These minutes do not include any wording the Board has agreed be kept confidential in the online publication.

Diocese of Leeds
Leeds Board (“the Board”)

Minutes of the Board meeting held 9 July 2020, via Zoom conferencing.

Present:
The Rt Revd Nick Baines (Chair), Mr Matthew Ambler, The Ven Paul Ayers, Canon Mr Simon Baldwin, Mrs Marilyn Banister, Ms Kay Brown, The Revd Canon Sam Corley, The Ven Dr Anne Dawtry, The Very Revd John Dobson, Canon Mrs Jane Evans, The Revd Canon Kathryn Fitzsimons, The Rt Revd Dr Jonathan Gibbs, The Ven Jonathan Gough, The Rt Revd Dr Helen-Ann Hartley, The Rt Revd Dr Toby Howarth, The Ven Andy Jolley, Mr Andrew Maude, Canon Ann Nicholl, The Rt Revd Tony Robinson, The Rt Revd Paul Slater, Mrs Jane Wardman, Mr Irving Warnett and The Revd Nigel Wright.

In Attendance:
Ms Alison Bogle (AB), Mrs Charlotte Lilley (CL), Mr Peter Foskett (PF), The Revd Canon Andrew Norman (AN), Mr Geoff Park (GP), Mr Chris Tate (CT) and Mr Jonathan Wood (JW).

Minutes taker:
Mrs Heather Burge (HB)

Papers:
All papers circulated for Leeds Board meetings are taken as read.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Minute</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Opening Prayers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The meeting opened with prayers led by Bishop Helen-Ann Hartley.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Welcome and Apologies.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Chair asked for formal confirmation from the Trustees that they were content to meet via Zoom conferencing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Chair proposed:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“That this Board, for the purposes of Article 9.3 of the Memorandum and Articles of Association of the Leeds Diocesan Board of Finance and for all business and matters conducted during the holding of this meeting approves meeting by means of Zoom conferencing as a suitable means through which all participants may communicate with all the other participants”.

Agreed unanimously.

Welcomed:
Simon Dennis (SD), Chair of the Leeds Diocesan Board of Finance Audit Committee
Kathryn Belton (KB), Senior Manager, Saffery Champness LLP, auditors of the Leeds Diocesan Board of Finance.
Jemima Parker (JP), Environment Officer, joined at Item 14.

Apologies received from The Ven Peter Townley.

3 Declarations of conflicts interest.

Members were reminded to declare any conflicts of interest concerning any items on the Agenda.

No conflict of interest was disclosed.

4 Leeds Diocesan Board of Finance Annual Reports and Financial Statements 2019

Circulated papers: LB20 07 022019 Annual Report and Accounts, LB20 07 02 01 Draft Letter of Representation to the Auditors, LB20 07 02 02 Draft Audit Findings report and Audit overview, LB20 07 02 03 Annual Report and Accounts covering note.

Presenters: GP, SD and KB.

GP gave a summary of the covering note and shared a PowerPoint, highlighting some key items. There was a net unrestricted funds surplus of £4,297k before investment gains or £685k if the pension valuation movements were excluded. This surplus included the final payment of restructuring funding of £641k. There had been some progress on the parish share receipts with receipts of £13,454k, which represented a collection rate of 86.6%. There had been a reduction in statutory fees receipts but an increase in income from housing, Parcevall Hall and schools. Investment income had also increased.

Expenditure had generally reduced with the exception of the contribution to the national church and parish ministry (stipends and pension costs).

Overall funds were just short of £200m split between endowment, restricted and unrestricted. There had been a revaluation of the Church of England Clergy
pension scheme in 2018. This was reflected in the 2019 Accounts as a significant reduction in the Leeds DBF’s liability by £3,417k.

Two issues had delayed the signing of the 2019 Accounts:

1. There had been a property reclassification following a reconciliation of the Finance team’s and Property team’s records with the Mission and Pastoral team’s records, which had proved to be more up to date. A check for property classification had been made for every benefice. Twenty-seven properties had been reclassified. The result was a net historical property reclassification of £4.45m from Benefice and Glebe to Leeds DBF. This reclassification had been audit tested after the May 2020 Leeds Board meeting. A note has been included in the Letter of Representation [LB20 07 02 01] that there are a small number of cases where documentation remained unclear or unavailable but there was confidence that the allocation reflected within the financial statements is reflective of the underlying intention around the use of these properties.

A process was being developed to ensure property classifications are reflected in all internal diocesan records and that as part of the ongoing property registration project a full reconciliation to Land Registry records will be undertaken.

2. A Going Concern analysis for the company has to be reviewed every year for the Report and Financial Statements to ensure the Trustees are confident that the company will remain viable for the next twelve months. Due to the economic uncertainties produced by the Covid-19 pandemic, this analysis had been brought in to sharp focus this year. The analysis was for the twelve months period to the end of July 2021. GP explained that the main assumption in the analysis is that Parish Share receipts will reduce significantly to 50% of budget. The other assumptions (which had been updated to reflect April and May 2020) were that fee income would remain at 70% of budget, other income would be at 50% of budget and that expenditure would be at 70% of budget. The result of these assumptions would be a depletion of the cash and liquid assets reserves so that there was c. £425k left at 31 July 2021. This was thought to be a conservative analysis as Parish Share receipts had not fallen to 50% of budget to date.

Members were also reminded that the Pastoral Fund (currently c £4m) had a wide application and there were properties that could be sold if needed. On this basis, there was confidence that the Leeds DBF would remain a going concern for the next twelve months.

SD confirmed the Audit Committee had considered all the points GP had reported to the Board and commended GP and the Finance team and the Saffery Champness LLP audit team for their work in preparing the revised Report and Financial Statements.
KB spoke to the draft Audit Findings Report (LB20 07 02 02)

This was the first year Saffery Champness LLP had audited the Leeds DBF accounts. The Audit Committee had considered the Audit Findings Report at two of its meetings. The Audit Findings Report had been concluded save for any post balance sheet items. Sally Appleton, Audit Partner, would sign the Audit Findings Report when she returned from annual leave w/c 20 July 2020 and the audit team would report anything to the DBF they were not sure of up to that date.

KB highlighted some key features of the Audit Findings Report:

Section 2 Key audit risks
Overall, the auditors were content with the Significant Risks and the Other significant and accounting matters they had audited. The auditors had considered the impact of Covid-19 on the Going Concern basis of preparation of the Accounts and having looked at the assumptions being made, cash and investments they were able to give an unqualified opinion of the management’s assessment of the Leeds DBF as a going concern. In the Summary of Audit findings section, the auditors had noted the transfer between parsonage and Diocesan properties and the transfer between endowment and unrestricted funds. The recommended that the land registry records are also reviewed against the pastoral scheme documentation. KB also mentioned that there was one property where records could not be found for the property.

There was nothing of significance to report on with regard to misstatements. Overall, the appropriate checks and balances were in place and key risks identified. There were some housekeeping points with regard to properties and lettings, essentially to ensure all the paperwork links up.

There were no questions.

The Chair to proposed that:
“This Board acknowledges receipt of the Audit Findings report (LB20 07 02 02) and approves the draft letter of representation from the Board to the auditors (LB20 07 02 01) and approves the Leeds Diocesan Board of Finance Draft Annual Reports and Financial Statements for the year ended 31 December 2019 (LB20 07 02).”

The proposal was approved.

The Chair reported that the Letter of Representation, Annual Report and Financial Statements would all be signed using electronic signatures.
SD and KB were thanked for their work and left the meeting.

The Chair requested that an electronic voting function be introduced for the next Board Zoom meetings.

| 5 | **COVID-19 update**  
**Circulated paper:** None  
**Presenter:** Jonathan Wood |
|---|


An emergence group, chaired by Archdeacon Jonathan Gough, was meeting at least once a week to discuss government and national church guidance and diocesan support for parishes. Guidance from the group has covered opening churches for private prayer, opening for nurseries and good practice with regard to vulnerable people. The group also looks at diocesan publication of guidance with the diocesan Communications team to ensure a balance between regular and pertinent information. A diocesan support email address for Covid-19 has been implemented. An online Emergency surgery on opening churches had been held on 8 July 2020 and was attended by 96 people. Emergence consultants were also available to advise parishes on various aspects of emergence. The Children, Young People and Families team and Lay Training team are both providing support and training during the current situation.

The diocesan office remains closed during July and the plan is to open three days per week during August and return to five days in September. This is a planned phased return. The diocese had utilised the Furlough scheme up to the end of June and was also making use of the flexible furlough scheme that had come into operation in July. This enabled staff previously on furlough to work part time where there was some work, but not at the levels to require them fully back.

Parcevall Hall remains closed. JW will be visiting on Monday 13 July to discuss the way forward with them.

Diocesan planning was now looking at the longer term impact of Covid-19.

Questions of clarification and feedback:
• Will the goal be to have everyone working full time in Church House in the future or would some be working from home?
  More information was needed and so the approach was “wait and see” for the time being.
• The advice from the diocese was about right.
• Other organisations were not opening until the New Year, except for those staff who have to physically in the workplace or for whom it was difficult to work from home.
• The Emergence surgery had been very useful for sharing problems and getting them resolved.

The Chair thanked JW and Archdeacon Jonathan for all the work they had done for Emergence.

The Bishop of Leeds had recorded a video for the diocesan website and written a brief letter to the laity of the diocese that could be read out at services.
Nationally, Archbishop Stephen Cottrell was chairing a Vision and Strategy Group, the Bishop of Leeds was chairing a Governance Review group and the Bishop of London was chairing a Recovery Group.

6  
**Minutes of the Leeds Board held on 7 May 2020 LB20 07 03**

The draft Minutes of the Leeds Board held on 7 May 2020 had been circulated.

One amendment had been notified, a correction to the spelling of The Revd Peter Mayo-Smith’s name in Item 13. The draft Minutes, with this one amendment, were for approval.

The minutes as amended were approved.

The minutes would be signed electronically after the meeting.

JW

7  
**Matters arising from the Minutes of the meeting on 7 May 2020**

Matters arising from the minutes of 7 May 2020

Item 6 Minutes of the Board 17.2.20 - the Board members noted that as the term of General Synod had been extended to summer 2021, the annual approval of Millie Cork’s continuing membership of General Synod, will need to be considered by the Leeds Board (Bishop’s Council) before 17.2.21.

Open actions (page 13) at 09.7.20
There were no current open actions due for completion by the date of the meeting.

JW
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Leeds DBF Register of Signings LB20 07 04.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Circulated paper:</strong></td>
<td>LB20 07 04 Leeds DBF Register of Signings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Presenter:</strong></td>
<td>Jonathan Wood.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A query was raised concerning the Newall Church Hall, Otley item on the list. It was confirmed that this was the sale of the church hall for £160k and that there was an overage deed in respect of the buyer’s development of the property.

The members noted the contents of the Register of Signings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>There was a ten minutes’ refreshment break until 7.15 pm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Size of Synod update LB20 07 11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Circulated paper:</strong></td>
<td>LB20 07 11 Size of Synod update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Presenter:</strong></td>
<td>Jonathan Wood</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

JW spoke to the circulated report. He outlined that the low response to the request for feedback was echoed in other items on the agenda about engagement with the Synod and the wider community. The feedback which had been received would be taken to the September Synod and then the November Diocesan Synod would vote on the size of the Diocesan Synod for the 2021-2024 term.

The trustees discussed the feedback. Members expressed disappointment in the low response rate. There was a serious piece of work to be done to encourage engagement. It was helpful to have the data from the feedback. The low numbers were consistent with the number who vote in elections. The possibility of online Synods could perhaps be explored. Perhaps there would be more engagement in the next Synod triennium? The timing of the feedback being requested was clarified (the form would have been distributed at the March Synod but this was cancelled and instead it was circulated by email with a return date of 30 April 2020.

The contents of the report were noted by the Board members.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Rhythm of Life update LB20 07 12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Circulated paper:</strong></td>
<td>LB20 07 11 Size of Synod update.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Presenter:</strong></td>
<td>The Revd Canon Andrew Norman and Bishop Tony Robinson.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Presentation:</strong></td>
<td>PowerPoint and sharing of Digital Learning Platform.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Rhythm of Life had been discussed the Board before. AN provided an update on the revised timetable and proposed framework. The Bishop of Leeds would be writing to clergy, those who had participated in the diocesan Lay Conference and
Digital Learning Platform subscribers to commend the initiative.

There were four simple steps, taking stock, one or more practical steps, sharing with others and periodically reviewing commitments. Resources would be available, a leaflet, commitment card and a dedicated page on the Digital Learning Platform and a link on the diocesan website. The Rhythm of Life would enable the development of spiritual life, framed by loving, living, learning through a commitment to celebrate, reflect, pray, rest, share and create.

It was proposed that the initiative would start during the summer to be followed by taster sessions in the autumn.

The Board members discussed the Rhythm of Life. Comments included:

- There was a need to make this type of resource available to younger people. Particularly at the current time and as some struggle with mental health issues.

Bishop Tony had discussed the initiative with the DBE but at the moment the timing for DBE involvement were likely to be 2021/2022. In the meantime, resources would be added to the Digital Learning Platform by the Children, Youth and Families team. It was also planned to have resources for households in due course.

- It would be good to have resources for schools, young people and for use by the diocesan chaplaincy group for children and young people, focussed on their needs.

Bishop Tony and AN outlined that it was hoped that parishes would print leaflets for those who were not online and that along with the letter from the Bishop of Leeds previously mentioned, the information would be spread by word of mouth. It was hoped that each Area Bishop would host a gathering to publicise the Rhythm of Life. This was an ongoing initiative, which would develop over time, rather than a one-off event.

Charlotte Lilley joined the meeting.

### Minutes of the meeting of the Episcopal Areas Mission and Pastoral Committees for noting.

**Circulated papers:** Draft minutes of the Area Mission and Pastoral Committees are LB20 07 05, LB20 07 05 01, LB20 07 05 02, LB20 07 05 03, LB20 07 05 04 had been made available on the Leeds Board members’ diocesan website page and were for noting only.
Presenter: Charlotte Lilley, Secretary to the Diocesan Mission & Pastoral Committee.

There were no questions of clarification on the Area Mission and Pastoral Committees’ minutes.

10 Diocesan Mission and Pastoral report.

Circulated paper: LB20 07 06 Report from the Secretary to the Diocesan Mission & Pastoral Committee.

Presenter: Charlotte Lilley, Secretary to the Diocesan Mission & Pastoral Committee.

CL highlighted that the figures remained unchanged from her report to the 7 May 2020 Board. This was due to the moratorium imposed by the Church Commissioners. However, CL reported that the Church Commissioners had lifted the moratorium and the Mission and Pastoral team were now able to progress proposals again.

There were no questions.

CL left the meeting.

11 Finance Report and Parish Share report


Presenters: Geoff Park and The Revd Nigel Wright.

Presentation: PowerPoint.

Management Accounts

GP gave an overview of the financial performance to the end of May 2020. The operating surplus after reserves transfers was £462k ie £335k behind budget. Parish share was £788k behind budget but this was offset by lower support costs and property maintenance costs. The June 2020 share receipt figures were an improvement on those in May with a deficit of around £250k. This was all in line with the better of the four scenarios put in place for parish share receipts. Members were directed to the appendices of the Finance report for the detail.

There were no questions on the management accounts.

Budget 2021 Assumptions

GP outlined that the Board were asked to approve four assumptions for the 2021 budget. The Board would be considering the detail of the 2021 budget at its meeting on 9 September 2020. However, to draft the budget, the Board needed
to approve the assumptions.

Of the four assumptions set out in the Finance Report, only one couldn’t be changed later: parish share as the Parish Share requests will be sent out to the parishes after the 26 September 2020 Diocesan Synod.

The context of the clergy stipends assumption was set out in the Finance report. In the current Covid-19 situation, the Board were asked to look again at the proposal in the 2019 Sustainability Plan to move to the previously standard increase of 2% over the period 2020-2023. A number of dioceses were considering stipend freezes. FAIC had acknowledged that few organisations will be discussing increases and would be focussing on preserving jobs. However there was also recognition that, having frozen stipends in 2019, a further freeze may damage clergy morale.

Board members were asked for views on the proposed assumptions and whether the decisions on share and stipend increases should in principle be tied together.

It was also proposed to link staff salary inflation to the stipend inflation assumption.

It was noted that whilst the Board could revisit stipend and salary assumptions in the New Year, this approach could not be used for the parish share allocations.

Board members discussed the budget assumption proposals. Comments included:

- A number of parishes will probably struggle to pay parish share this year. Raising parish share allocations would probably cause more distress than freezing stipends would affect morale.
- The inflation impact in New Year should be borne in mind along with a triple lock on pensions, which was likely to affect many who pay parish share.
- Would propose keeping parish share requests as 2020 and link stipend increases to this ie 0% parish share increase and 0% stipend increase.

GP confirmed that a 0.5% increase in stipend on a budget year basis was £35k so 1.5% would be c£100k.

- Communication was the key to whatever decision was taken.
- The diocese pays a higher level of stipend than any other diocese in the Northern Province.
- Growth and evangelism need to be at the top of the agenda.
• Propose have 0% share increase and review clergy stipend in January 2021.

In the meeting, it was proposed that the assumptions for parish share, stipends and staff salaries would be 0%. Staff salaries would be linked to stipends assumptions. The stipend assumption would be reviewed in the context of the overall emergence budget in 2021.

Agreed unanimously.

**Proposer for money resolution**
The Chair proposed that The Revd Nigel Wright propose the money resolution at the 26 September 2020 Diocesan Synod.

All agreed.

**Additional item discussed**
GP outlined that the Board could consider moving cap and collar of the parish share system to 0% for 2021 too. That is that effectively there would be no change to the parish share request from 2020 to 2021 (unless there was a change in deployment in the parish eg a reduction from 1 clergy person to 0.5 clergy).

All approved.

**Money resolution**
JW outlined a technical matter. A money resolution needed to go to the 26 September 2020 Diocesan Synod (This was the resolution which would be the “Budget 2021 approval”.) The wording of the resolution needed to be included on the Synod agenda which was to be circulated on 3 September 2020. This was before the Board meeting on 9 September 2020, which would discuss the money resolution. If the figure needed to change following the discussions at the Board an amended resolution would be put to the Synod.

The Chair to propose that the Board note that a draft figure for the money resolution will be included in the Diocesan Synod agenda circulated on 03.9.20.

Approved unanimously.

**Diocesan Synod Agenda 26 September 2020 and Leeds Diocesan Board of Finance company meeting 26 September 2020**

**Circulated papers:** LB20 07 08 Draft Diocesan Synod Agenda 26 September 2020 and LB20 07 08 01 Draft notice of Leeds Diocesan Board of Finance meeting.
a) **Draft Diocesan Synod Agenda 26 September**

The Board were asked to approve the Agenda items at this meeting because the Preliminary Notice for the September Synod meeting needed to be circulated on 13 August 2020 ie before the next Board meeting on 9 September 2020. There was a contingency plan for holding the Synod if large group meetings were not permitted under the Covid-19 rules but this would not be finalised until nearer the time.

The Chair proposed that the substantive agenda items set out in LB20 07 08 Draft Diocesan Synod Agenda 26 September 2020 be approved.

The proposal was approved.

b) **Leeds DBF company meeting 26.9.20 - new date for meeting and new notice LB20 07 08 01.**

The draft Company Ordinary Resolutions had been approved at the Leeds Board meeting on 17 February 2020 for submission to the company in a general meeting to be held on 14 March 2020. That company meeting was postponed due to Covid-19. The trustees of the Leeds Diocesan Board of Finance were asked to call another meeting on 26 September 2020 at 9.30 am to consider the resolutions set out in the draft notice of a company meeting LB20 07 08 01.

There were no questions or comments.

The Chair proposed:
“That the Trustees of the Leeds Diocesan Board of Finance call a meeting of the company members to consider the resolutions set out in LB20 07 08 01”.

The proposal was approved.

---

**Response to Governance Review**

a) **Mission and Pastoral**

b) **Property Committee; and**

c) **Scrutiny**

**Circulated papers:**

- LB20 07 09 Mission and Pastoral Review report
- LB20 07 09 01 Draft Mission & Pastoral policy
- LB20 07 09 02 Draft AMPC amended constitution
- LB20 07 09 03 Draft AMPC Terms of Reference
- LB20 07 09 04 Property Committee Review Summary
Mary Chapman had been asked to review three areas in the diocesan Governance Review: the effectiveness of Mission and Pastoral structure, Property Committee and Scrutiny Panel. Mary made a number of recommendations. The proposals contained in the circulated papers were a response to the recommendations together with ideas for implementation.

a) Mission and Pastoral committee

Broadly, the proposal was for the Diocesan Mission and Pastoral Committee (DMPC) to meet once a year. The Area Mission and Pastoral Committees (AMPCs) were to report to the DMPC each year and align their report with the Diocesan Strategy. Currently, the DMPC meets each time the Leeds Board meets and the Archdeacons remain in attendance at the Board of Finance and Bishop’s Council sections of the Leeds Board meetings. If the DMPC meets once a year, the Archdeacons would only be in attendance annually.

The Board members discussed the proposals. Comments included:

- This would bring the working of the Leeds Board more in line with what was originally intended.
- How would the AMPC’s technical role and the broader strategic matters referred to in section 14 of the Terms of Reference work?
- In some episcopal areas, much of the implementation thinking happens at the area bishop’s staff meeting. However, the challenge was to get lay contribution to these discussions, rather than just the technical mission and pastoral aspects. One solution was to have the area staff meeting and the AMPC meeting at the same time.
- One challenge is to achieve consistency across the episcopal areas.
- In Ripon episcopal area the AMPC had been technical and reactive rather than proactive. To tackle this, a short presentation on a context (eg BMO, Rural) is included in AMPC meetings. This means that the AMPC has a lived example of a context when it makes its decisions. There are also small sub-committee working groups of members or the AMPC and the deanery to have informed conversations. This works well. These small groups feed back to the AMPC. This means the AMPC is fully informed, engaged and proactive.

JW confirmed that the proposals were to encourage the AMPCs to move away from the purely technical conversations to include regard to the diocesan Strategy. This would mean that the Board (DMPC) could be assured that the
decisions being taken by the AMPCs were being taken in the wider strategic context. JW had been in discussion with the archdeacons about new wording in the terms of reference to clarify the AMPCs duties and responsibilities. The issue raised (about ensuring the AMPCs were clear that they needed to consider the Strategy as well as technical matters) would be included.

The Chair proposed that:
  i. JW and the Archdeacons resolve the wording of the AMPCs terms of reference to make plain the requirement for the AMPCs to consider the diocesan Strategy as well as the technical aspect of proposals,
  ii. Subject to i) above, the proposals contained in LB20 07 09 for the DMPC/AMPCs and its Appendices 1 – 4 be approved, and
  iii. LB20 07 09 02 (the amended AMPC constitution) be submitted for approval at the next Diocesan Synod meeting.

The proposals were approved.

b) Property Committee proposals
JW outlined that, broadly, a slightly larger property committee was being proposed than that outlined in the Governance Review. The reasoning being that this would enable all the archdeacons to be on the committee. A small amendment to the terms of reference (section five) was needed. This would separate matters which came under the Repair of Benefices Measure and those which related just to DBF properties. Both would be dealt with by the Property Committee but this amendment would clarify the different types of property.

The Chair to propose that the Board approve:
  i) Subject to the small amendment to section five to clearly identify Repair of Benefice matters and DBF property matters, the proposals contained LB20 07 09 04 for the Property Committee in the LB20 07 09 06 (2) Property Committee Terms of Reference and LB20 07 09 05 amended Property Committee Scheme; and
  ii) The submission of LB20 07 09 05 the amended Property Committee Scheme for approval by the Diocesan Synod at its next meeting.

The proposals were approved.

Scrutiny proposal
JW outlined that the Scrutiny proposals were a response to Mary Chapman’s findings. The Board was being asked to provide feedback and approve the recommendation that a small working group is tasked with implementing the proposals.
The Board discussed the proposals. Feedback included:

- Synod members were being asked to give significantly more time under the proposals than currently
- The role of the Synod member included communications with the deaneries and parishes. So training in this and tools to use were needed. As well as the minutes and report after the Synod, both published on the diocesan website, Synod members could be given a simple short report of the meeting which they could use. Synod members also needed training on how to gather back information from the deaneries and parishes.
- Strategies and small forums needed to be in place to make this happen.
- General Synod has had similar issues and they have done some work on this. This information would be passed to JW.

The Chair proposed that:

i) the Leeds Board is asked to provide feedback on LB20 07 09 07 the proposals for implementation of Mary Chapman’s recommendations and
ii) the Board approves the recommendation that a small working group is tasked with implementing the proposals.

The proposals were agreed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>14</th>
<th>Net Zero Carbon Diocese Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Circulated paper:</td>
<td>LB20 07 10 Net Zero Carbon Diocese Proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presenter:</td>
<td>Jemima Parker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation:</td>
<td>PowerPoint.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Jemima Parker gave an overview of the circulated paper. The General Synod had approved a motion at its February 2020 sessions calling on all dioceses to have net zero carbon emissions by 2030. The circulated paper outlined a proposed response to this. The National Church has produced a consultation document on what is within the scope of each diocese’s emissions. This proposal was quite narrow covering energy use by church buildings and the travel of diocesan staff and clergy. The diocese had already gathered data and so was in a good position to gauge what needed to reduce emissions. Cross-diocesan department working and one hundred and twenty five Parish Environment Officers could assist with implementing proposals.

The Board members asked questions of clarification and discussed the proposal. Comments included:
• In the calculation of reduced travel, would the potential increase in emissions resulting from working from home be factored in?

JP - home heating was not be factored in to the national guidance because home heating is part of an individual’s carbon emission.

• Is the scope the same as other dioceses are using? Is the use of the transport by congregations of churches and cathedrals included in the diocesan accountability?

JP – the definition is from the national church. With regard to churches and cathedrals, while the diocese is not accountable, it would be hoped it sought to be influential.

• Why are only voluntary aided schools included?

JP – These are the schools where the diocese has most influence.

• The figures would be more meaningful if they were compared with other organisations and over time.

JP – it was hoped that in the future there would be comparable data from other dioceses. At the moment the national definition looks at churches, church property and diocesan staff travel, not individual members of a congregation.

JW – work was needed on defining what the figures mean. All the data the diocese has is from the excellent work JP has done. A working group would take this to the next stage to look at what actions were needed to meet the zero target and so that Synod could have an informed debate swiftly enough to meet the 2030 deadline.

• It was great that the diocese was moving forward after the General Synod vote. JP was thanked for all her work on this.

The Chair proposed that the Board notes and endorses the work of the Diocesan Secretary and Diocesan Environment Officer in:

a) Responding to the national Church of England consultation on what will be in scope for diocesan carbon emission accounting

b) Gathering more data on the current emissions of the Diocese

c) Establishing a cross department working group to assess the actions needed to meet the net zero target and develop an emissions reduction plan which can be embedded within the Diocesan Strategy

d) Reporting back to the Board on progress, together with clear and simple
comparators for the data, so that any necessary policy change can swiftly be brought to the Diocesan Synod, given the urgency of action required on climate change.

The proposals were agreed.

JP left the meeting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>17</th>
<th>Any other business.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appointment of member of FAIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Presenter:</strong> Jonathan Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JW outlined that Bishop Paul Slater had taken over from Bishop Jonathan Gibbs as a member of FAIC. The appointment was being brought to the Board for formal approval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Chair proposed that The Rt Revd Paul Slater be appointed to the Finance Assets and Investments Committee for a period of three years beginning on 9 July 2020.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agreed unanimously.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>18</th>
<th>Close.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Bishop of Leeds closed the meeting with the Grace.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Signed: ........................................................................................................................................................................

Date: ...........................................................................................................................................................................