

CRAG

CRAG Summary Report and Main Report

Frequently Asked Questions

Version 3

22nd May, 2017

Always refer back to cc-crag.weebly.com/faqs.html for the most up to date version

CRAG Summary Report and Main Report - Frequently Asked Questions

Table of Contents

A. THE PRINCIPLE OF CHANGE----- 2

B. THE STRATEGY, MISSION AND ACTION PLAN ----- 3

C. THE CENTRAL RINGING ORGANISATION ----- 6

D. THE EXECUTIVE ----- 7

E. WORKGROUPS-----10

F. THE COUNCIL OF REPRESENTATIVES-----13

G. INDIVIDUAL MEMBERSHIP -----16

H. PROFESSIONAL SUPPORT, REVENUE AND BRANDING-----19

I. ALTERNATIVE SOLUTIONS -----21

J. IMPLEMENTATION -----23

	<p>New to the Second Edition</p>
	<p>New to the Third Edition</p>

A. The Principles of Change

1.



How confident can I be that CRAG's proposals are not simply "change for change's sake"? Will these proposals actually make a difference to ordinary ringers?

The proposals contained in the CRAG report are designed to address the concerns expressed in the detailed submissions received during the two consultation exercises performed in the autumn of 2016, the other submissions which CRAG has received and the views of over 2,000 ringers who responded to CRAG's survey at the start of 2017.

In particular, they are targeted at two key findings from this feedback and which are elaborated in Section 3 of our Summary Report:

- *"To serve and represent the interests of ringers, it is vital that the Council urgently establishes a direct relationship with individual ringers, which allows them both to benefit from and exert influence upon the Council's range of services and activities."*
- *"The Council should dramatically improve its ability to make and implement timely decisions by bringing its structure and working practices into line with the standard governance model adopted by most UK charities."*

Action on these two issues alone will not transform the CRO overnight and in the absence of effective leadership, commitment and an appropriate financial model the pace of progress will be slow.

However, the changes proposed by CRAG represent far-reaching reforms, which will put the CRO in a much stronger position to achieve its objectives, because its volunteers will find that its governance and organisation will be working for them and not against them.

In particular:

- The presence of a Strategy and Action Plan (Proposal A) will lead to better and faster decisions because decision-makers will find it easier to judge which activities and projects are important and which are less essential. It will also be easier for representatives to assess the performance of the CRO's leadership.
- The adoption of a standard governance model (Proposals B to D), will address various points where the existing Council no longer complies with Charity Commission guidance and will ensure that decision-making processes are dramatically improved.
- The establishment of a direct relationship with individual ringers (Proposal E) will, for the first time enable the CRO to communicate directly with ringers at all levels, rather than through the layers of society, branch and tower secretaries on which the Council currently relies.

B. The Strategy, Mission and Action Plan

2.

Will the new Mission statement effectively change the CRO's charity class (religious) meaning that it would be necessary to wind up the existing charity and create a new one?



Charities have the power to change their governing documents to bring either their administrative procedures or their charitable purposes up-to-date so that they can more effectively respond to the changing environments in which they operate.

The procedure for changing a governing document is well-established and outlined in the Charity Commission's document CC36 "Changing your Charity's Governing Document".

It is very common for charities to take this step, and in recent years major charities that have made changes to their governing documents include the RAF Benevolent Fund and War on Want.

The amended governing document must ensure that the charity's amended purposes remain charitable, as defined by the Charities Act 2011, but there is no need to dissolve or re-form the charity.

The proposed Vision and Activity statements have been drafted to ensure that they can be expressed as a purpose which meets the guidelines provided by the Charity Commission in its document "How to Write Charitable Purposes".

The detailed rule changes required to give effect to the above will be written by the group charged with drawing up the CRO's statutory rules, operating principles and procedures, provided for in Proposal F.

Charity Commission guidance is that where possible a charity's purposes should explicitly refer to the public benefit that will result.

The Council's existing objects do not meet this new standard and, in addition to bringing them up to date, the various changes proposed will make them compliant with the 2011 Charities Act.

3.

Should the new Mission statement be elaborated in a booklet for all ringers setting out what the new CRO does?



Many charities publish their mission statement and organise their annual reports to show how successful they have been in promoting each individual activity, goal or charitable object to which their mission statement refers.

4.

How do the proposed Vision, Mission and Activity statements differ from the Council's current objects?

The Council's current objects are limited to "promote and foster the ringing of bells for

	<p>Christian prayer, worship and celebration”. The proposed Vision statement points to ringing’s wider role as a performing art, which enhances the life of both community and church. The proposed Mission statement makes clear the Council’s unique role “to be the strategic leader and public voice of the ringing community, the arbiter of standards and to promote an environment where ringing can flourish”.</p> <p>The new Activity statements deal with a number of omissions in the Council’s current objects, which are silent on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Recruitment and retention of ringers ➤ Training and education ➤ Establishment of strong relationships with key partners, notably the Church of England
<p>5.</p>	<p>As the CCCBR is a charity do you know that the proposed changes (the new Vision) would allow the new organisation to have charitable status?</p> <p>The proposed Vision statement has been drafted to ensure that it can be expressed as a purpose which meets the guidelines provided by the Charity Commission in its document “How to Write Charitable Purposes”.</p> <p>Under the Charities Act 2011, a charity’s ‘purpose’ is one which:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ falls within one or more of 13 ‘descriptions of purposes’ listed in the Charities Act itself ➤ is for the benefit of the public in general, or a sufficient section of the public <p>The detailed rule changes required to give effect to the above will be written by the group charged with drawing up the CRO’s statutory rules, operating principles and procedures, provided for in Proposal F.</p> <p>Charity Commission guidance is that where possible a charity’s purposes should explicitly refer to the public benefit that will result.</p> <p>The Council’s existing objects do not meet this new standard and, in addition to bringing them up to date, the various changes proposed will make them compliant with the 2011 Charities Act.</p>
<p>6.</p>	<p>The ‘Relationship Management’ activity separates ‘church’ from ‘stakeholders’ – surely the ‘church’ is a stakeholder like any other and therefore should not be listed separately?</p> <p>The “Relationship Management” Activity proposed by CRAG, based around the responses received during the consultation exercise in October 2016 states one of the Council’s activities to be “Representing the interests of ringing and ringers through the development of strong relationships with the church, stakeholders, the media and others outside the bell ringing community.”</p> <p>A significant proportion of those responding to CRAG’s consultation expressed concern about the need to maintain a strong, but robust relationship with the church. The following</p>

	<p>comment is typical of those received on this subject:</p> <p><i>A central body needs to liaise with a wide range of third parties, but pre-eminent among those is surely the Church. Perhaps in some distant future ringing may be completely secularised. But for the moment, the Church is our biggest partner, supporter, asset, collaborator, advocate, etc etc. Perhaps if we did a SWOT analysis, the Church would fall into all four quadrants (!), which is indicative of the current reality?" I honestly feel this link is currently inseparable. As such, I feel this should be reflected in both the Vision and the Mission</i></p> <p>Our analysis indicated that while many churches are interested in having their bells chimed or rung for service, this does not necessarily equate to a commitment to ringers or the exercise of ringing, and at least one example has been brought to our attention where a church has chosen not to enlist the services of ringers for divine worship, but to have its bells chimed mechanically instead. The Activity statement therefore includes the term stakeholders to refer to organisations such as the ART, bell hangers and rope makers, who are dependent upon ringing, but lists the Church separately as its role is much more all-embracing.</p>
<p>7.</p> 	<p>I'm a little worried that "the Church" features too prominently in your Vision for ringing and the proposed Mission and Activity statements.</p> <p>We believe it is essential that ringing develops even stronger relationships with the church, and one of the principles for change (L) referred to in our report states "[The Council] should at all times foster strong and constructive relationships with community, church and bell owners". While church attendances may be falling, in England at least the Church of England owns more than 95% of all ringing bells so a strong relationship, nurtured by mutual respect, is crucial. This is equally important in securing a future for the bells hung in those towers where a church is at risk of redundancy.</p>
<p>8.</p>	<p>What practical difference will a Strategy and Action Plan make?</p> <p>The presence of a Strategy and Action Plan will lead to better and faster decisions because decision-makers will find it easier to judge which activities and projects are important and which are less essential. It will enable the Council to meet Charity Commission guidance and bring it into line with many other charities by ensuring that it regularly reviews its activities, ceasing those that do not sufficiently promote its charitable objectives. The production of each Action Plan will lead to a greater sense of purpose by ensuring that the CRO's annual priorities are focused on achieving its strategy.</p> <p>The Strategy and Action Plan will also lead to a cultural change. By preparing and presenting an Action Plan the Executive will be encouraged to be clear about their plans for the Council and it will be easier to judge how successful they have been in meeting their objectives.</p>

C. The Central Ringing Organisation	
9.	<p>How will a “Central Ringing Organisation” (CRO) differ from the Central Council and why is this new term necessary?</p> <p>The existing Central Council is already the Central Ringing Organisation (CRO), but it does not currently tackle all of the functions that a CRO would be expected to perform. The term CRO is used simply as shorthand to indicate the position of the Council once the necessary reforms to its governance and organisation are complete.</p>
10.	<p>If the Council of Representatives should not be involved in operational decisions, who is responsible for making sure the CRO does what it has been set-up to do?</p> <p>In line with all UK charities, the Executive of the CRO will be required to comply with UK law and the requirements of the Charity Commission. The Council of Representatives, who will elect the Executive, will also approve their annual report and accounts. The Executive will operate within the framework of CRO’s rules, operating principles and procedures. The CRO’s accounts will continue to be assessed by an Independent Examiner or auditors and the requirement for the Executive to produce a Strategy and Action Plan will make it easier for members of the Council of Representatives to assess their performance.</p> <p>The Executive will be required to review the governance of the CRO each three years and submit proposals for any necessary improvements.</p> <p>In exceptional circumstances, as with the existing Central Council, the Council of Representatives will be empowered to amend the CRO’s constitution to give effect to any additional controls or scrutiny, but the experience of most UK charities indicates that the policies and controls referred to above are more than sufficient to ensure good governance.</p>
11.	<p>Is the CRO only for those ringers who already are members of another organization? Should it not represent ALL ringers?</p> <p>The proposed Vision, Mission and Activity statements for the CRO consulted on by CRAG require the CRO to represent the interests of all ringers.</p> <p>The new direct membership facility provided for under Proposal E will enable any ringer to influence the CRO and to benefit from its services, regardless of whether they belong to another ringing society or not.</p>
12.	<p>What is meant by “standard governance model”?</p> <p>The model for charity governance derived from Charity Commission’s guidelines together with the Charity Governance Code consultation document published November 2016, and</p>

employed by almost all equivalent charities, including the Royal School of Church Music, Making Music, Guide Association and Royal College of Organists. Under this model, the management of the charity is entrusted to an executive or trustee board comprising approximately 8-14 members, who are either elected, appointed or a combination of both.

D. The Executive

13.

Is there a danger that an Executive formed of up to 8 elected members (meaning that it could contain maybe four) would be too small to get the job done and/or could pursue too narrow objectives which do not reflect the needs of ringers?



Charity Commission guidance (as set out in its document CC10) states that charities should have “a trustee body that is the right size for the charity – large enough to include the skills and experience needed to run the charity effectively, but small enough to allow effective discussion and decision making.”

Our research included detailed assessments of a small number of charities with similar objectives to those of the Central Council, which were found to have executive or management boards that follow this model.

The Charity Commission also recommend that a management board is empowered to appoint further members, in addition to its elected members, where they judge this to be necessary in order to achieve the right balance of skills, backgrounds or expertise. This capability is also reflected in the organisations we have examined in detail.

In the light of this evidence, and taking into account the specific needs of the Central Council, our conclusion is that an Executive of no more than 8 elected members, with empowerment to make two further non-elected appointments, is appropriate for the CRO’s needs. This is provided under Proposal B.

It should be noted that the Executive’s role is to manage the CRO’s affairs, but not to perform the majority of work itself, as this is delegated to the CRO’s various Workgroups and sub-groups. Large Executive groups tend to be less able to get things done and take effective and timely decisions.

We also believe it is most unlikely that a board comprising less than eight elected members would provide the balance of skills necessary to run the CRO’s affairs, and would expect the group charged with drawing up the CRO’s statutory rules, operating principles and procedures, as provided for in Proposal F to settle on an Executive size of eight elected members.

14.

Surely an Executive composed of the existing four main current officers (President, Vice President, Treasurer and Secretary) is all that is required? Anything more will be too cumbersome?



Taking into account the specific needs of the CRO, our conclusion is that an Executive of fewer than 8 elected members would have difficulty achieving the right balance of skills and expertise necessary to provide the necessary leadership for the future.

It should be noted that the specialist skills required for an effective CRO Executive include

	<p>financial, technical, regulatory, administrative, ICT and relationship management.</p> <p>We believe that a board comprising less than eight elected members would struggle to achieve the right balance of skills and would lack the spread of different backgrounds and perspectives necessary to meet Charity Commission guidelines for effective decision-making.</p> <p>Our research of a sample of charities with similar objectives to those of the Central Council indicated none with a management board of less than 8.</p>
<p>15.</p>	<p>Will you need to be a ringer to volunteer for the Executive or a Workgroup? How do you define a “ringer” in this context?</p> <p>To encourage recruitment of the most talented people a key recommendation is that Executive and Workgroup positions should be open to all ringers so that recruitment takes place from the largest possible pool. In practice it is unlikely that non-ringers will volunteer for these roles, but the word ‘ringer’ in this context can be defined as anyone who is a member of an affiliated ringing society or a direct member of the CRO.</p>
<p>16.</p>	<p>Who is appointing the Executive?</p> <p><u>Transitional arrangements – to May 2018</u></p> <p>Under the initial arrangements provided for under Proposals B ii and B vi:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ the first Executive should be formed no later than November 2017. ➤ by virtue of their election in May 2017 the Council’s President, Vice President, Secretary and Treasurer will automatically become its first appointments. ➤ the Council’s trustees will then make up to four further appointments of additional members who will become eligible for re-election at the 2018 Council meeting. <p><u>May 2018 onwards</u></p> <p>Thereafter:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ All of the above Executive members will be elected by the Council of Representatives, with terms of office of 3 years ➤ At the end of their term each will become eligible to stand for re-election by the Council of Representatives for one further 3-year term. ➤ Proposal B contains provisions that will ensure that the terms of office for Executive members are staggered so that the entire Executive does not all retire in the same year. ➤ In line with Charity Commission guidance, the Executive will also be empowered to appoint two further members, in addition to its elected members, where they judge this to be necessary in order to achieve the right balance of skills, backgrounds or expertise.

17.	<p>Will a smaller Executive “empowered to make decisions without further approval” make the CRO more remote than the existing Council?</p> <p>A smaller executive with additional powers to make decisions will be able to respond more quickly and stay closer to the changing needs of ringers. The current council meets only once per year and so is already somewhat remote from day-to-day management. The replacement governance model proposed is common to the vast majority of UK charities, who entrust their management to an executive or board of trustees. Accountability will be enforced through the CRO’s governing rules, publication of an Action Plan against which performance can be measured, annual elections and the approval of each annual report and accounts. In addition, the direct membership channel proposed will ensure that communications between the new Executive and membership are dramatically improved, ensuring that the new Executive becomes far less remote than the Council’s officers have historically been perceived.</p>
18.	<p>If all posts have a maximum term of office, will this prevent the most able candidates from serving?</p> <p>To survive and prosper it is critical that the CRO is able to bring in new skills and people at regular intervals so that its skillsets do not ‘ossify’ and its key officers do not become institutionalised. The maximum term of office for Workgroup and Executive appointments of six years (three years renewable once, as provided under Proposals B v) and C vi)), provides stability whilst ensuring that there is a regular intake of new people with fresh ideas. It is in line with all the equivalent charities that CRAG has researched.</p> <p>In the case of highly technical roles there is no reason why Workgroups cannot continue to have access to the expertise of their most experienced people after the end of their term by making arrangements which enable them to provide consultancy, take responsibility for specific projects or offer informal ‘as needed’ advice.</p>
19.	<p>What benefit is served by the Executive and the Trustees being the same people?</p> <p>Our research shows that the standard governing model employed by most charities of an equivalent size to the Central Council provides that their affairs are managed by a board of trustees, each of whom has specific responsibilities, but who together take responsibility for all key management decisions.</p> <p>Effective peer review is an essential control in any organisation and for this reason the Charity Commission highlights a strong board as one of the key features of an effective charity. Separation of the Executive into some members who are trustees and some who are not reduces accountability and confuses decision-making by creating two ‘classes’ of executive members.</p>
20.	<p>What is the purpose of allowing the Executive to appoint up to two additional members?</p> <p>Charity Commission guidance encourages charities to consider appointing a small number of their board members where this is necessary to ensure the right balance of</p>

	<p>skills and expertise. In many cases charities look beyond their own membership where it is necessary to bring in someone with relevant professional skills that can help them achieve their objectives.</p>
E. Workgroups	
<p>21.</p> 	<p>What about the stewards and other roles that are ‘ex officio’ members of the current Central Council?</p> <p>A number of specific roles are ‘ex officio’ members of the existing Central Council, because of the convention that the holders of all key positions are drawn from the Central Council’s representatives.</p> <p>Under the reformed organisation, it will not be necessary for the holder of any office to be a member of the Council of Representatives, and in the case of members of the Executive and Workgroup Leaders this will not be possible in the interests of maintaining an effective separation between those charged with managing the charity’s affairs and its governing body.</p> <p>Arrangements for the existing ex officio positions will be dealt with by the group charged with drawing up the CRO’s statutory rules, operating principles and procedures, provided for in Proposal F.</p> <p>However, we would expect each existing ex officio role to be linked either to a named Workgroup Leader or Executive member, who would be responsible for ensuring that each role receives the necessary support and empowerment.</p>
<p>22.</p>	<p>What is the difference between a “Workgroup” and an existing committee?</p> <p>Although the new Workgroups will do some of the work currently performed by existing committees, they will go about it in a very different way. The new workgroups will be smaller in number, more streamlined, better co-ordinated by close links with the Executive, more effective and efficient than the current committees. Their workplans will be agreed with the Executive and the Workgroup Leaders will be accountable for delivery of their agreed workplans. Some of the great work being done by the current committees will continue, whilst other parts will be reviewed and reconsidered</p> <p>The key procedural change is that their members will be appointed by their Workgroup Leader in consultation with the Executive, rather than by the Council. Typically, each Workgroup Leader will wish to create a group of the most talented people, who are able to work well together as a team. As a result, Workgroups can be expected to have a more dynamic and task-focused culture than the existing committees.</p>
<p>23.</p>	<p>If Workgroup Leaders and their Workgroups are appointed rather than elected, will this make the new CRO less democratic than the existing Council? What protections will exist against ‘cronyism’?</p> <p>As with other charities, entrusting the Executive (and through the Executive the</p>

	<p>workgroups) with the management of the CRO's affairs does involve a small loss of "democracy", although this is counter-balanced by much improved accountability through the following provisions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Each Workgroup will report to a named Executive member who will be accountable for their activities. Executive members will be elected. ➤ The Executive will be required to publish an Action Plan against which its performance can be clearly evaluated. ➤ All Workgroup Leader and Executive appointments are limited to six years (three years renewable once). ➤ To enforce a separation of powers, Workgroup Leaders and Executive members may not sit on the Council of Representatives. ➤ The Executive and Workgroups will at all times have to comply with the CRO's constitution, operating principles and procedures.
<p>24.</p>	<p>How will people volunteer to serve on the Executive or on Workgroups?</p> <p>The detailed recruitment procedures will be written by the group charged with drawing up the CRO's statutory rules, operating principles and procedures, provided for in Proposal F. An open recruitment policy is likely to form one of the CRO's key operating procedures.</p>
<p>25.</p>	<p>Surely 'Workgroup' sounds depressingly like 'business' terminology?</p> <p>Whilst it is important that the existing Central Council is run along more conventional business lines, the term "Workgroup" was chosen merely to emphasise that Workgroups will be appointed to perform specific functions and can be expected to have a more dynamic and task-focused culture than the existing committees.</p> <p>The detailed rule changes required to give permanent effect to Workgroups will be written by the group charged with drawing up the CRO's statutory rules, operating principles and procedures, provided for in Proposal F. This group may reach the conclusion that an alternative, less "business" sounding name is more appropriate.</p>
<p>26.</p>	<p>If membership of some of the Workgroups requires significant prior experience, meaning the number of suitably experienced people will be low, could imposing a maximum term mean that they will struggle to find suitable expertise?</p> <p>It is critical that even the most technical Workgroups are encouraged to bring in new people at regular intervals to ensure that they have a 'succession policy' and that critical skillsets do not wither. The maximum term of office for Workgroup appointments of six years (three years renewable once) allows sufficient time for new members to be brought in to work alongside experienced members to gain any technical training that they may need.</p> <p>It is not necessary that Workgroups completely sever their connections with former members once their term expires. In the case of highly technical roles there is no reason why Workgroups should not continue to have access to the expertise of their most experienced people by making arrangements for them to provide consultancy, take responsibility for specific projects or offer informal 'as needed' advice.</p>

	<p>The key change is that Workgroups will have access to the widest possible range of expertise from across the ringing community, whereas at present the membership of committees is in practice limited to a relatively small pool of council representatives.</p>
<p>27.</p>	<p>If Workgroup Leaders and Executive members cannot also be members of the Council of Representatives, will this lead to divergence between these two groups?</p> <p>This recommendation is necessary to ensure an effective separation of powers between those charged with managing the CRO's affairs and those who form its governing body. It applies only to those in leadership roles, meaning that there is no restriction preventing the members of Workgroups serving at the same time as members of the Council of Representatives.</p> <p>In the interests of good communication, each Workgroup will report to a named Executive member (as provided for under Proposal C ii) and all Executive members will be expected to attend meetings of the Council of Representatives (as provided for under Proposal D i)) although they will not become representatives themselves.</p> <p>The existing structure, where committee chairmen and officers are often leading members of the Council, prevents the Council from performing its proper duty to hold the Executive to account.</p>
<p>28.</p> 	<p>If Workgroup Leaders are appointed by the Executive, will this stifle originality compared with the current system by which committee chairman are elected by the committees themselves?</p> <p>As with other charities, the appointment of key roles empowers the Executive to perform their duty to manage the CRO's affairs. In practice, it is most unlikely to lead to any overall loss of initiative or originality for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Workgroup and Executive appointments will be limited to six years (three years renewable once), giving rise to a regular intake of new perspectives and ideas ➤ Workgroup and Workgroup Leaders will be appointed from a much wider pool than existing committees because their members will not need to be members of the Council of Representatives. ➤ Each Workgroup Leader will report to a named Executive member who will take responsibility for their performance. In practice it would be most unlikely that the responsible Executive member would not want their Workgroup to be as dynamic and innovative as possible. ➤ Where good ideas are put forward, the new structure will make it easier for Workgroups to implement them, because they will have Executive support, particularly in circumstances where collaboration between more than one Workgroup is required. ➤ The development by the Executive of a five-year Strategy and Action Plan will encourage rather than inhibit the presentation of new ideas that can support the agreed strategy.

29.	<p>How many new Workgroups will there be? Will the number change over time?</p> <p>By ensuring that Workgroups are appointed by the Executive rather than at each annual Council meeting, it will be possible for the number and composition of Workgroups to be adapted more flexibly to meet new challenges and promote the CRO's objectives. The Executive, who will regularly review the position to ensure that the structure of Workgroups meets the CRO's needs, will determine the exact number of Workgroups.</p>
<p>F. The Council of Representatives</p>	
<p>30.</p> 	<p>Would it make sense for the Council of Representatives to have its own section on the CRO's website to make clear its specific role? Should it have its own chairman?</p> <p>Our recommendations ensure an effective separation of powers between those charged with managing the CRO's affairs and those who form its governing body through Proposal B, which provides that members of the Executive will not be voting members of the Council of Representatives, but will attend its meetings.</p> <p>The precise organisation of the Council of Representatives will be determined by the group drawing up the CRO's statutory rules, operating principles and procedures, provided for in Proposal F.</p> <p>It is likely that they will draw on evidence from other charities which employ a range of models, including those where the governing body has a separate chair, and those where meetings of the governing body are chaired by the chair of its trustee or management board.</p> <p>In the case of many large charities, the governing body has its own separate area on the charity's website to emphasise its separate governance role.</p>
<p>31.</p> 	<p>If the size of the new Council of Representatives is smaller than the current Central Council, is there a risk that the most able and experienced people will be the most likely to retire, resulting in a major loss of expertise?</p> <p>The vast majority of the work of the current Central Council is performed by its committees during the course of the year, rather than by representatives at the annual meeting.</p> <p>Similarly, under our proposals, the vast majority of work will be performed by the new Workgroups and, where appropriate, their sub-groups under the guidance of the Executive.</p> <p>Although the new Workgroups will appear similar to existing committees, they will go about their work in a very different way.</p> <p>A key change is that Workgroups will no longer be formed exclusively from members of the Council of Representatives, meaning that they will have access to the widest possible pool of talent from across the ringing community.</p>

	<p>In practice therefore, it is likely that Workgroups will not only retain the services of many of the key subject matter experts who support the Central Council's existing committees, but that they will be further strengthened by the introduction of new people who have expertise to offer, from all sections of the ringing world.</p>
<p>32.</p>	<p>If Additional Members are discontinued, will there be a loss of valuable expertise, which is currently available?</p> <p>Where there is a need to recognise an important contribution made by an individual, their election as a "Fellow" will be the appropriate course. In practice Fellows will continue to play an important role in the CRO and their experience will continue to be invaluable. The rationale for election as an Additional Member at present is to bring significant expertise to the Council. In future it will still be possible for them to bring their expertise to bear by working directly with the Workgroups to which their skills relate.</p>
<p>33.</p>	<p>How will the formal business meeting of the new Council of Representatives differ from the current annual Council meeting?</p> <p>The formal business meeting can be expected to be shorter and more structured, because the Council of Representatives will in future entrust the Executive with the management of the CRO's affairs. As a result, many decisions which currently wait for the Council's next annual meeting (including those on methods) will be made by the Executive, with appropriate consultation and on the advice of the relevant Workgroup. The rules governing the conduct of the annual meeting will be drafted by the group charged with drawing up the CRO's statutory rules, operating principles and procedures, provided for in Proposal F. However, the main statutory business items are likely to be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Presentation and approval of the annual report and accounts ➤ Presentation and approval of the five-year Strategy and Action Plan ➤ Election of Executive members and the Independent Examiner or Auditors. ➤ Election of Fellows ➤ Approval of rule changes ➤ Debates on specific subjects of interest to members. <p>Under proposal I it is recommended that the formal business meeting, being much shorter, is incorporated into an annual ringing festival which will be open to all ringers. Typically this will include speaker meetings, presentations covering the CRO's work and discussions on other subjects of general interest to ringers.</p>
<p>34.</p>	<p>Surely 'Council of Representatives' sounds akin to 'American' political terminology? Is there a better alternative?</p> <p>Although the new "Council of Representatives" will initially have a form similar to the existing Central Council meeting, its remit will be more specific as provided for under Proposal D. The term Council of Representatives is used as shorthand to indicate the position of the Council meeting once the necessary reforms to its governance and organisation are complete.</p> <p>The term "Council of Representatives" reflects the fact that it will initially consist of</p>

	<p>representatives from affiliated societies, as at present, and will not include individual members of the CRO unless or until this is judged appropriate as provided for under Proposal E.</p> <p>The detailed rule changes required to give effect to the Council of Representatives will be written by the group charged with drawing up the CRO's statutory rules, operating principles and procedures, provided for in Proposal F. This group may reach the conclusion that an alternative name is more appropriate.</p>
<p>35.</p> 	<p>As society representatives understand the concerns of ordinary ringers, would it be more democratic for the Council of Representatives to take the important management decisions at their annual meetings?</p> <p>Whilst the Council of Representatives would approve strategy, provide advice and hold the Executive to account, it is not suited to a day-to-day management role.</p> <p>Charity Commission guidance, encapsulated in its document CC10 "The Hallmarks of an Effective Charity", recommends that a charity's management is entrusted to a board of trustees or executive, which is expected to take effective and timely decisions with the best interests of the charity in mind. The legal responsibilities of trustees are wide-ranging and for this reason the Charity Commission also recommends training of trustees to ensure they understand their duties.</p> <p>While it may appear more 'democratic' to have detailed management decisions taken by Council representatives at their annual meeting, this form of organisation no longer meets modern governance standards for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ A council meeting only once a year is not well placed to make timely and effective management decisions. ➤ A council consisting of 50, 100 or 200 people is less cohesive than an executive and will be less likely to have deliberated on each matter presented to it to a level that ensures that its management decisions are made in a way that meets the Charity Commission's guidance.
<p>36.</p>	<p>How will the new Council of Representatives 'hold the Executive to account'?</p> <p>In all circumstances, and in line with all UK charities, the Executive of the CRO will be required to comply with UK law and the requirements of the Charity Commission.</p> <p>The Council of Representatives, who will elect the Executive, will also have the power to approve (or not) their annual report and accounts. In practice, the Executive will wish to keep all members of the CRO informed of their key activities and decisions and the direct membership channel will assist them in communicating effectively.</p> <p>The executive will operate within the framework of CRO's rules, operating principles and procedures. The CRO's accounts will continue to be assessed by an Independent Examiner or auditors and the requirement for the Executive to produce a Strategy and Action Plan will make it easier for members of the Council of Representatives to assess their performance.</p>

	<p>The Executive will be required to review the governance of the CRO each three years and submit proposals for any necessary improvements.</p> <p>In exceptional circumstances, as with the existing Central Council, the Council of Representatives will be empowered to amend the CRO's constitution to give effect to any additional controls or scrutiny, but the experience of most UK charities indicates that the policies and controls referred to above are more than sufficient to ensure good governance.</p>
G. Individual Membership	
<p>37.</p> 	<p>Do these proposals affect the representation of my association or society?</p> <p>Our proposals do not propose any specific changes to society representation, although we do recommend that the CRO considers the feasibility of reducing the number of representatives, in the context of making its annual meetings shorter and more effective, with a view to making any agreed changes in time for the election of representatives to take office in 2020.</p> <p>We also recommend that, as a matter of good practice, the Executive undertakes a review of the CRO's rules and governance each three years commencing 2019, including an assessment as to whether it would be appropriate to transfer some or all of the powers of the society representatives (who will comprise the Council of Representatives) to individual direct members. This is provided in Proposal D iii)</p>
<p>38.</p> 	<p>If new 'direct' members want to change something, do they have to find a Council of Representatives member to promote their idea? What if they are not members of a represented organisation?</p> <p>Under the reformed organisation, any individual with energy and good ideas will be able to apply to join a Workgroup, become a Workgroup Leader or a member of the Executive as none of these roles will in future be restricted to members of the Council of Representatives.</p> <p>This contrasts with the current position where officers and members of committees must be members of the Central Council (although additional 'consultants' are permitted).</p> <p>The new direct membership facility provided under Proposal E will enable any ringer to influence the CRO and to benefit from its services, regardless of whether they belong to another ringing society or not.</p> <p>As a result, it can be expected that the new Executive will become far less remote than the Council's officers have historically been perceived.</p> <p>These changes should mean that an individual ringer, regardless of whether they are a member of an established ringing association, would be able to play a much greater role in the affairs of the CRO than is currently the case.</p>

39.	<p>What is meant by a ‘direct communication link’ with individual ringers?</p> <p>Direct communication links will typically involve communication direct with individual members or supporters, who will have provided the necessary consents under Data Protection legislation to receive communications from the CRO, either through their existing societies or by registering on the CRO’s website.</p> <p>The main purpose of a direct communications link will be to ensure that the CRO is able to communicate conveniently and quickly with individual ringers, rather than through the layers of society, branch and tower secretaries on which the Council currently relies.</p> <p>Appendix L to the Main Report (“Potential Services Offered by the CRO”) provides a number of suggestions, based on CRAG’s research of equivalent charities, as to various communications channels that may be developed.</p>
40.	<p>Who will be eligible to join the CRO through an individual or direct membership?</p> <p>The Executive in line with Proposal E will develop the precise plans and format by which membership of the CRO will be made available to all ringers. It is likely that the Executive will in practice wish to offer membership or a category of membership not only to ringers, but also to any individual or organisation that wishes to support ringing.</p>
41.	<p>Will the new individual members immediately become members of the Council of Representatives?</p> <p>Is it true that societies will no longer have any say in proceedings?</p> <p>The precise plans under which membership of the CRO will be made available to individuals will be developed by the Executive under Proposal E, under which the Executive will also assess each three years whether it would be appropriate to transfer some or all of the powers of the Council of Representatives to individual direct members.</p> <p>Until or unless this occurs, individual members will not automatically become members of the Council of Representatives and the Executive will be likely to use other methods to ensure that their voice is heard.</p> <p>The full development of a direct membership organisation will require significant research, planning and consultation to ensure that it:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ offers services that will be attractive and valuable to its members ➤ is financially sustainable ➤ complements the services currently available from other societies; ➤ retains those positive features of the current Central Council ➤ has the right balance of governance between society and individual membership. <p>In the meantime, even if the Council of Representatives becomes smaller the CRAG proposals mean that there will still be representation from each affiliated society.</p>

42.	<p>What will the typical membership fee be for an individual?</p> <p>Assuming that the membership fee is around that of the National Trust, say £60-70, how many ringers would have to sign up if a realistic income is to be generated?</p> <p>It should be noted that our research of charities of a similar size to the Central Council indicates that they all benefit from a mix of income streams, of which membership subscriptions are only one (and in some cases a small) part. Our analysis indicates that comparable charities offer individual memberships at fees ranging between of between £15 and £100 depending on the value that they provide to their members.</p> <p>In the case of the CRO, subscription rates for individuals can be expected to climb gradually from a low level as the membership offer becomes richer and more refined. There could also be different levels of membership – with different benefits and different subscriptions.</p> <p>At a membership fee of £15, a membership base of 5,000 would yield an annual revenue stream of £75,000. At a membership fee of £25, a membership base of 10,000 would yield an annual revenue stream of £250,000.</p>
43.	<p>What would the typical membership benefits be? Why should I consider joining as an individual member?</p> <p>The precise membership offer to individual members will be developed over time by the Executive. It is likely that they will wish to offer different levels of membership – with different benefits and different subscriptions – whilst also providing a form of membership to individuals and organisations who would like to support ringing.</p> <p>A key aim of CRAG’s proposals is to see the CRO to achieve its mission of being the strategic leader and public voice of the ringing community. Central to this ambition is that it is seen to be in better contact with and more accountable to ringers in general.</p> <p>We do not expect all ringers to become individual members, but our survey revealed that a significant proportion of ringers would pay some form of membership fee in return for a service offering directed at them. A detailed analysis of the services that are likely to form part of the CRO’s future membership offer is provided in Appendix L.</p> <p>Our research of a number of equivalent charities indicates that they have built a compelling range of services for their individual members and in a number of instances these bear many similarities with the services already provided or contemplated by the Central Council. This research is summarised in Appendix D.</p>
44.	<p>For UK members, could the basic membership fee be gift-aided, boosting it by 25% for all tax payers?</p> <p>HMRC’s current guidance is that membership subscriptions may qualify for Gift Aid, provided that (in the case of subscriptions of less than £100), the “value” of the membership benefits (excluding newsletters), is no more than 25% of the membership subscription.</p>

	<p>There are various rules that enable the “value” of membership benefits to be determined. It is therefore possible for membership subscriptions to qualify for Gift Aid, depending on the nature of the membership benefits received. Regular reviews would be necessary to confirm that the value of the benefits offered remained below the 25% threshold.</p>
<p>45.</p>	<p>If the CRO develops “direct communication links with individual ringers” what does this mean about the future of territorial societies such as the one that I belong to?</p> <p>What are the implications for existing affiliated guilds and societies?</p> <p>Assessment of the health of the territorial and other ringing societies fell outside the CRAG terms of reference, although feedback during the various CRAG consultations made clear that there is considerable variability in the strength of the different societies and the level of support which they provide for individual ringers.</p> <p>Although consideration of the structure of societies fell outside its remit, CRAG nevertheless made the following assumptions in formulating its proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ that existing societies would continue to exist in one form or another for a considerable time and that new societies may well be formed. ➤ that the CRO would as far as possible wish to promote a healthy ringing environment in which societies flourished. ➤ that nothing in its recommendations should therefore lead to a risk or threat to the continued vibrancy of societies
<p>H. Professional Support, Revenue and Branding</p>	
<p>46.</p> 	<p>Will it be realistic for the new CRO to rely on trading income as, unlike cyclists or golfers, ringers do not need to purchase their own hardware or kit? This in turn limits both product sales and advertising revenue?</p> <p>Construction of a detailed financial forecast requires work over a sustained period, which falls outside CRAG’s remit and reporting deadlines.</p> <p>Nevertheless, our review of equivalent charities, indicates that they achieve funding through a mixture of membership subscriptions, the provision of services, grant aid and donations/legacies. We believe a key objective for the CRO should be the maintenance of a healthy mix of income sources, to avoid over-dependence on any specific income stream.</p> <p>Our review revealed relatively high levels of operating income even in charities dealing with performing arts, similar to bell ringing, which do not involve the purchase of hardware or kit. In the case of the National Federation of Music Societies (NFMS) for example, membership income is approximately £350,000 per annum, while operating income from sales and services amounts to approx. £250,000 per annum. NFMS employ 10 members of staff, with revenue of £62,000 per employee.</p> <p>In a number of instances the mixture of services offered by these organisations bears many similarities with the services already provided or contemplated by the Central</p>

	<p>Council. These are described in Appendix D. In Appendix J we have applied the funding model used by these organisations identify the potential sources of income available to the CRO.</p> <p>In these circumstances, our conclusion is that with appropriate leadership and a robust operating model it is realistic to expect the CRO to benefit from increasing levels of operating income over time.</p>
<p>47.</p> 	<p>Under Proposal I i) the new Executive will review the Central Council’s branding? Is this really necessary? What benefits will a costly new logo bring?</p> <p>One of our key recommendations involves the establishment of a direct relationship between the CRO and individual ringers and this in turn requires a re-assessment of the CRO’s branding to ensure that its communication with individual ringers, as opposed to society representatives, is as effective as possible.</p> <p>The work to the CRO’s brand provided for under Proposal I involves a more wide-ranging review than merely its logo. The CRO’s ‘brand’ in this context includes its reputation and any cultural and promotional changes that could assist it in communicating more effectively.</p> <p>It will require research among the public, ringers and other interested parties to ensure that the CRO adopts a style of communication at all levels which:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ is appropriate across the range of its activities and audiences ➤ upholds and promotes its values and mission ➤ avoids inappropriate or out-dated connotations <p>It should be noted that the Central Council’s ICT team, with Christopher O’Mahony’s support, has already completed an important redesign of its logo as part of the redevelopment of the Council’s website. This was achieved at virtually nil cost.</p> <p>Whilst the question of cost is a management decision which lies outside CRAG’s remit, the success achieved with the new website indicates that there is no certainty that any further work on the Council’s logo would involve significant expense.</p>
<p>48.</p>	<p>What numbers of professional staff are associated with other, similar charities?</p> <p>Our research included a review of a number of charities with similar objectives to those of the Central Council (see Appendix D in our full report). Of these:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ National Federation of Music Societies (<i>Making Music</i>) – 10 employees ➤ Royal College of Organists – 7 employees ➤ ECB ACO (Cricket umpires and scorers) – 7 employees ➤ Royal School of Church Music – 23 employees.

**49. What is meant by “new and diverse sources of income” and will these be sufficient to pay for professional support?
How are the proposed new measures to be funded?**

Construction of a detailed financial forecast requires work over a sustained period, which falls outside CRAG’s remit and reporting deadlines.

Nevertheless, we have performed a high-level review to confirm that the cost of implementing Proposals A through to I is sustainable given the potential sources of income available and taking into account the Council’s open reserves.

In the short-term, with the exception of the engagement of more professional support provided under Proposal G, the recommendations do not require a significant budget. In due course the reduction in the number of committees, the introduction of an Executive and a reduction in the number of Council representatives (if introduced) may reduce costs.

Our review of equivalent charities, including those referred to above, indicated that they achieve funding through a mixture of membership subscriptions, the provision of services, grant aid and donations/legacies.

In a number of instances the mixture of services offered by these organisations bears many similarities with the services already provided or contemplated by the Central Council. These are described in Appendix D. In Appendix J we have applied the funding model used by these organisations identify the potential sources of income available to the CRO.

In these circumstances, our conclusion is that with appropriate leadership a robust operating model can be established which will lead to the generation of sufficient operating income to provide an appropriate level of professional support over time.

I. Alternative Solutions

50. What alternative solutions have CRAG taken into account? Has CRAG ‘road tested’ its proposals by comparing them to similar organisations?



In formulating its proposals CRAG reviewed a sample of other UK charities, including those identified in Appendix D. It also conducted detailed governance reviews on six equivalent UK organisations, including:

- National Federation of Music Societies (Making Music)
- Royal College of Organists
- Royal School of Church Music
- Campaign for Real Ale
- Guide Association
- British Cycling Federation

The research included interviews with one Chief Executive and another Chief Operating Officer.

	<p>The conclusions from this research are that all six organisations employ a similar governance model, at whose core is a board of management comprising between 8 and 14 people. This approach is employed partly because it is the most effective method of organisation and partly because it complies with Charity Commission guidance.</p> <p>CRAG’s proposals therefore involve the adoption of this standard governance model to bring the CRO’s governance into line with current practice as exhibited by these organisations.</p>
<p>51.</p> 	<p>What alternative ways forward has CRAG taken into account? Is there a ‘Plan B’?</p> <p>During its deliberations, CRAG considered the implications of a number of alternative approaches, including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. “Do Nothing” – was considered insufficient to enable the Central Council to meet the expectations of societies and ringers because vital governance reforms cannot be achieved under the existing framework. 2. “Disband the Central Council and re-form” – was considered to involve too high a level of risk, together with the danger that many of the strengths of the existing Central Council would not be retained. 3. “Immediately replace society representatives with those chosen by individual members” - it was acknowledged that the development of a direct membership organisation would require significant research, planning and consultation. Therefore to ensure orderly and effective change, a series of reviews each three years is provided under Proposal E to assess whether it would be appropriate to transfer some or all of the powers of the Council of Representatives to individual, direct members. 4. “Reconstitute the technical committees to a similarly organised but separate ‘Technical Council’”. This would have the effect of removing some of the time consuming and technical aspects from the Central Council’s work, but would not deliver better efficiency to the Council and would set the new body up with the same inherent weaknesses. 5. Maintain a Central Ringing Organisation, protecting its existing strengths, but reform its decision-making capability, its ability to think strategically and its capacity to communicate with individual ringers” – this is CRAG’s recommendation. <p>The reforms recommended in our proposals, as with any other aspects of the Council’s organisation, are open to being changed at any time in the future. There are no proposals recommended for implementation in the next three years that are irreversible.</p> <p>The phasing in of changes over the next three years, or over a longer period, as provided under our proposals, will enable the benefits of each change to be assessed and further modifications made if necessary.</p>

J. Implementation

52.



What would be the impact on timings and process if there were to be a further consultation period with member associations and representatives?

It should be noted that the governance reforms proposed in our report relate to the internal organisation and effectiveness of the Central Council and do not involve changes to society representation (although we do recommend that the Executive considers the feasibility of reducing the number of representatives with a view to making any agreed changes in time for the 2020 intake).

In endorsing the principles of reform described in our report, representatives at the Edinburgh meeting will therefore be acting within their area of competence.

Should representatives endorse these reform principles, the phased approach proposed by CRAG allows for extensive consultation over a period of three years, and in some instances longer, giving representatives ample opportunity to assess (and if necessary improve upon) on the proposals made by CRAG:

- The first rule changes will not be proposed until **May 2018**, allowing for a lengthy consultation period with member associations and representatives.
- As a result of the feedback received during this period, there is no reason why the rule changes prepared for agreement at the May 2018 Council Meeting should not incorporate improvements to the detail of our proposals, provided that these do not affect the broad principles of reform on which the Council will have agreed.
- In the unlikely event that fundamental concerns over the direction of reform emerge during 2017/8, there also is no reason why Council representatives should not choose to implement an alternative reform programme at the May 2018 Council Meeting or to defer reform entirely (provided of course that alternatives are subject to appropriate consultation).
- The phasing in of our remaining recommendations will take place over the following two years, or over a longer period, once the initial governance reforms have been implemented. We would expect each proposed change to be preceded by extensive consultation.
- This phased approach enables the benefits of each change to be assessed and further modifications made if necessary.
- The reforms recommended in our report, as with any other aspects of the Council's organisation, are open to being changed at any time in the future. There are no proposals recommended for implementation in the next three years that are irreversible.

We believe that the phased approach provides the right balance between need to make genuine progress and the need to provide for consultation, and to respond where appropriate to feedback from members and societies.

Nevertheless, in the event that the Central Council meeting in May 2017 decides that a further period of up to six months is necessary to make a firm decision on the principles of reform contained in our report, this need not effect the timings or phasing of our proposals, provided that they are approved via an EGM or adjourned AGM within this

	<p>period. A delay beyond this would seriously risk deferring meaningful reform until the next triennium, which commences in 2023. Our assessment of the feedback we received is that this would be a most risky course of action for the Council.</p>
<p>53.</p> 	<p>Is it unrealistic to expect the new Executive to manage “business as usual” as well as implementing a large programme of change?</p> <p>Our proposals include four features which should ensure that the necessary reforms can be managed successfully alongside the Council’s “business as usual” work:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Proposals will be phased in over a 3-year (or sometimes longer) period, meaning that implementation will take place in an orderly manner. ➤ Additional capacity during this period will be provided by entrusting key tasks to subject matter experts, such as the drafting of necessary changes to rules and decisions that are provided for under proposals F and H. ➤ The Executive will have the opportunity to appoint up to 2 additional members where this is needed to provide the right balance of skills and expertise. ➤ The Executive will be supported by Workgroups and Workgroup Leaders. This may include specific “task and finish” Workgroups set-up to implement specific changes as provided under Proposal C v). A key effect of Proposal B will be to ensure that the new Workgroups are able to work more dynamically with the Executive and with each other, because responsibilities and relationships will be much more clear. This in turn will enable the Executive to take and implement decisions more effectively. <p>It should be noted that the Executive’s role is to manage the CRO’s affairs, but not to perform the majority of work itself, as this is delegated to the CRO’s various Workgroups and sub-groups.</p> <p>Overall, our conclusion is that with the right leadership and commitment there is no reason why the majority of changes recommended cannot be implemented over a 3-year period as recommended.</p>
<p>54.</p> 	<p>Will the members of the CRAG committee be responsible for implementing these proposals?</p> <p>No. The CRAG Committee were asked to consult and to report to the Central Council Meeting in May 2017 on improvements to modernise the Central Council’s organisation, as reflected in the motion agreed at the Central Council meeting in May 2016.</p> <p>Having delivered its report, the CRAG Committee’s engagement will end at the May 2017 Central Council meeting. In the event that its report is agreed, implementation of the report’s proposals will be the responsibility of the Central Council’s trustees, supported by its committees and the subject matter experts appointed to work on the Council’s rules and Decisions as provided for in Proposals F and H.</p> <p>Provided those leading the Central Council take ownership over the reform process and approach it with a sense of commitment there is no reason why the majority of changes recommended cannot be implemented over the 3-year period specified in our report.</p>

<p>55.</p> 	<p>Why has CRAG only given people four weeks to consider the future of the Central Council?</p> <p>We have been very open in seeking feedback on our proposals as we have developed them since the Council meeting in May 2016. There have been four articles in the Ringing World as well as numerous email updates sent out via the Council and affiliated societies. We have been as open and transparent with our thinking and emerging proposals as we could at all stages.</p> <p>The 28-day timetable is not CRAG's but follows strictly the Central Council's procedures for the submission of reports and proposals for its Annual Meeting. This involves the delivery of documents to the Council's officers in advance, so that they may be circulated to representatives in good time for the Annual Meeting and published in the Ringing World Supplement. The report was duly delivered to the officers according to these timescales.</p> <p>Our report was delivered as requested by the Central Council and consequently could not be released elsewhere until it was published to the Council's officers. However, as soon as it had been sent to Council members it was published onto the internet and widely publicised, including to all societies.</p> <p>It should be noted that our report deals only with the principles of reform, after which detailed work will be undertaken over the following three years (and in some cases longer). This work will involve ongoing consultation and the first rule changes will not be proposed until May 2018.</p>
<p>56.</p>	<p>How realistic and practical is it to adopt all the proposed measures at once?</p> <p>It should be emphasised that the current Central Council relies almost entirely on the support, good will and dedication of its volunteers. Any plan for change therefore needs to be realistic and not over-dependent on the efforts of a small number of people, many of whom already work hard on the Council's day-to-day activities.</p> <p>The proposals therefore provide a framework under which the necessary changes will be phased in over a 3-year (and in some instances possibly longer) period.</p> <p>The phased implementation which is proposed concentrates first on those enabling changes which will permit the Council to undertake reform of itself more effectively.</p> <p>Critically, these include essential measures to strengthen its decision-making capability, through the establishment of an Executive under Proposal B, permitting it to take and implement decisions more quickly.</p> <p>Additional capacity is provided by enlarging the Executive (compared with the current officer team) and entrusting key tasks to subject matter experts, such as the drafting of necessary changes to rules and decisions that are provided for under proposals F and H.</p> <p>The remaining changes will be phased in subsequently, but are dependent on the reform of the Council's core governance as set out above.</p> <p>Overall, our conclusion is that with the right leadership and commitment there is no reason why the majority of changes recommended cannot be implemented over a 3-year period. Indeed to spend longer over implementation would create a sense of change fatigue and get in the way of providing the leadership that ringing needs.</p>

<p>57.</p> 	<p>Is it realistic to make the proposed changes in 2017? Will every ringer have the chance to make their views known to their CC representative?</p> <p>The Council is being asked to approve the principles of reform at this year's Council meeting in Edinburgh, after which detailed work will be undertaken over the following three years (and in some cases longer). There will be on-going consultation.</p> <p>The first rule changes will not be proposed until May 2018. This allows appropriate time for consultation and reflects the fact that the Council's officers also need to devote time to its 'business as usual' activities.</p> <p>The phased implementation which is proposed concentrates first on those enabling rule changes, which will permit the Council to undertake reform of itself more effectively. Critically, these include essential measures to strengthen its decision-making capability, through the establishment of an Executive, the realignment of existing committees and improvements to the conduct of the Council's annual meeting under Proposals B, C and D.</p> <p>Our review of the Council's existing rules, which are relatively short, indicates that the 12-month period specified in Proposal F allows sufficient time for this process to take place in an orderly and transparent fashion. We would expect any further rule changes required after May 2018 to follow a similar and thorough consultation process.</p>
<p>58.</p> 	<p>Will the rule changes presented in May 2018 require a two-thirds majority in line with the Council's existing rules?</p> <p>Yes. The Council's existing rules require that any rule changes submitted to the May 2018 Council Meeting are approved by a majority of no less than two thirds of those present.</p> <p>The requirement for a two-thirds majority to approve rule or constitutional changes is common to many organisations and appears in the governing documents of a number of the bodies that CRAG has researched, including the Guide Association, Royal College of Organists, Ramblers Association and British Cycling Federation.</p>
<p>59.</p>	<p>What specific rule changes are required to achieve the implementation of these proposals?</p> <p>The task of writing the necessary changes to the Council's rules requires detailed work over a sustained period, which falls outside CRAG's remit and reporting deadlines. For this reason, the detailed rule changes will be written by a group charged with drawing up the CRO's statutory rules, operating principles and procedures, provided for in Proposal F. Our review of the Council's existing rules, which are relatively short, indicates that the 12-month period specified in Proposal F allows sufficient time for the necessary wording to be drafted.</p>

60.



The proposals indicate that some steps, including appointments to some roles, will take place *before May 2018*. Is this realistic given that the rule changes that will create these roles will not be presented for approval until the 2018 annual meeting?

To ensure that Crag's proposals are implemented in a way which is consistent with the Central Council's current rules, a 12-month period is provided to enable the initial rule changes to be devised and consulted upon before their eventual presentation for approval by the May 2018 Council Meeting, as set out under Proposal F.

Once the initial rule changes have been agreed in May 2018, it is important that those who are charged with taking forward the CRO's work are fully prepared, clear about their objectives and ready to move forward as a team. It will also be beneficial if those tasks that do not require rule changes are initiated as early as possible. An unnecessarily long change programme would hinder the Council by creating a sense of "change fatigue" which would impede it in achieving much needed improvements.

To place the CRO in a position of readiness our proposals therefore set out a number of tasks that can be commenced ahead of May 2018. These preliminary tasks can be summarised as follows:

- Work on projects already being undertaken by the Central Council, or which can be completed without rule changes, including:
 - Development of a five-year strategy and action plan under Proposal A)
 - Development of direct communications links with individual ringers, allowing direct membership of the CRO to be available, under Proposal E)
 - Consideration of the CRO's future branding, the triennial cycle and the organisation of its annual meetings, under Proposal I)
- Appointments to a number of the key roles that will be enshrined in the rules after May 2018, enabling those involved to work closely alongside existing officers and committees. These appointments include additional members of the CRO Executive (as provided for under Proposal B) and Workgroup appointments (as provided under Proposal C)).

Whilst those appointed to these 'shadow' roles will have no formal powers prior to May 2018, our conclusion is that with the right leadership there is no reason why they should not receive the full co-operation and support of the Council's existing committees and officers.

These measures will ensure that any rule changes agreed at the May 2018 meeting are implemented in a smooth and orderly fashion and that the majority of those appointed in May 2018 are fully prepared for their new roles.

61.

Is it realistic to pick and choose which proposals to adopt?

The various proposals, covering the areas of governance, accountability, communication and professional support have been carefully designed to work together as a cohesive whole. Proposal B without C for example, would result in an Executive built to modernise the Council, but without sufficient empowerment. Implementation of these proposals without Proposal E would create a CRO more capable of serving the needs of individual ringers, but denied effective methods of communicating with them.

That is why Proposals A-F are grouped together as a single Motion. We do not consider that it is possible to properly implement any one without the rest. They are inter-

	dependent.
62.	<p>If we approve these proposals, does that mean we are writing a ‘blank cheque’ and that the detailed rule changes will be implemented without further consultation?</p> <p>It was not within CRAG’s remit or timeframe to give a final, detailed view of every aspect of the future CRO. Our proposals indicate the principles of reform necessary to create an organisation fit for the future. The detailed work to produce supporting rule changes is provided for under Proposal F.</p> <p>We would expect the group charged with this task to follow our example of open consultation and regular progress reports, allowing ample opportunity for feedback on these important details.</p> <p>The output of this group, in the form of the necessary rule changes, will be presented first for the approval of the new Executive and then to the annual meeting in 2018 for the approval of representatives.</p>
63.	<p>Once set in motion by the 2017 Council Meeting, do CRAG’s proposals become inevitable in every detail? From this point can they be stopped, improved upon, or even reversed?</p> <p> It was not within CRAG’s remit or timeframe to give a final, detailed view of every aspect of the future CRO. Our proposals indicate the principles of reform necessary to create an organisation fit for the future. We have endeavoured to consider every eventuality, but there are various areas where more detailed work is required.</p> <p><u>From May 2017</u></p> <p>In approving the CRAG report as proposed at the May 2017 Council Meeting, representatives will be endorsing the principles of reform described in the CRAG report.</p> <p>The task of writing the rule changes necessary to implement these principles will be assigned to a group charged with drawing up the CRO’s statutory rules, operating principles and procedures, as provided for in Proposal F. We would expect this group to follow our example of open consultation and regular progress reporting.</p> <p>As a result of this feedback, there is no reason why the final rule changes submitted by this group to the May 2018 Council Meeting should not incorporate additions or amendments to the detail of our proposals, provided that these do not affect the broad principles of reform on which the Council will have agreed.</p> <p><u>After May 2018</u></p> <p>Assuming that the rule changes necessary to give effect to the new CRO are approved at the May 2018 Council Meeting, the resulting rules will become the governing document of the CRO. As with all governing documents, the new rules will provide a mechanism by which future changes may be effected.</p>