



# COUNCIL OF SOUTHERN CAVING CLUBS

A constituent member of the British Caving Association

## CSCC's Representatives report to BCA National Council meeting 9<sup>th</sup> Oct. 2004

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**CSCC proposed subscription would be as follows:**

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

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

David G Cooke  
CSCC's BCA Rep.  
8<sup>th</sup> Oct. 2004