. He therefore asked CS to provide a summary.</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p>	

Item	Topic and Main Aspects Considered	Decision / Action
	[REDACTED]	
10.2	<p>The meeting discussed this and the following points were raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any demonstrations which required the BMC to provide data needed to ensure the BMC was very clear around copyright and other intellectual property rights (IPR) <p>[REDACTED]</p>	
10.3	<p>The Chair brought the discussion to a close and asked the Board if they were happy for CS to work with the CCO and JW in order to move this project forward. The Board indicated agreement with this proposal.</p>	CS, JW and the CCO to meet to ensure that digital guidebooks moved forward in a contractual and structured way.
10.4	<p>The Chair then asked for feedback on the meeting, he recognised it had overrun by about 40 minutes, but felt some important issues had been covered. The following feedback was provided:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The meeting had not really covered strategic issues that would drive the BMC forward There was a need to draw on the expertise across the BMC, staff and volunteers, to ensure that papers that come to the Board are relevant to the strategic aims set The Chair was doing a good job in managing time and good discussion Meetings were still a work in progress – there should be more focus on the revenue of the BMC, but this meeting had ensured some difficult issues were covered 	
11	<p>Date and time of next meeting</p> <p>The Chair said the date of the next meeting was Thursday 11 May 2023, it was noted that this was a face to face meeting at the Manchester office, and the day before there would be a deep dive into the work being carried out by the staff. It was noted that it had been agreed Council members could also attend this.</p> <p>The Chair said the deep dive was a really good opportunity for directors to meet each part of the BMC in an informal way and he recommended as many directors attended as possible.</p> <p>The CoSec said she would be in touch regarding accommodation requirements.</p>	

Item 12 Topic and Main Aspects Considered
Close of meeting

Decision / Action

There being no other business, the Chair closed the meeting and thanked everyone for their time.

Item	Action	Involving	Target date
2.1	CoSec to prepare set of minutes for redaction and send them to the Chair and CEO.	LV	27 March 2023
3.1	CoSec to prepare a paper on outstanding actions for each Board meeting moving forward.	LV	4 May 2023 (then ongoing)
5.3	BDO Group to reconvene and review the Draft Responses in respect of language at 1B-F and timelines	JW, LV, PD, FS, MH, JC	4 April 2023
5.3	BDO Group to prepare amended Draft Responses and bring back to the Board at the 11 May meeting	JW, LV, PD, FS, MH, JC	4 May 2023
5.3	CoSec to add amended Draft Responses to the agenda for 11 May meeting	LV	14 April 2023
5.3	Chair to provide wording for the responses to the risk management recommendations.	RM	4 May 2023
6.4	CEO and CCPG Chair to prepare a plan on how BMC to deal with performance and grassroots side of competition climbing.	PD, PR	4 May 2023
6.5	Report to be prepared on safeguarding issues affecting the BMC and brought to the Board meeting on 11 May.	RM	4 May 2023
6.7	CCPG Paper wording to be strengthened in respect of the need to underpin the top-level performance focus.	GF (on behalf of RC)	1 April 2023
7.2	Statement to be amended and dealt with as set out in minute 7.2.	LV and Board	30 April 2023
7.2	If Statement not approved prior to 30 April, then to be added to the agenda for the 11 May meeting	LV	30 April 2023
8.2	Board to send comments to the SLT.	All	30 April 2023
9.1.2	CoSec to make necessary amendments to Wales Role so it is ready for advertising	LV	5 April 2023
9.1.2	Chair to make necessary amendments to Sports Role so it is ready for advertising.	RM	5 April 2023
9.2.2	CoSec to amend the Board Code as set out, and to upload it to Teamwork so all the directors had access to it.	LV	5 April 2023
9.3.3	Flexible Working Policy to be amended as per minutes 9.3.2.	JC	5 April 2023
9.3.3	Lone Working Policy to be reviewed as per comments in minutes 9.3.2.	LV	5 April 2023
10.3	CS, JW and the CCO to meet to ensure that digital guidebooks moved forward in a contractual and structured way.	CS, JW, GF	4 May 2023