

BMC National Council	7 December 2019
Item 7.2.1	Competition Working Group Report

ODG Comments on: Report of the Competition Working Group v5

Summary

The ODG reviewed the “Report of the Competition Working Group v5” on 20th Nov. The ODG supported the paper but they believe that in order to ensure delivery the Board must specifically consider and address the following:

1. Setting up an Internal Department for Competition Climbing is not a soft option and the Board must to give that department the remit and authority to work autonomously.
2. To ensure effective evaluations of the Internal Department for Competition Climbing the reviews need to be a joint between PMG and the Board as equal stakeholders.

The ODG noted that they would like to see clearer deadlines and processes for review. The ODG would suggest evaluations should be carried out on a minimum of a 6 monthly basis and with a full formal review 2 years after the department is implemented. The evaluation reviews need to be formally programmed into the calendar of the Board at fixed and specific dates.

Further assuming the staged approach, or option 1, is agreed by the Board then this should be implemented immediately, and PR strategy developed. The PR strategy should be actioned to coincide with the any agreement on the future plan in order that we minimize any back-lash of moving away from ORG recommendation that our members supported.

Document Approval

Name	Role	Date
Rab Carrington – Workstream Lead	Approver	20/11/19
Fiona Saunders – ODG Chair	Approver	21/11/19

Change Record

Changes	By	Date
Initial Draft	Andy Syme	20/11/19
Final Version	Andy Syme and Fiona Sanders	21/11/19

Date Issued: 20/11/19

Author: Andy Syme and Fiona Sanders

Report of the Competition Working Group

Index

Appendix A	Option 1 Internal Department	Pg8
Appendix B	Option 3 Joint Subsidiary	Pg10
Appendix C	Personnel of Working Group	Pg13
Appendix D	Organisations; who are our Partners	Pg14
Appendix E	Evidence; who were consulted	Pg15
Appendix F	Minutes of the Final Meeting	Pg18
Appendix G	Remit of the Working Group	Pg24

The work of this group is a direct result of ORG's R24:

In ORG's Report of November 2017, R24 stated: *"The BMC should consider a clearly defined sub-group, or creation of a separate governing body subsidiary within the BMC for the purposes of managing competitive activities and to support elite level competitive activities such as Team GB"*

In its Amended Report of March 2018, R24 is amended to state: *"The BMC should create a joint subsidiary for competitive activities in partnership with Mountaineering Scotland and other relevant home nation governing bodies for the purposes of managing competitive activities and to support elite level competitive activities such as Team GB"*

Rather than just reading the above paragraphs it is important to read the commentary which goes along with R24. This commentary can be found on p46 November 2017 Report and p26 March 2018 report.

Twelve months ago, I was asked by Dave Turnbull if I would Chair such a Review. I agreed and produced the remit for the work of the group which was accepted by the BMC Board.

Competition Working Groups Unanimous Decisions

Very early on in our discussions certain conclusions were reached which were not opposed by anybody in the Working Group. Those initial conclusions were shared with the BMC BoD in a paper presented to them on 22nd July 2019. Below in Italics is a segment of that report.

1. *Aims and Requirements of the Competition Sector*

* ***Aim:*** *Achieve podium gold in International Events, including the Olympics*

* ***Requires:***

- 1. World class team of coaches to train our athletes*
- 2. World class development programme to allow competitors to achieve their full potential*
- 3. Facilities to Competition standards for athletes to train*
- 4. Ability to host International Events*

* ***Needs:*** *A governance which is focussed on every aspect required to achieve the above.*

* **Partners:** IFSC, UIAA, ISMF, Volunteers, Route Setters, ABC and Facility Owners, Athletes, Coaches and MTUK, Sport England, UK Sport, BOA, EIS, ABCTT, Mountaineering Scotland & Mountaineering Ireland.

2. **Current Competition Sector**

This working group agreed that , though the current competition staff are doing a great job, the rising costs and demands on the system coupled with the finances available mean athletes are not achieving their full potential. So change is necessary.

3. **Financial Considerations**

*The group appreciates the money that the BMC has made available from membership fees (£150k net) and recognises that the members have been generous in allowing this. However, the required competition programme needs more money for it to run more effectively. We appreciate that this cannot come from the members subscriptions and so this group should have ring fenced finances and the ability to raise its own funds through commercial sponsorship or other methods. **Since this was reported to the Board, using figures from the BMC's year end figures 2017, there is the possibility that those figures should be revised upwards by potentially £80k. This figure has been put forward by Dave T. The variation is not due to an error in the BMC's accounting more a case of underestimating Staff time involved in Competition.***

4. **Social Media and Website**

In order to attract sponsorship, the Competition sector will need to have a full suite of social media dedicated to Competition. This will be a necessity in order to attract potential sponsors. Not only will this need to be put in place, it will also have to be serviced and kept current with news and information that is pushed out continuously and effectively through the various social media channels.

5. **Sub Branding for Competition**

To go alongside the Social Media, there would need to be a sub branding of Competitions in order to attract sponsorship (not having 4 & 5 greatly reduces the ability to raise funds) and hopefully become self funding. This sub branding exercise has been carried out very successfully by MS with its Climb Scotland identity.

6. **Involvement and Co-operation with Partners**

It was highlighted at our most recent meeting that there was a need for closer cooperation with all of our partners. After all, we are all trying to achieve the same goals. We need to work closely with all interested parties.

Though it wasn't mentioned in the interim report to the BMC BoD there was a strong feeling from the WG that there was a very important need for the "new" brand and the "new" governance to be sold to everyone; the athletes, our partners, the climbing walls, the volunteers and parents, coaches, in fact all who have been involved in Competition climbing.

Non-Unanimous Decisions

Having come to the decisions above, it was time to look at the trickier problem of which form of Governance would produce the best results for all concerned; the BMC, the Athletes, the Partners including ABC, MS, MI, Sport England and UK Sport.

The forms of Governance that were discussed were:-

- **Internal Department within the BMC**
- **Subsidiary with the BMC being the sole member**
- **Joint Subsidiary with 3 equal members; the BMC, MS and ABC**

How option 1 and Option 3 may operate, please see the Appendices. Option 2 would be as Option 3 but with the proviso that the sole member would be the BMC.

Discussion of this matter was very divided but none-the-less very cordial and points of view were expressed and received very well.

In order to evaluate the value of each option, I will try and outline the Pro's and Con's for each Option.

Option 1; Internal Department within the BMC

Pro's

- Speed of transfer from status quo to new Department would mean that the new structure would be in place before the 2020-24 Olympic cycle
- Ability to make use of existing BMC infrastructure
- Though an Internal Department, there will be substantial start up costs but less than setting up a subsidiary
- As long as BMC Articles and the BoD allow the structure (as outlined in the Appendix A) a Department should be able to deliver all of the changes necessary.
- Acceptable to both Sport England and UK Sport
- BMC retains control of competition climbing

Con's

- With Competition being part of the BMC, it is possible that Partners and Athletes fail to notice the changes made. With that in mind, it is important that a sound PR job is done to counteract this.
- The new Department is very unlikely to receive any additional funding from ABC or MS
- All financial and legal responsibility for the Department would remain with the BMC BoD.
- All reputational responsibility due to the Departments actions would rest squarely with the BMC.

Option 2; Subsidiary with BMC the Sole Member

Pro's

- Financial and legal responsibility rest with the new BoD of the Subsidiary
- Reputational damage rests with the subsidiary
- It is likely, but not guaranteed, that SE and UKS would look favourably on this structure.

Con's

- Would the BMC bale out the subsidiary in event of a financial failure?
- Does this have any advantage over Option 1
- The new Department is very unlikely to receive any additional funding from ABC or MS
- Partners may not see this as proper change
- More expensive to set up than Option 1 and with a longer time scale

Option 3; Joint Subsidiary with members: BMC, MS, ABC

Pro's

- This would herald a new start for Competition climbing and as such would be better positioned to gain support of Partners and Athletes
- Would benefit from potential extra budgets from ABC and MS (ABC may be able to contribute some £85k+)
- Financial and legal responsibility rest with the BoD of the Joint Subsidiary
- With this new venture, extra energy may go into the new subsidiary

Con's

- Though costings are not precise, this could be more expensive to set up
- There could be difficulty in transferring staff from the BMC to the joint Subsidiary
- It would be more complicated utilising existing BMC infrastructure.
- Sport England and UK Sport may not accept this arrangement

During our discussions on which Option would produce the best results for Competition, it was suggested that a staged approach to Governance might be worth considering. This staged approach would look something like this:-

Staged Approach

- Start off by implementing Option 1, the Internal Department.
- Establish a set of measurement criteria with timescales attached so that success or failure can be measured.
- After a period of time, say 2 or 3 years, PMG should measure the success of the Internal Department against those criteria.
- If those standards are not met, then PMG request from the BMC BoD that Competition moves on to Option 3

This Staged Approach was discussed for some time during our meetings and the positives and negatives were fully discussed.

Pro's

- The move to an Internal Department could be achieved fairly swiftly with no break in the work of Competition.
- Sport England/UK Sport would be willing to accept this initial outcome; by following the success/failure of this step they would be more understanding of the situation should a move to Option 3 occur
- Having measurement criteria in place with a timescale is good practice
- Should Option 1 fail in reaching targets, there will be history of what doesn't work when setting up Option 3

Con's

- Should Competition fail as Option 1 and move on to Option 3 this would involve extra expense of the two set up costs.
- It is unlikely that under the first stage, that funds could be budgeted from ABC or MS
- In the first stage, all liabilities (financial, legal and reputation) remains with the BMC BoD

Extracted Comments from the Competition Working Party's meeting of 31st October

Extracted comments showing each person's position on which Option is preferred:

ID - I feel [the best option] is an internal department, because the costs of a joint venture are considerable, and that money can be spent on improving things for the athletes straight away.

ID- I would strongly second [the comments] about a performance review in the future [for an internal department]

ID – I'd say that a future review would only be valuable if a well constructed business plan was produced for the department. The Board can then be very comfortable in their analysis of the performance against the plan. This can be done relatively quickly, then it might be that we go to a wholly owned subsidiary

FN – The ABC position is that we would prefer to be working in a jointly owned organisation alongside BMC, MS, MI etc.

FN-The internal department feels like status quo by another name. If we did move down the route of an internal department, we would want to put in checks and balances with performance measures that trigger a further review.

SY - We have a preferred option, an internal department, but there are big caveats that it has to [have the autonomy and flexibility to make decisions and work in collaboration with partners. As with any proposed change this should](#) be done with the best interest of the sport, rather than [to address a political](#) issue that part of the BMC membership have.

SY- I agree with FN that even if we vote for an internal department we have to have strong checks and balances in place [and an opportunity to review progress should be built in. If it fails to deliver the ambitions of the partner organisations then an external body should be considered.](#) [\(the passage in blue was added by SY, the phrases do not feature in the minutes, however, they were not verbatim. This addition is perfectly acceptable to me. RC\)](#)

SY – I've shared a lot of how Climb Scotland works for us and it is a great example of how an internal department can work. It can work, as long as there is a willingness to work together.

MG - I would personally want to see a joint venture.

MG- I think the subsidiary gives the greater potential for increased funding in the long term, but not necessarily in the short and medium term.

NC – I see the internal department as by far the strongest option. We need to look at how much autonomy can be given through a Performance Management Group, also whether any of these other sources of funding can be leveraged with an internal department.

NC-We have the talent development hubs and the cascade training for coaches, which gives a new revenue stream. We also need to see the impact of the Olympics before going for a wholesale change, so I would say internal department with a future review

RF-There are constraints around how quickly we can make decision in the BMC and I don't see that we can come around that sufficiently with delegated authority. My preference would be for a joint venture with MS, ABC, MI, maybe MT. However I have a concern that the government funding would not go to a separate body owned by these entities.

RF-. I'm not comfortable with either of the options and so on balance go towards a wholly owned subsidiary.

RF – I still come to the wholly owned subsidiary which strikes the best compromise of autonomy and speed of decision making, without incurring the higher costs of a joint venture.

RF- I came into this thinking that I was going to prefer the joint venture option. I think that competition climbing can't happen without the walls, so they need a voice in this. But the practicalities of setting that up would take away resources from the climbers.

RF – It is worth reflecting back on the internal department. Everyone is saying it needs to be ringfenced, have it's own budget, own business plan – this sounds very much like a separate company.

E Mailed Comments for those not Present at the Final Meeting:

Colin Knowles:

Having carefully considered today's minutes (Thanks to Dave) I consider the best medium-term option is to go with Wholly Owned Subsidiary. However I think the composition of the Board and the voting rights need to be looked at carefully to ensure the right balance.

Damien O'Sullivan (MI)

Mountaineering Ireland's preference would be for an internal department.

Jamie Smith is on Paternity leave at present. SY stated, though not minuted, that Jamie would vote in line with MS. Jamie would vote for a Department with the provisos mentioned by SY

Zoe Spriggins (BMC)

"My vote goes towards an internal department"

Conclusion

Looking back over the comments and preferences listed above we can see that the working group's preferences were 6 in favour of a Department (Option 1) and 4 were in favour of a Subsidiary Options 2 &3). This is not a clear cut decision as many of the reasons for opting for 2 &3 were recognised by all to be very valid.

However, as we recommend Option 1, we have to be very clear that the **Staged Approach** was very much supported across the board.

It needs to be noted that 5 out of the 6 who voted for Option 1 are employees of the HNB's.

We also have to note that by choosing Option 1, this would be at odds with the recommendation proposed by ORG R24 from March 2018, though in line with November 2017

Therefore as Chair of this Competition Working Group, my recommendation is:

- The BMC should set up an Internal Department for Competition Climbing as described in Appendix A
- That if the BMC BoD cannot accept the points raised as Delegated Authority then the vision of the Internal Department could be diluted and as such it may be preferable to set up a Joint Subsidiary along with ABC and MS
- That in setting up the Internal Department there needs to be a Strategy and Business Plan. Attached to that there need to be measurement criteria with timescales.
- Annually, progress/success of the Internal Department should be evaluated using this criteria.
- Should the Internal Department fail to meet its targets and the Performance Management Group feels that better results could come from being a Joint Subsidiary, then the BMC BoD should put in motion a plan to move from Internal Department to Joint Subsidiary.

Please bear in mind that setting up an Internal Department is NOT a soft option. There is so much work to be done for Competition within the BMC

- Regain the confidence of all of its athletes
- Work alongside our partners, ABC, MT, MS, MI, coaches etc to come up with a common goal and a plan to achieve that goal
- Liaise with Sport England and UK Sport to ensure that Talent Pathways are supported, Olympic athletes are funded and the best facilities are put in place.
- Work with all Climbing Walls to ensure that low level competitions are well supported, so that the grassroots will flourish from which we can ensure SE funding which is vital to success.
- Put in place a process for seeking extra sponsorship so that less funding falls on the shoulders of BMC members and our athletes ,volunteers, and parents

In putting together this report, I have had to balance " how much information is given" against " how much information can be absorbed ". For those who feel that they have been short changed on information, then I am very happy to open the full contents of Teamwork CWG for their perusal.

I wish the Board all the best in their task to determine the future outcome of Competition Climbing in Great Britain.

Thank you,

Rab Carrington
4th November 2019.

Appendix A : Option 1, Internal Department

Whether this sort of arrangement is acceptable under the current Articles would need to be checked

Purpose of the Internal Department

- Development of all Competition Climbing in England and Wales (Lead, Boulder, Speed, Paraclimbing, Ice Climbing, Ski Mountaineering), recognising that MS is the NGB for Climbing in Scotland, and working jointly with MS and MI for IFSC and Olympic competitions.
- Work with MS and MI to ensure there is a clear pathway from grassroots to Team GB
- Preparing and implementing policies, procedures and registrations for GB Teams including selection policies
- Organising and promoting British Climbing Competitions
- Supporting International Competitions and relevant bodies
- Supporting and developing the Olympic Programme
- Preparing a strategic plan for the development of all Competition Climbing with goals and milestones
- Managing the finances of the Internal Department in collaboration with the BMC Financial Controller
- Raising funds through government grants, commercial sponsorship or other means to add to the budget available to Competition Climbing.
- To promote Competition Climbing, disseminate information to athletes and the public through social media channels
- To ensure that Competition Climbing operates in accordance with all relevant GDPR, anti-doping and safeguarding policies and procedures within England and Wales and work closely with MS and MI on these matters
- Assist the other departments of the BMC in preparing bids for Governmental funding as the NGB for Competition Climbing in England and Wales.

Structure of the Internal Department

Performance Management Group

The Performance Management Group would replace the current Competition Committee

- The PMG would manage and direct the affairs of Competition Climbing within the BMC
- The PMG's members would be:
 - (a) Chair who may be external or employee but with clear selection policy
 - (b) Representative from Mountaineering Scotland (MI (Belfast Agreement))
 - (c) Representative from the BMC BoD
 - (d) Representative of ABC
 - (e) Competition Programme Manager (BMC salaried staff)
 - (f) Independent with Financial/Business/Marketing skills
 - (g) Representative from Athlete with clear selection policy
 - (h) UK Sport representative ?

Governance

- Reporting; PMG would report to the BMC BoD through the Chair
- Voting & Quorum; would be in line with current BMC procedures. Which means that each person on the PMG has a vote. The Chair would have the casting vote if necessary.
- Agenda and Supporting Papers: would be in line with current BMC procedures

- Minutes and Meetings;
 - (a) Minutes would be in line with current BMC procedures
 - (b) Meetings, the number and location of meeting will be decided by PMG but should be no fewer than quarterly

Functions

- The PMG will ensure that the aims of Competition Climbing are being achieved (as set out in the purposes above)
- The PMG will ensure that Competition Climbing works within its budgets. Quarterly reviews will take place between PMG and the BMC Financial Controller / Finance and Audit Committee
- The PMG will, either through its own endeavours or by appointing a third party seek external funding for the promotion of Competition Climbing.
- The PMG will ensure that the criteria for which grants or sponsorship are received are fully met.
- The PMG will annually submit a work plan for the forthcoming year so that the BMC can agree the budgets
- The PMG will ensure, through consultation with all partners, that there is a coherent forward plan for Competition Climbing so that it can achieve its aims
- The PMG will liaise with and update all partners, and report back to the BMC BoD
- The PMG will carry out bi annual reviews of its practices.

Delegated Authority

The PMG will have delegated authority from the BMC BoD :

- To operate its own finances within the budget set by the BMC plus any other funds raised on behalf of Competition Climbing
- Any long term financial planning (projects which will be outwith the current budgets) need to have BMC approval.
- To negotiate funding through Commercial opportunities.
- To ensure that the purposes of Competition Climbing are executed
- To develop future strategies for the development of Competition Climbing

Appendix B : Option 3 Joint Subsidiary

Identity of Parties Involved

- The BMC - the representative body for Mountaineering, Hillwalking and Climbing and the recognised NGB for Competition Climbing in England and Wales. Representing Competition Climbing for Great Britain at International and Olympic levels through IFSC and IOC.
- Association of British Climbing Walls (ABC) - the representative body for climbing Wall owners. Approx 65% of British Climbing Walls are members.
- Mountaineering Scotland - the Scottish equivalent to the BMC and is the representative body for Mountaineering, Hill walking and Climbing in Scotland. MS is the NGB for Indoor Climbing and Competition Climbing in Scotland.

Business of the Joint Venture

- Development of all Competition Climbing in Britain (Lead, Boulder, Speed, Paraclimbing, Ice Climbing, Ski Mountaineering)
- Development of Training Programmes, Talent Pathways in conjunction with Coaches
- Preparing and implementing policies, procedures and registrations for GB Teams
- Organising and promoting British Climbing Competitions
- Supporting International Competitions and relevant bodies
- Supporting and developing the Olympic Programme
- Preparing a strategic plan for the development of all Competition Climbing with goals and milestones
- Managing the finances of Competition Climbing especially from budgets supplied by the interested parties named above
- Raising funds through grants, commercial sponsorship or other means to add to the budget available to Competition Climbing.
- To promote Competition Climbing, disseminate information to athletes and the public through social media channels
- To ensure that Competition Climbing operates in accordance with all relevant anti-doping and safeguarding policies and procedures
- Recognise that the BMC is the NGB for Competition Climbing for England & Wales and that MS is the NGB for Scotland and therefore work closely with them to prepare bids for Governmental funding

Structure of the joint venture

- It is likely that a new company will be created. However, I believe that the BMC does already own a shell company which may or may not be of value in this case.
- The company would be a company limited by guarantee

Financing of the joint venture

- In 2017, the gross expenditure on Competition Climbing was £220k of which contributions by BMC members through subscriptions was £143k. **(This figure may have to be revised upwards by some £80k in light of comments made by DaveT)**
- £220k is not sufficient funds to carry out the Climbing Competition programme effectively. £500k would be a more realistic sum which would allow athletes to compete internationally and receive subsidised travel and lodging. It would also allow Coaches to travel to these International Competitions as support for the athletes.

- In order to finance this the BMC should contribute an annual budget to the joint venture in the region of £150k. Likewise, the other parties should contribute an annual budget commensurate with their involvement and ability to pay.
- The extra funding required would have to be obtained from commercial sponsorship deals or other funding grants.
- As a separate company, the joint venture must live within the budgets contributed or go bankrupt.

Board of Directors

- The Board Directors would be:
 - Chair
 - Representative from Mountaineering Scotland
 - Representative from the BMC BoD
 - Representative of ABC
 - Competition Programme Manager (BMC salaried staff)
 - Independent Director with Financial/Business/Marketing skills
 - Representative from Athlete
- Quorum, notice requirements, papers distribution and minute taking will be based on the practices of the 2/3 parties involved.
- Voting; each member of the Board will have a single vote. The Chair will have the deciding vote.
- On financial matters, each member of the Board must have prior knowledge of the agenda item through prepared papers and be given the opportunity to vote on the item either by proxy or electronically. This means that any financial decision has to be made with the full knowledge and support of all Directors of the Board.
- There will be matters reserved, for example committing to long term financial projects which will need to be agreed unanimously by the members.

Shareholders/ Members

- As a company limited by guarantee, there would be 3 members.
 - The BMC
 - ABC
 - Mountaineering Scotland

Each member would have one vote.

Control and Minority Protection

There will be protection of minority views, however, such provisions will be established when a Joint Venture is the selected approach.

Employees

- The joint venture will need employees
- It is likely that current employees will be employed in the joint venture, either by way of being seconded to the joint venture, or by way of a TUPE transfer. Currently, the employer of those working in Competition Climbing is the BMC. Discussion will take place between the BMC and the joint venture as to the best way to proceed.

- The management structure has not been formalised

Continuing business involvement of the parties

- It is anticipated that the joint venture will at the outset operate out of the BMC Offices and there will be chargeable services utilised which will be agreed between the BMC and the joint venture.
- The joint venture will be a “not for profit” organisation and as such the difficulty of profit sharing will not arise.
- The joint venture, as a separate company, will stand or fall on its own finances. It will not take out any long term financial commitment and must operate within its preset and guaranteed budgets.
- It is in the interest of all parties involved and the joint venture, that this project works. Reporting to the Boards of the BMC, ABC and MS will be through reports as well as directly through the joint venture’s Board who represent each of these organisations. Also, through its members.
- Information concerning the financial situation will be reviewed quarterly and that information submitted to all parties involved. The BMC receives Tier 3 funding, it is therefore required to be compliant with the Code for Sports Governance Tier 3 requirements.

Recognised NGB status

- In the BMC’s Articles updated in 2019 the following reference has been added:
 - *4.1.10 – to manage and support the GB Climbing Teams;*
 - *4.1.11 – to act as the national governing body for competitions in climbing, para climbing, ice-climbing and ski mountaineering*
- The BMC is the NGB for Mountaineering in England & Wales. MS is the NGB for Indoor Climbing and Competition Climbing in Scotland.
- That position would remain and the new joint venture would work with the BMC to prepare bids for grants from Sport England and UK Sport to help fund its projects. The BMC would then delegate the duty of carrying out the terms of the grant to the joint venture. In return the joint venture would receive the funding from SE or UKS.
- A similar situation already exists between the BMC and Mountain Training England; the BMC and ABC; BMC and Mountain Training UK

Deadlock

- If for any reason there is deadlock or a breakdown in the functioning of the Board then the Chair needs to inform the members and through them seek resolution.
- Membership of an organisation like Peninsula could be beneficial.

Termination

- Termination of the joint venture can be done unanimously by the members
- Should the joint venture be insolvent, then with the agreement of its members it should be dissolved.
- Should the business of the joint venture cease to be relevant then the members can unanimously terminate the joint venture
- Any assets, tangible or otherwise will be disposed of by agreement by its members.

Appendix C : Personnel

In January of 2019, work started in recruiting people to sit on the Working Group, those who volunteered were:

Stuart Younie	CEO of Mountaineering Scotland
Jamie Smith	Climb Scotland Team Leader
Ian Dunn	Coach and Competition Committee member
Mark Glennie	Coach and Competition Committee member
Roger Fanner	Member of the BMC Board of Directors
Colin Knowles	Special Delegate to IFSC/UIAA, past member of BMC Exec & NC
Zoe Spriggins	BMC Competitions Programme Manager
Freddie Naish	ABC representative and Climbing Wall owner
Nick Colton	Deputy CEO of the BMC
Rab Carrington	Chair of the working group, ex BMC President and Patron
Damien O'Sullivan	Mountaineering Ireland
David Stanley	BMC Project Manager, minute taker and advisor (non voting)
Suzanne Jones	BMC coordinator (non voting)

Appendix D : Organisations

British Mountaineering Council (BMC)

The BMC is the representative body for Hill walking, Mountaineering and Climbing for England and Wales. In the eyes of Sport England it is the NGB for Mountaineering and as such receives funding for specific projects from both Sport England and UK Sport. In its role as NGB, the BMC works in unison with ABC, MTUK and MTE to bid for funding from SE on their behalf.

Competition Climbing (Climbing, Ice Climbing, Paraclimbing and Ski Mountaineering) is a Specialist Committee within the BMC.

The BMC is affiliated to IFSC, IFSM and UIAA and has the responsibility of representing Scotland, England and Wales in these organisations through which International Competitions are organised. There exists an MoU between MS and BMC to cover this and consequently there needs to be very close cooperation between the two organisations.

Mountaineering Scotland (MS)

MS is the NGB for Hill walking, Mountaineering and Climbing in Scotland. Within MS, there is a distinct department, Climb Scotland. Climb Scotland is the NGB for the sport of Indoor Climbing in Scotland and as such it has the role of growing participation, especially growth of youth participation. Its role is very far reaching; developing new and existing club structure, working with schools, developing participation strategies, programmes for indoors to outdoors, as well as the whole competition strategy. Sport Scotland has its own standalone website and social media channels.

Mountaineering Ireland (MI)

In recent years the representative body has merged so that MI now represents the whole of Ireland. The Good Friday Agreement means that an athlete from Northern Ireland is allowed to select which country they will represent, either Ireland or GB. Should an athlete select GB then for International Competitions they will be registered through the BMC. Likewise, should they choose Ireland. Then they will be registered through MI.

Association of British Climbing Walls (ABC)

ABC is a member organisation which represents Climbing Walls and ancillary organisations. It recommends safety procedures and promotes best practice within the indoor climbing sector. As all Climbing Competitions take place on artificial climbing surfaces, the indoor climbing wall is integral to the success of competitions. ABC probably represents 70% of the main UK climbing walls. ABCTT runs NICAS and NIBAS, schemes developed specifically to introduce young people to climbing and bouldering.

International Federation of Sport Climbing (IFSC)

IFSC broke away from UIAA to become the governing body for Competition climbing. IFSC is recognised by the IOC and promotes Lead, Bouldering and Speed as well as looking after Paraclimbers. It is through the work of IFSC that climbing is an Olympic Sport.

UIAA

UIAA, amongst other things is the governing body for International Ice Climbing competitions. Ice Climbing is not an Olympic event.

Appendix E : Evidence

The working group met on 4 occasions; January, April, September and October and also made an interim presentation to the BMC BoD in July. Minutes of those meetings are available on Teamwork as is the presentation.

A lot of the initial work was fact finding from the various related organisations

Mountain Training:

MTUK was asked if they wished to participate in the WG. They declined and said they would work with whichever option was selected. Additionally, RC interviewed Martin Chester in his role as coaching awards developer.

- **Would work with whichever governance is selected**

ABC:

The members of ABC were sent a Questionnaire and a report from those results was prepared by FN which is available on Teamwork. This is a very important piece of evidence:

- **69% of ABC members would be willing to contribute between £500 and £1,000 annually to support and promote competition climbing. This could raise £85k to £170k.**
- **35% in favour of a Joint Venture; 21% thought either option could meet governance standards**
- **50% thought a joint venture would be better for the athletes; 41% thought either could do the job**
- **72% thought wall owners would prefer to work with a joint venture**
- **50% thought a joint venture could better fund competition**

Sport England:

Dave Turnbull and Lucy Valerio had a conference call with Sport England. During that call it appeared that the BMC could delegate work to a third party to execute. Much like it does currently for MTUK, MTE and ABC. With this information the working group accepted that any option which was selected could receive SE funding as long as a bid went in under the auspices of the BMC and that the BMC would subsequently contract that work out to the chosen option.

Recent phone calls to Richard Clarkson, cast some doubt on that situation. In late October, after a conference call involving DT, LV, RC and Richard Clarkson, two papers were prepared to give more detailed information about two of the options; Internal Department and Joint Subsidiary.

- **We await their response.**

IFSC:

It is through Colin Knowles that we received our info About IFSC. During the year, he was made General Secretary for IFSC in Europe....a posh title for a voluntary role.

- **We have been assured that IFSC will be willing to work with whichever governance is selected.**
- **However, there are also some constraints that IFSC imposes within that governance; principally to do with athlete representation.**

Other UK Sports NGB:

Most NGB's are not set up in the same manner as the BMC. For many, for example the NGB for Equestrian is set up as a Federation under which headline the separate disciplines, Dressage etc participate with their own governance. Otherwise the NGB has an internal Department dedicated to the performance programme. However, in 2015, Nick Colton and Rob Adie investigated 4 Federation with similarities to Climbing: Triathlon, Taekwondo, Boxing and Parcour.

- **There was no clearly defined solution but key was that there needed to be separation between the normal work of the BMC and the Competition programme.**

Climbing Federations:

It was important to look at other National Federations and their governance structures to see if there was any correlation between governance and success. Through Colin Knowles contacts at IFSC we were able to gain direct information on a variety of European federations and their set ups. We also looked at the top 20 performers in all 3 disciplines (lead, boulder and speed) for 2017. We then highlighted the top performing countries. Their governing structure was looked at on-line. The top 3 countries were Slovenia, Austria and Japan. In Slovenia, where 2.6% of the population are members of the Slovenian Mountaineering Federation, the competition sector resides within its parent organisation. Competition is given great support by the Club sector. Putting on local competition and fully getting behind the athletes. In Austria, another high flier, Competition is separate from the Austrian Alpine Club. Austria has a history of supporting all climbing activities, I believe that climbing is part of the School's curriculum for all students. Austria has also got a worldwide reputation for having the "best" climbing wall facility for comp climbing. Japan has received much success in recent years. Not much information was available as to their structure but the fact that the Olympics being held in Tokyo may have had an effect on recent success.

- **So from this line of enquiry we can say that there is no direct correlation between governance and competition success.**

Paraclimbers:

Paraclimbing in England is a strong activity and what they can achieve is truly amazing. Please view the film with the blind climber leading the Old Man of Hoy to get a flavour of their dedication and skill. We tapped into their thoughts via the questionnaire sent out to all GB Team athletes. From that survey their chief concerns were:

- **Paraclimbing needed a higher profile**
- **More effort put into getting Paraclimbing as an Olympic event**

Ice Climbing:

Ice climbing has its own international competition circuit. Its governing body is UIAA and it is not a winter Olympic sport. RC spoke to Neil Blake who will be representing GB in Europe. His comments:

- **The dry tooling and comp ice climbing brigade have little contact with the BMC**
- **There needs to be greater exposure/recognition of dry tooling/ice competition**
- **UIAA needs to push ice climbing for permanent inclusion in the Winter Olympics,**

Ski Mountaineering:

SkiMo has its International governing body ISMF. MS is the main coordinator for SkiMo in GB. SY contacted Di Griffith on this matter

- **SkiMo is happy with the status quo**

Athletes:

For many years there has been discontent between the athletes and the management running competitions. A lot of the criticism could be blamed on lack of funding, lack of transparency, lack of clarity in selection processes. Since 2017, there have been many changes in the management of BMC competitions; replacement of Rob Adie by ZS; Lucinda and Tim's SE funded positions in Talent Development. It will take time and effort to build up the athletes confidence in the management; and this is imperative for a more successful competition sector.

In 2017, whilst working on ORG, RC interviewed a range of the athletes. Additionally, GB Team members had the opportunity to pass comment in the questionnaire.

- **Athletes need representation on the Management team**
- **Other organisations need to be involved, especially ABC**
- **Officers need to have clearly defined roles**

- **More money for travel, coaching support, training camps, physio support**

Coaches:

Coaches were well represented in the working group through MG, ID and FN. In recent years the MT has been developing a coaching qualification through the work of Martin Chester. Many coaches operate throughout the country usually attached to specific climbing walls. For many youth climbers their initial training will have been done through this group of wall based coaches. RC talked to Martin C and also Adge Last, both who have been heavily involved in youth coaching/instruction.

- **Governance needs to be acceptable to SE and UK Sport**
- **The new structure should be outward looking and learn from other sports**
- **Maybe there needs to be an Association of Coaches**

Parents:

Coaching is heavily reliant on parents. Parents take on voluntary roles at competitions, parents transport young athletes round the country/world, parents fund the athletes journey. Consulting with parents can often be difficult as they are so biased, and rightly so, to the problems which beset their offspring. However, they were given the opportunity to voice their opinion through the GB Team questionnaire. RC also talked to Libby Peters whose daughters compete and also runs the Beacon climbing team based in Snowdonia.

- **Quality and experience of the management team is more important than the governance structure**
- **Currently, staff spread too thinly**
- **Need a focussed dedicated organisation gaining expertise from different quarters**
- **Climbing walls need to be involved**

Routesetters:

On the working group, FN as a wall owner has closest association with route setters.

- **As yet no direct contact has been made to routesetters.**

Wall Owners:

The views of most wall owners has been expressed through association with ABC. However, not all walls are members of ABC. So, additional to the ABC questionnaire I received the following comments.

- **The money received for hosting a competition never covers the total expense of putting it on.**
- **The BMC does little to promote the Walls by which the Competition sector and the GB Team benefit**
- **ABC should stick to promoting safety and best practices and not get involved in other things. (this from a climbing wall which disassociated from ABC for this reason)**

BMC Staff:

ZS and NC, both BMC Staff, sit on this working group and as such can express the views of the BMC Competition Sector. However, RC thought it would good to speak to Lucinda Whittaker and Tim Cunnington who have been employed by the BMC on a half time basis funded by Sport England. Their role is to put together a programme for Talent Development. After that meeting LW was invited to give a presentation of their work for BMC Competitions. Her presentation can be found on Teamwork.

- **This is exciting times for the development of Competition Climbing with the BMC**
- **The BMC have developed profiling tools to improve and identify early talent in climbing**
- **A lot of work is going on to develop a coaching network across the country, to develop hubs of excellence across the country working with climbing walls to achieve these aims.**

Appendix F : The Minutes of Final Meeting

Competitions Working Group 31/10/19

Attendance:

Rab Carrington, Dave Turnbull, Stuart Younie, Nick Colton, Roger Fanner, Ian Dunn, Freddie Naish, Mark Glennie, Dave Stanley

Zoe Spriggins and Colin Knowles gave apologies in advance

RC – Today is decision time, hoping to have report completed by 25th December. 10 days ago I was invited by DT to join a call with Richard Clarkson from Sport England (SE). They asked us to present our options for them to respond to. You can see these on TeamWork. These papers and the surveys from ABC members and from GB Climbing teams have all been added since the last meeting.

What are the group's thoughts on the papers?

ID – I looked through the surveys to the teams and agree with the Chair's summary

FN – I have concerns about the survey, because it didn't give any background to why they would answer the survey. I had direct feedback that athletes dropped out at question 2 as it was asking irrelevant questions

RC - We had a heads up at the last meeting that the questionnaire was going to piggy back on one already going out to climbers, so we had to make compromises

ID – Had a good talk with 3 senior athletes, the underlying feeling is that they're not happy with current situation. They want to see transparency in finances and selection policies but are **not** bothered too much about what structure they are under. An example is transparency about where the money from Clif Bar has gone. Whatever we come up with, we need to have transparency, a male and female rep would be good and how the people are selected.

FN – We don't know who filled it in, but I have feeling that a number of senior athletes didn't fill it in

RC – did they give any feedback when you were talking to them?

FN – It was very similar to ID's points, but also having a voice. The athletes want a meaningful voice in the future of what is happening

ID – having a way that the athletes voice has been elected by the athletes is really important here too.

FN – I strongly agree

RC – What are everyone's thoughts on the papers I shared ahead of this meeting?

SY – We've been in conversation with Sport Scotland about these developments and I have asked for the views of Megan Griffiths, our partnerships officer. To summarise, our position remains that our

preference remains an internal department. Our fundamental concern is how a separate body would sit when we are seeking funding from the national bodies.

Running briefly through the points: the order they are raised leads to the impression that the political points are the primary reason. When we speak about what the athletes need, we should be putting that to the fore. We wouldn't speak about the bureaucracy, with the negative connotations of that. I would also ask for sensitivity around the wording where it comes to being the National Governing Body. While our preference is for a ringfenced department, it would have to achieve the effect of being able to have sufficient autonomy and speed of decision making and operation.

FN – The first comment you have made SY, you make the point that MS is the NGB for Scotland. How do you reconcile that with your choice of an internal department?

SY – I think it comes down to how could it be recognised as a governing body. We need to think of this from the grassroots level, supporting people through the development pipeline from the very bottom to the top. The new internal department gives us the best opportunities to achieve what we need to do.

FN – I would say that the grassroots are already serviced by an external organisation; NICAS/NIBAS

SY – That is only one piece of it, there is also schools, clubs, where do people go after the qualifications

RF – we are all agreeing on the importance of grassroots, we said at the last meeting that we want to encompass that in what the organisation does. The wider the base, the higher the pyramid. These papers don't speak to this, which they need to.

SY – We've been speaking to Di Griffiths from Ski Mountaineering to see how we could support them a little more. Di was happy with the status quo of the BMC holding the role, we continue to work with them to see how we can support more.

DT – I asked Alan Brown to go through the finances in the paper to bring them up to date. It would be around £80k higher in staff time now.

RC – What we can take from that, is that the costs going forward for either option is going to be £80k higher

NC – Have we got a definitive figure from the ABC about what they would be able to contribute?

FN – It's between £85k and £170k per year (see slides on TeamWork for detail)

ID – Do they mean this in cash and not in-kind contribution?

FN – In cash

RC – SY, could Mountaineering Scotland (MS) see themselves contributing financially?

SY – that's a difficult question. We would have to speak with Sport Scotland. There would not be the funds in Climb Scotland, it would have to come from Mountaineering Scotland.

FN – It doesn't reconcile that you want to be the NGB, but don't want to contribute

SY – We are the NGB. We work together with the BMC and all of the home nations to give a child access to the same system whether they start in Aberdeen or Sheffield.

FN – Why isn't there parity on contributions from Scottish members and English and Welsh members?

SY – We contribute per athlete

NC – The point that occurred to me is that there are 3 options, but only 2 papers to SE. What were the grounds for the sole member option being removed?

RC – 2 meetings ago, we took it off the table and then checked it at the last meeting.

RF – I believe it was that it brought the downsides of each option (cost, not complete autonomy etc.) without the upsides

ID – I think it was interesting to see Dave Douglas' thoughts

FN – I think it was very inappropriate to take his views. I'm here as the representative of the ABC. It was not appropriate for him to give his views.

DT – It would be worthwhile here if I recap our talk with SE. A few months ago, I spoke to SE to a contact I have who wasn't that knowledgeable on this. Richard Clarkson was then put forward by them, who is much more knowledgeable. I spoke with Richard about 6 weeks ago and then followed up with a call with RC and Lucy Valerio on the call as well.

Internal department is really straight forwards and is what most sports do. He didn't know of anyone who runs their competition operation as a joint venture. We had to put it down on paper for them to even understand what we were proposing. The NGB's accountability and control of the money is their greatest concern. That's what it would come down to for the Joint Venture – how can SE have confidence that the body they give money to has full and proper control over it.

RC – Can we move onto the question of which structure will give the best results for British Competition Climbing?

ID – I feel it is an internal department, because the costs of a joint venture are considerable, and that money can be spent on improving things for the athletes straight away. The concern with a joint venture is also how low down is the line drawn about what they deal with. For example, I don't believe a joint venture would be able to support YCS sufficiently while also focussing on elite performance.

FN – The ABC position is that we would prefer to be working in a jointly owned organisation alongside BMC, MS, MI etc.

The internal department feels like status quo by another name. If we did move down the route of an internal department, we would want to put in checks and balances with performance measures that trigger a further review.

ID – I would strongly second that about a performance review in the future

FN – I would also add that the people on a joint venture are all currently in receipt of SE funding, so they would not be totally new organisations

RF – There are constraints around how quickly we can make decision in the BMC and I don't see that we can come around that sufficiently with delegated authority. My preference would be for a joint venture with MS, ABC, MI, maybe MT. However I have a concern that the government funding would not go to a separate body owned by these entities. If it makes civil servants uncomfortable with releasing public money, it will not succeed in the long term. I'm not comfortable with either of the options and so on balance go towards a wholly owned subsidiary. I think that what is happening below the management level is going really well with the work of Zoe, Lucinda and Tim.

SY – We have a preferred option, an internal department, but there are big caveats that it has to be done with the best interest of the sport, rather than an issue that part of the BMC membership have. I agree with FN that even if we vote for an internal department we have to have strong checks and balances in place. We do have to come back to the issue of cost around a joint venture; that is money that can be put into the sport straight away. We also need to think about who is supporting the coaches and how will we build up from the grassroots.

MG – Personally I don't think that an internal department is a vote for change. It doesn't resolve the issues around branding and identity. I would personally want to see a joint venture, I recognise there are concerns around how this would impact Sport England and Sport Scotland funding.

NC – I see the internal department as by far the strongest option. We need to look at how much autonomy can be given through a Performance Management Group, also whether any of these other sources of funding can be leveraged with an internal department. We have the talent development hub's and the cascade training for coaches, which gives a new revenue stream. We also need to see the impact of the Olympics before going for a wholesale change, so I would say internal department with a future review

ID – I'd say that a future review would only be valuable if a well constructed business plan was produced for the department. The Board can then be very comfortable in their analysis of the performance against the plan. This can be done relatively quickly, then it might be that we go to a wholly owned subsidiary

DT – on each of these options, the same group of people are going to form the PMG or the BoD. What I take from this is that there has to be demonstrable real change. Whatever happens, it needs its own budget, it needs more staff, it needs a new senior member of staff overseeing it, it needs new junior members of staff supporting it. Other sports do it by formal documentation of what it has handed over to the PMG. The BMC BoD would want to be light touch on this, as it just doesn't have the bandwidth to do it. I think the Board would want to delegate most things to this formal sub group of the BMC BoD. It's likely that the BoD would want to sign off on the 4 year plan, but not much else.

RC – Moving onto the question of which structure would be most cost effective

FN – There are legal costs associated with the delegated authority list, you would have to structure it very carefully. For example, if this body went off to agree sponsorship that was at odds with the remainder of the BMC, it would not be a good position. Also building up good governance from a clean piece of paper is easier than reverse engineering from an existing institution.

RF – I still come to the wholly owned subsidiary which strikes the best compromise of autonomy and speed of decision making, without incurring the higher costs of a joint venture

ID – There would be little need for the speed of action with the right level of delegation set out

RC – RF can I ask you to expand on your thoughts

RF – I came into this thinking that I was going to prefer the joint venture option. I think that competition climbing can't happen without the walls, so they need a voice in this. But the practicalities of setting that up would take away resources from the climbers.

MG – I think the subsidiary gives the greater potential for increased funding in the long term, but not necessarily in the short and medium term

DT – EIS and UK Sport are upbeat in their outlook for the sport of climbing. They are asking for our plans out to 2032. The typical things they fund are performance directors, elite performance coaches and other support for athletes. Rocket Sport are also upbeat in their outlook

NC – Rocket Sport did also say that it doesn't matter to them what structure is used.

RC – Which structure is most likely to be supported by Sport England, Sport Scotland and UK Sport

RF – It is worth reflecting back on the internal department. Everyone is saying it needs to be ringfenced, have it's own budget, own business plan – this sounds very much like a separate company.

NC – British Cycling do this and very little comes back to the Board

SY – I've shared a lot of how Climb Scotland works for us and it is a great example of how an internal department can work. It can work, as long as there is a willingness to work together. I would say why not give that a try and see how it works

FN – The difference here is that there are not partner organisations on Climb Scotland. If a person in this department who worked for the BMC took exception to something, they could take it back to the BMC BoD rather than the PMG.

SY – fair point we are not in formal structures with partners, but we do work alongside them all the time.

RC – How would a new joint venture organisation work alongside the BMC?

ID – A good example would be where would the line be drawn between YCS and TWYC. It would be much easier to do as an internal department. If in the future the BMC wanted to start a round of schools competitions, with a department it could task it with doing that, they would then ask for the funding needed. With a separate organisation, they could say no and lead to a situation where the BMC have to do it from scratch, setting up a "schools competition climbing committee" as an example

RF – I can see that point, but it does cut both ways. I think that the financial system is going to be pressured for the foreseeable future. I can't see anyway that any body would be able to come to the BMC and demand more money right now. The department or subsidiary would have to manage it within their own in year budget

FN – I agree with that, they would manage it within their budget.

NC – An interesting question is whether the BMC would let a subsidiary fail financially? (thinking about MHT)

RC – Any liability would have to go back to the parent organisations proportionally

RF – This is not our decision, it has to go to the ODG and the Board. We have to hammer out what are the pro's and con's of each option

RC – I want the votes to be recorded, but also to get those from the people not present. I want to gather them in and then write a report based on it.

RF – Can we get the minutes out quickly and then get the views of those not present?

DS - Yes

DT – There is a comment on how the body would be structured? At the minute it looks quite political, but you would need to recruit to it from a skills basis so that it is able to do the breadth of operational things it is needed to do.

ID – I would say there is a need to have the two athlete reps on there voted on properly

DT – It would have to avoid falling into the traps that the Competition Committee has fallen into. It needs to be very strongly chaired and a highly functioning group to get everything done.

MG – It would be important to choose the athlete reps well, they could come from a very small group, but might not have awareness of the needs for all of the athletes

ID – For example if a senior team athlete took on the role and were then bombarded by parents from YCS athletes, it would hold them back from training

DT – it could also be somebody who is a previous athlete.

I had a good conversation with Paul Buxton of SE about athlete rep after talking to Marco Scolari about whether there would be a vote for the athlete rep. Paul said it is not usual

RF – It is quite a tricky one, as if they were a Director, their responsibilities are then to the organisation, not the electorate, as we see with Council Nominated Directors

DT – We can gather best practice from SE from other sports

RC – We took this from Badminton earlier in the process

So we will now all reflect on the minutes, let Colin, Zoe and Jamie respond to them. Then I will write a report and put it on TeamWork and onto ODG then the Board.

Appendix G: Remit of the Working Group

Working Group to Explore the Options available to the BMC for the Implementation of Recommendation 24

Background

In ORG's Report of November 2017, R24 stated: *"The BMC should consider a clearly defined sub-group, or creation of a separate governing body subsidiary within the BMC for the purposes of managing competitive activities and to support elite level competitive activities such as Team GB"*

In its Amended Report of March 2018, R24 is amended to state: *"The BMC should create a joint subsidiary for competitive activities in partnership with Mountaineering Scotland and other relevant home nation governing bodies for the purposes of managing competitive activities and to support elite level competitive activities such as Team GB"*

Rather than just reading the above paragraphs it is important to read the commentary which goes along with R24. This commentary can be found on p46 November 2017 Report and p26 March 2018 report.

It is important that this Working Group explores all potential scenarios which are available to the BMC for delivering a successful landscape in which all competitive activities can flourish. It is important when researching these possibilities, that the selected structure will accomplish the following:

- Allow competitors to perform to the best of their ability
- Create a framework within which competitors and potential competitors can get clear guidance to develop their talents.
- Work successfully within the whole of the UK giving equal opportunity to all.
- Have autonomy to allow for future development in the competitive field
- Have transparency, both financial and strategically, so that it is clear to all where the money is coming from and what the future plans for National & International competitions are. Note: the Competitions Program Manager, has already commenced work in this area and this will be incorporated in the finding of this Working Group.
- Be financially viable. Complete financial viability may be some time in the future but by working to tight budgets and with income from grants and commercial sponsors along with support from the BMC a sustainable financial future will be guaranteed.

Process

- 1) For this paper and process to be accepted by, and given the go ahead, by the Board, National Council and by ODG.
- 2) For a budget to be set aside for necessary expenditure during the work of this Working Group.
- 3) To bring together a small group of people to carry out this work. This should include relevant staff (NC & ZS), a Scottish Rep of Climb Scotland (as selected by Climb Scotland), a Competition Committee rep (as selected by Comps Committee), Rab C plus two others. We would also need to call in, when needed, financial expertise from the office and Finance & Audit Committee.
- 4) Information gathering needs to be carried out by looking at and gaining information from:
 - (a) Other related national bodies.
 - (b) Those directly involved in Competitions; currently we would be looking at competitions in Climbing, Ice Climbing, Paraclimbing and Ski Mountaineering. We will therefore be

consulting with coaches, competitors, and officials from each of these disciplines and their governing bodies ie IFSC, UIAA and IFSM.

- (c) IFSC/UIAA and Colin Knowles.
 - (d) The indoor climbing sector & Mountain Training. The ABC represents indoor climbing walls and Mountain Training represents coaching practices within the UK.
 - (e) Mountaineering Ireland. MI is a cross border organisation and currently the BMC only work together on the Youth Climbing Series. However, it is important to consider the position of Olympic representation.
 - (f) International Ski Mountaineering Federation and UK representatives.
 - (g) BMC Staff.
 - (h) Others who might have views on this subject.
- 5) Analysis of the gathered information and careful costings of possible scenarios, which would include the following:
- (a) Retaining the current status quo with no change.
 - (b) New ring fenced internal structure within the BMC but not a separate entity.
 - (c) A self governing subsidiary within the BMC (similar to Mountain Heritage Trust).
 - (d) Any other option which will produce the required end result.
- 6) Written report of findings to be presented to:
- BMC Comps Committee
 - ODG
 - BMC Board
 - BMC National Council

Outcome

It is hoped that the outcome will reflect the bullet points outlined in the Background sector above but, apart from that, it is imperative that the outcome is in the best interests of the BMC as a whole. We would hope that this report will take less than 12 months to complete. It may be that this Working Group's report gives a starting point for a development to take place over a period of years rather than a single dramatic change.