

GENERAL SYNOD

OPTIMISING THE ROLE OF THE NCIs

1. The attached report was commissioned by the Joint Employment and Common Services Board (JECSB) in June and discussed at its meeting on 10 November. It has also now been considered by the Archbishops' Council, the Church Commissioners and the House of Bishops (and will be discussed at the Pensions Board later this month). It requires no decisions by Synod at this stage but is being circulated for information.
2. The report has received a general welcome from each of the various bodies that has considered it. The specific proposals for further work- on IT and on national functions exercised in relation to church buildings- have been endorsed. The Archbishops' Council has agreed to adopt the additional objective recommended at paragraph 17.
3. There are two recommendations on which no decision has yet been taken:
 - Paragraphs 59-63 touch on the **frequency and length of General Synod meetings**. Any decisions to change the present pattern would be for the Synod itself. The view of the Archbishops' Council was that it would be premature for the Synod to debate any possible change until there was more clarity over the implications of the emerging reform and renewal programme for Synodical time in the first part of the new quinquennium. The Synod has in fact already agreed dates for groups of sessions (including November contingency dates) through to the end of 2018. So, in the normal course of events it will be for the new Synod in 2016 to consider the pattern of dates beyond that.
 - Paragraphs 65-67 propose a **new enabling measure that would simplify the process for amending existing church legislation**. There was considerable interest in this idea. The options paper referred to at paragraph 67 was considered by the Archbishops' Council in November and further work was commissioned for the Council's next meeting in March. It was recognised that further work and consultation were needed before any decision was taken to bring legislative proposals to the new Synod, which is due to be elected this autumn.

William Fittall
Secretary General

12 January 2015

Optimising the Role of the NCIs

SUMMARY

- We recommend an **updated statement of the NCIs' purpose** (para 1-5)
- We see **no case for change in the core tasks of the Commissioners or Pensions Board**. There should be **an openness to moving some of the non-investment functions of the Commissioners** if a clear business advantage is established (para 6-15)
- We recommend an **additional objective for the Council**. We also offer a **tool for analysing Council activity by type of work** rather than subject matter (para 16-20)
- **A ruthless focus is needed over what, nationally, is genuinely going to add value in helping the church grow, given the serious challenge the Church faces**. The present allocation of resources should be reviewed in the light of the programme of work flowing from the other Task Groups (para 21-26)
- We are not yet sufficiently **exploiting new digital opportunities in how we communicate and manage information and improve our overall efficiency**. We recommend 3 scoping studies to develop costed business plans (para 27-32)
- We recommend that the Bishop of Worcester should lead a group to recommend within six months *what functions need to be exercised nationally in relation to the Church of England's church buildings and how might they best be carried out* (para 33-42)
- We note that the NCI role in relation to **safeguarding** is going to have to increase further. The nature of the support for bishops and dioceses will now need to be reviewed in the light of the Cahill report's recommendations for a national safeguarding service (para 43-49)
- We have identified **some areas for further efficiency savings through more modern working and recommend a progressive reduction of printing costs** through as great a possible **a move away from paper for national church business by 2020** (para 50-54)
- We don't believe it would be helpful to try and compile a list of areas of work that should stop but recommend that **the Council and the House of Bishops assess the value of areas of work in the annual business planning and budget round and identify particular areas for a deep dive** (para 55-58)
- We recommend that **the Synod normally meet for 6 days a year** (para 59-63)
- We should be asked to report every two years on progress in **increasing the amount of member level business done by conference calls and reducing the number of meetings to which people have to travel** (para 64)

- We support the Legal Office’s proposal, shortly to be considered by the Council, for legislation to create an enabling power that would enable **much of the church’s rule book to be changed by order rather than measure** (para 65-67)
- Some of what we recommend will require **new capabilities and working styles** (para 68-69)
- The JECSB should submit this report, with its own conclusions, to the **three trustee bodies** and for information to the House of Bishops (para 70).

The Task

1. John Spence's note of 27 June which gave us our mandate is at **Annex A**. It has been exhilarating but also daunting to address such far reaching issues in such a short period of time. We would not have got as far as we have without the help of diocesan colleagues and others (listed at **Annex B**) who joined us for a 24 hour away day in September. And even so we are conscious that on some issues we have not been able to get beyond some initial scoping. Further more focused work will be needed if our analysis and recommendations are accepted.
2. In thinking about the objectives of the National Church Institutions (NCIs) we found the following paragraph from the Turnbull report from 1995 a good starting point:

“4.1 The Church of England does not need a large centralised bureaucracy. Within the Church authority is dispersed. The real need is to ensure that the Archbishops, the bishops, the General Synod and others at the centre are empowered and enabled to work well for the dioceses and parishes for the good of Church and nation. Our concern has been to ensure that in future the functions carried out at the national level are only those which should be done at that level on behalf of the Church as a whole and they are done coherently, economically and well. It is clear from the evidence we received that that is also what parishes and dioceses want. “

3. This remains true, though it begs two questions:
 - How can the centre and the dioceses together best support and resource the parishes? Rapid changes in technology mean that the answer is unlikely to be the same as twenty years ago;
 - What are the criteria for identifying which functions should best be done nationally? We think the key tests should be whether by their nature they can only be done nationally or may more efficiently or cost effectively be done in one place (not necessarily in the NCIs).

A new statement of purpose and approach?

4. Though it arguably only makes explicit what is already implicit we thought it would be helpful to try and articulate in succinct form a statement of what all the work undertaken at the national level of the Church of England is for and what standards and values are brought to bear in accomplishing it. This updated version of the Turnbull paragraph may help to shape a common purpose across what are very diverse activities and be useful to trustees and Synod members as well as staff.
5. A possible formulation would be:

“The primary mission and ministry of the Church of England is carried out in local communities. The purpose of the work undertaken at national level, in partnership with the dioceses, is designed to resource that mission and ministry. It consists of those activities which either, by their nature, can only be done nationally or are most effectively and efficiently done nationally. The National Church Institutions seek to ensure that work undertaken nationally is characterised by the professionalism, imagination, creativity and, integrity of their staff, with a focus on outcomes and customer service.”

The NCIs' objectives

6. As Annex A notes, the roles and objectives of the Church Commissioners and the Pensions Board are less complex and ambiguous than those of the Archbishops' Council. The Pensions Board exists to provide **retirement services** for those who have served or worked for the Church. The services consist of pension schemes and, for the clergy, retirement housing. As the funded clergy scheme established in 1998 continues to grow the investment management function for the Board becomes ever more important (some £1.5bn funds under management in 2013.)
7. While there continue to be important challenges around how the Board ensures the delivery of high quality services which meet the needs of its customers, **we have not identified any need for change in its role or objectives** (nor would the idea, floated in the 1980s of combining the Board and the Commissioners now be feasible given the differing regulatory frameworks surrounding the two main funds).
8. The pension schemes and retirement housing arrangements clearly need administering nationally (which also makes it easier to comply with the distinct legal frameworks under which both have to operate). It was reassuring to hear from diocesan colleagues that the more consultative style that the Pensions Board has adopted in the past few years in relation to funding challenges and other policy changes has been well received.
9. The core function of the Church Commissioners is to **manage the Church of England's historic national endowment** (some £6.1bn at the end of 2013) and make money available for distribution by the Archbishops' Council to support mission and ministry across the Church.
10. In addition, while some of its functions were transferred to the Archbishops' Council in 1999, the Commissioners retain **some more general Church functions**. The most significant of these are to administer the legal framework and exercise certain appellate functions in relation to pastoral reorganisation, make schemes for the closing of church buildings, pay directly for episcopal ministry and some cathedral costs, provide housing for diocesan bishops and administer the clergy pay role.
11. **The core function of the Commissioners in relation to investment management is clear and not in question.** The other Church functions-with the possible exception of providing see houses, which could in principle be owned and managed within dioceses if there were a sufficient will on all sides for change (that is not something we have felt able to explore in the time available) - all clearly need to be done at national level.
12. It is largely a matter of history that they are a Church Commissioner responsibility. The National Institutions Measure created an enabling power for transferring these functions elsewhere by order. We see no point in doing so simply for the purpose of rearranging the deckchairs. The test should be whether there would be a business advantage.
13. We do identify below the need to reassess what the NCIs should be doing to support the church in its stewardship of church buildings. That will inevitably include reviewing which member level body should best provide oversight.
14. We also note that it might help clarify responsibilities and priorities at member level if all non-pension distributions to support the mission and ministry of the Church were distributed and prioritised by the Archbishops' Council rather than support for episcopal and cathedral ministry being provided directly by the Commissioners and overseen by their Bishops and Cathedrals Committee.
15. The Commissioners do, though, retain some relevant statutory duties and successive Spending Plan Task Groups have in practice sustained close working between the Commissioners and Council. So we flag this point rather than recommending any change for now.

16. The Archbishops' Council's statutory remit is to **“co-ordinate, promote, aid and further the work and mission of the Church of England”**. To that end it agreed with the House of Bishops three quinquennial themes namely to, “promote spiritual and numerical growth, contribute to the common good and reimagine ministry.” The objectives of the Archbishops' Council which were set some years ago in 2008 are:

“(i) *to enhance the Church's mission by:*

promoting spiritual and numerical growth

enabling and supporting the worshipping Church and encouraging and promoting new ways of being Church, and

engaging with issues of social justice and environmental stewardship

(ii) *to sustain and advance the Church's work in education, lifelong learning and discipleship;*

(iii) *to enable the Church to select, train and resource the right people, both ordained and lay, to carry out public ministry and to encourage lay people in their vocation to the world; and*

(iv) *to encourage the maintenance and development of the inherited fabric of Church buildings for worship and service to the community.”*

17. These objectives were drawn up by a group of Archbishops' Council members and helpfully reflect the work respectively of the MPA, Education, Ministry and the Cathedral and Church Buildings Divisions. If the Council decides to retain the framework of its present objectives **we think that a fifth might usefully be added** to capture another important strand of its work:

(v) *to strengthen the institutional effectiveness of the Church through promoting good governance, risk management, robust financial systems and a framework of law that is fit for purpose”*

18. We are aware that the Council is due in November to consider its business plan for 2015 and that will give it the chance to consider whether these four or five objectives remain sufficiently sharp and clear to shape what the Archbishops' Council is and should be doing. If present activities were analyzed by type of work rather than objectives they might be categorized roughly as follows:

- **Providing thought leadership and supporting policy development and the preparation of legislation in those areas where the Church needs national rules or policies;**
- **Advancing the Church's interests externally (for example in negotiations with Whitehall, supporting Bishops in the Lords, managing ecumenical relations etc);**
- **Providing services for and advice to bishops/dioceses/parishes/church schools (e.g. running selection conferences, giving advice on changes to church buildings, undertaking research and publishing national statistics);**
- **Promoting the financial wellbeing of the Church, distributing funds for mission and ministry, and promoting effective risk management;**
- **Spreading good practice, sustaining networks and running particular national initiatives (eg promoting minority ethnic concerns, running the Weddings, Christenings and Funerals projects, supporting the work of HE chaplains.)**

19. For completeness it is important to note that an additional responsibility of the Archbishops' Council is to employ and oversee staff whose work is tasked not only by its sub committees such as the MPA Council but by other legally constituted bodies which are not accountable to

the Archbishops' Council. These are the committees or commissions of the General Synod, the House of Bishops and statutory bodies such as the Church Buildings Council, Cathedral Fabrics Commission and Dioceses Commission.

20. Since the Archbishops' Council prepares the annual budget, which has to be approved by the General Synod, it has some scope for influencing priorities and resource allocations in relation to these bodies. But it is likely to continue to have to rely primarily on coalition building and co-ordination. More detail about the present NCI structures is attached at **Annex C**.

New opportunities and challenges

21. First, **the biggest challenge faced by the Church continues to be how to secure spiritual and numerical growth** rather than having to devote disproportionate energy simply to managing the consequences of decline. We can't directly grow the Church from Church House Westminster. And there is a lot of good honest 'backroom' work which has to be done simply because we are a very large institution with people to be paid, pension schemes to be run, investments to be managed and so on.
22. But **much that is done from Church House is directly about facilitating growth**, for example:
- the work of the National Mission and Evangelism Adviser,
 - the promotion of young vocations to full time ministry,
 - the support of the church's work in education and among children and young people more generally,
 - the promotion of wider community use of church buildings,
 - the projects to promote a missional approach to the occasional offices (through which half a million people attend Anglican services each week),
 - CHP's development of the Pilgrim resources,
 - the *Anecdote to Evidence* research,
 - the support of diocesan teams in devising mission and ministry plans.
23. If we are not seen, both via the dioceses and directly, to be resourcing the frontline in parishes in trying to promote growth and doing all we can to relieve unnecessary administrative burdens that get in the way of that, something is wrong. Whether we prefer the imagery of a burning platform or a melting icecap the fact is that the Church of England is facing a serious situation.
24. The age profile of the membership, the forthcoming clergy retirement bulge and the impact that a declining base of committed givers will have on church finances will call into question the Church's ability to sustain a Christian presence in every community unless a serious and effective growth strategy is pursued.
25. **We believe a ruthless focus is needed over what, nationally, is genuinely going to add value in helping the church grow.** The work of the other Task Groups should help produce that and prompt questions over whether the present application of resources to the areas listed in paragraph 22 is right.
26. We have in the time available identified three further areas of particular challenge and opportunity that may not emerge from the other Task group work:
- the consequences and opportunities of the digital and information revolution,
 - the stewardship of church buildings and
 - safeguarding.

The consequences of the digital and information revolution

27. There have been huge changes in the last 10 years in how people communicate and access information. This impacts on how we work in organisations and relate to our world as private individuals as a result of the ease and speed at which complex material can be published and updated, the ability to access a huge range of information through all sorts of digital devices at any time of the day or night, the growth in new interactive platforms such as Twitter, Linked In and Facebook and the decline in printed media.
28. We think the NCIs need to:
 - a) explore and exploit the potential for a **different kind of engagement with the public** on the Church nationally;
 - b) improve – and potentially develop – their capacity to publish, hold and **make more accessible Church information and data for the benefit of Church office holders** (ordained and lay) **and staff** (parish, Diocesan and NCI);
 - c) work with dioceses – in line with the views expressed at the last meeting of the Inter-Diocesan Finance Forum – **to improve the efficiency of Church IT sourcing and access to IT business expertise** to improve capability in our IS and IT management.
29. In the time available we have been able to do no more than sketch out possibilities. We attach at Annex D some information about present websites and portals and at Annex E some more material on the rationale for each project and associated issues and risks. The question for now is **whether one or more of these looks sufficiently promising to warrant some commitment of resource to work up a costed business plan. We believe all merit further scoping.**
30. Attempting any accurate costings at this stage is hazardous. The initial scoping work over the coming months will need to involve outside support and is likely to cost a significant five figure sum. This might be within the range of what the Council and Commissioners could find by judicious budget management.
31. Delivery would cost substantially more and would need to be planned into budgets. We find it impossible at this stage to assess what the balance would be between one off and ongoing expenditure or to recommend how much should be funded by levying the dioceses or top-slicing money which would otherwise have been distributed to dioceses.
32. A key part of the scoping work would be to establish the benefits as well as the costs. We expect there to be reductions in opportunity cost (time no longer spent searching for the correct piece of information; duplicating data entry); savings in direct costs (cheaper IT kit as well as opportunities to save money at the centre– collecting once and using many times will give us economies of scale and probably also non-financial benefits around accuracy, business continuity and data security.

Church Buildings

33. The Church of England is responsible for 42 cathedrals and 16,000 parish churches, over 12,000 of them listed and half of them built before the Reformation. Many of them are landmark buildings within their local community. The Church of England has stewardship of 45% of the grade 1 listed buildings of England. Yet the Church of England is not an institution whose defining purposes are related to heritage and culture.
34. Nationally there are two separate staff teams with responsibilities relating to church buildings: the Cathedral and Church Buildings Division (CCB) of the Archbishops' Council, and the closed churches team within the Pastoral and Closed Churches Department (P&CCD) of the Church Commissioners. The former supports two statutory bodies (the Church Buildings

Council and the Cathedral Fabrics Commission), the latter the Church Buildings (Uses and Disposals) Committee of the Commissioners.

35. The main purposes of the CCB are to:
- Provide advice, training and best practice on development of cathedral and church buildings for mission, worship and community engagement and supporting the Cathedrals Fabric Commission in the exercise of certain determinative powers..
 - Campaign with Government and others to ensure a fair deal for church buildings.
 - Raise funds and distribute grants to cathedrals and parish churches.
 - Undertake initiatives to assist those in dioceses, chapters and parishes responsible for church buildings.
36. The main purposes of the part of the P&CCD which deals with closing or closed churches (in other words, excluding the main part of the department, which supports dioceses on pastoral reorganisation, parsonage and glebe matters) are:
- Advising dioceses on legal and practical matters settling the future of churches closed for regular public worship.
 - Hearing representations about proposals for the closure and/or reuse of buildings used for public worship.
37. At first glance, the obvious question is why should there be two distinct teams, reporting to different member level bodies, sat in different parts of Church House advising the same dioceses about church buildings, one team keen to help dioceses keep church buildings open and the other facilitating the closure process initiated by a diocesan bishop.
38. The Church of England's approach to its buildings is in practice always likely to include an element of creative tension because the buildings are at one and the same time a huge opportunity and privilege and a weighty responsibility. But whether this tension is managed most creatively by having two teams with distinct cultures and priorities repays some thought given that this is the result of separate institutional and legislative histories.
39. There was also a view at one time that it was helpful for certain statutory and appellate responsibilities to rest with the Commissioners since this ensured that the work was financed from their investment income rather than by the dioceses, which might be reluctant to fund through vote 2 the work of those reviewing their decisions.
40. Neither history nor separation of funding streams seems to us, however, to be a knock-down argument. We believe that the time has come to step back and ask, without starting from the present division of responsibilities, the key underlying question namely "*what functions need to be exercised nationally to advance the mission of the Church of England through its use and stewardship of church buildings and how might they best be carried out.*"
41. This exercise in optimising the role of the NCIs, together with the appointment of a new lead bishop for church buildings, Chair Designate of the Church Buildings Council and a still relatively new Third Commissioner, make this the right moment to ask this question from first principles. The leaders of the two teams, Janet Gough and Paul Lewis, have committed themselves, and their staff, to work together towards such an agenda.
42. **We recommend that the Bishop of Worcester, as the new lead bishop, should chair a small review group, to include the current Second and Third Estates Commissioners and someone who can bring a fresh critical eye to the subject, to produce recommendations to the Archbishops' Council and the Church Commissioners within six months.**

Safeguarding and other advice services

43. The resource that the Archbishops' Council and dioceses have had to commit to safeguarding work has grown hugely even over the past year. There have also been calls on the Commissioners' funds in connection with inquiries and legal costs. The large programme of work- including fresh legislation- flowing from the work of the Chichester Commissaries' report is set to expand further as a result of the recently established public inquiry and now the recommendations of the Cahill report.
44. The appointment in the New Year of the Church of England's first full time National Safeguarding Officer will be just the first stage in assembling a national team to resource the very substantial programme of activity that is going to be unavoidable for the next few years.
45. The Cahill report published on 22 October proposes that the child protection advisers available to bishops and dioceses should be part of a new national service. The recommendation is clearly driven by the perception that this would secure greater independence for the advisers and enable them to escalate issues where, in their professional judgement, they are not being properly handled locally by a diocesan bishop.
46. This recommendation will clearly need to be considered carefully, not least because it raises some significant issues of authority and accountability in a church which is at one and the same time national, provincial and episcopal.
47. We simply note that if it were decided to employ all advisers as part of a national service rather than relying on policies and protocols to secure their professional independence the question would arise whether a similar model should in due course be followed for other areas such as HR and the provision of legal advice.
48. Past trials of national provision (for example internal audit and HR to support the introduction of common tenure) have not flourished, partly because of the ecclesial weight of the diocese and partly perhaps because Church House Westminster can seem a long way away, even if it has out-posted staff. In addition, we did not detect in our 24 hour consultation a strong desire on the part of diocesan colleagues for a significant expansion in central service offered by the NCIs'.
49. Small group discussions at a recent IDFF did, however, reveal quite a wide range of views with support for more central development of IT services and from some for more centralised provision of legal and HR services. The creation of the Church of England Central Services Company has provided a vehicle through which this would be possible if there were sufficient demand. Our expectation is that this is more likely to come about by a process of evolution than sudden change.

Inefficiencies and other potential savings

50. In the past decade **real terms expenditure on Vote 2 has decreased by nearly a third**. This has been through reducing investment in various areas of work (including liturgical and ecumenical), introducing smarter ways of working (introduction of open plan working and removal of personal secretary posts) and reducing over generous staff term of service (closing of defined benefit scheme for new staff, new severance terms).
51. Much of the low hanging fruit in terms of potential efficiency savings has, therefore, already been harvested. But we still have further to go to keep up with ever changing, modern practices. Areas where we are now reviewing our performance include: use of space in Church House (too much storage of paper, not enough hot desking); management and control of travel; scope for rationalising provision of IT kit- including mobile devices- to staff; and effectiveness of training and development.

52. One obvious area for further progress is the **reduction of printing papers for member level meetings**. Each of the NCIs (and the Business Committee of the Synod) has relied ever more on electronic distribution of material for meetings over the past few years. But there have necessarily been judgements to make over how far to go in abolishing paper given the working preferences of some members (many of them volunteers) and the need to enable everyone to function effectively as a trustee, a member of Synod or a contributor to one of the other commissions or committees.
53. Sending material electronically only for people to print off inefficiently at home would be a false economy. So, while increasing numbers of Synod members have opted out of paper copies, much paper is still produced: the printing and posting of the papers for the July General Synod alone cost some £20,000. The total cost of a year's worth of papers for all of the Commissioners' Committees and Board, including printing and postage, has been costed at £40,000.
54. We do not suggest that there can be a single, at a stroke answer to this across all national bodies. But we think each of the trustee bodies, the other statutory bodies (for example the Dioceses Commission, the Church Buildings Council and the Cathedral Fabrics Commission) and the Business Committee in respect of the Synod should each commit themselves to **reviewing by the end of this quinquennium the full cost of their printing with a view to achieving substantial reductions in the next quinquennium and, so far as possible, a wholesale move away from paper by 2020**. The Church Commissioners will be considering their reliance on paper copies at their next meeting.
55. In terms of work which could be reduced or curtailed at the national level we are mindful of the fact that, when preparing a financial strategy for 2010-2015 a group chaired by Andrew Britton initially identified some possible areas for reduced investment and these immediately became the focus for intense lobbying. The list was not pursued.
56. In the course of the away-day we asked diocesan colleagues if there were any areas of work where they had questions whether the scale of the present national investment was too great. The four areas that they mentioned were **ecumenical work, liturgical work, the extent and range of public affairs work and whether all the present work of the Ministry Division needed to be done nationally**. On the first three they noted that the work done nationally was not particularly visible to them.
57. As to these we would note that:
- Ecumenical and liturgical work has borne the brunt of cuts over the past decade and on the former there has also now been streamlining with Lambeth. So unless the work can be stopped entirely- which seems doubtful to us, though that can only be a judgement for the Archbishops' Council and the House of Bishops- there is probably little scope for further reduction.
 - The challenge of public advocacy and getting the voice of Church of England representatives heard nationally has grown over recent years and will continue to do so. That is why we invested more by creating a Parliamentary Unit, strengthening the Legal Office and doing a major restructuring of the Communications Office. The scope for reduction on public affairs work is not, therefore, obvious to us
 - There are indeed some real questions about the right balance of work between dioceses and Church House in relation to the support, resourcing and reimagining of ministry. These are being addressed in the Resourcing Ministerial Exercise and in the planned restructuring of the Ministry Division on which a consultation was launched on 7 October. They include some fundamental questions about the future of the House of Bishops' Regulations and of Vote 1.

58. So rather than start by drawing up a further list simply for it to become another battle ground, it seems to us that the more fruitful approach is for the Archbishops' Council and the House of Bishops to assess the value of particular areas of work in the context of the annual business planning and budget round and from time to time identify particular areas for a deep dive (as we have recommended ourselves now in relation to church buildings).

Governance, structures and legislation

59. **Our structures are large, legislatively determined, complex, hungry of member and staff resource and embody some confusion between accountability and representation.** For all that, and in the light of the experience of the Bridge Review of Synodical Government and the Baxter Review of Boards and Councils we are wary of a further attempt at far reaching structural reform since there is a high probability that, like those exercises, they would consume much energy only to founder. We say this with some regret because there are in our view still far too many national committees.
60. We think that it **may be better to focus on a small number of changes that may be achievable and would do much to reduce actual and opportunity costs. Even they, will, however, be controversial and require significant leadership and coalition building.** Change in the Church of England is not generally achieved by fiat.
61. So far as we are aware, **the General Synod meets more than any comparable Anglican body in these islands or in the Anglican Communion.** Given the unique role of the Synod as a legislature, which is making public law, we can see, not least at a time of reform, that it needs to continue to meet twice a year (as the law requires). Otherwise the gestation period for legislation would be lengthened.
62. But even allowing for the importance of time for deliberation and relationship building **we seriously question whether 9 days (plus an additional 3 contingency days) need to be set aside in the diaries of 470 members and many staff every year.** The opportunity- quite aside from the actual- cost of this in terms of time that could be spent on other work for the Kingdom is huge.
63. We offer as a basis for discussion the proposal that **Synod should (save for the inaugural Synod once in five years) normally meet for a maximum of 6 days a year,** This might perhaps be Tuesday to Thursday in London in February and Friday afternoon to Monday lunchtime in York. This will provide an ample allowance for legislation to be dealt with and for other matters to be considered whether in debates or smaller groups.
64. It also seems to us that there is still much too much reluctance to transact national church business by conference calls. The default is that committees need to travel, usually to London. Of course some meetings such as the Synod can only properly be conducted face to face. But **the trustee bodies and the Business Committee of the Synod should ask us and the Clerk to the Synod to report every two years on progress to reducing the number of meetings for which people have to travel.**
65. Finally, Church legislation remains remarkably prescriptive over process. The sort of thing that would have been put in parliamentary regulations and order even when two of us joined Whitehall nearly four decades ago are still being put in measures. Church primary legislation from 1533 to 2003 runs to some 1400 pages in Halsbury's Statutes.
66. As a result simple reforms such as changing the membership of statutory bodies, modifying appointments processes, streamlining consultation processes and so on generally requires fresh primary legislation that then has to go through the full synodical process and then to Parliament.
67. The Legal Office has developed some thinking on how this might be addressed **by legislation creating a new enabling power.** It would give further impetus to the simplification process and enable the NCIs and those who work for them to be a good deal more responsive in adapting

processes to changing needs. We welcome the intention to produce an options paper for discussion by the Archbishops' Council in November.

Capabilities and working styles

68. Some of what we recommend can be delivered within existing resources and the capabilities of our staff teams. But some of what we recommend, especially the development of new IT resources, will put a premium on programme and change management skills and the development of management information systems.
69. We shall need to buy in some of this expertise. But we shall also need to review the competencies required of our existing staff teams and the learning and development we provide them. This will need to be one of the early tasks of our new HR Director, who arrives on 17 November.

Next steps

70. We were commissioned to submit this report to the JECSB for its November meeting. Given the range of issues covered, we recommend that the Board forward it, with its own conclusions to the three trustee bodies and, for information, to the House of Bishops. It needs to be considered alongside the work of the other Task Groups since its recommendations, if agreed, should form part of the wider reform programme which they are proposing.

Andrew Brown

William Fittall

Bernadette Kenny

31 October 2014

Archbishop of Canterbury
Archbishop of York

cc. Bishop of Sheffield,
Bishop of Willesden
Lord Green
Andreas Whittam Smith
Jonathan Spencer

Optimising the role of the NCIs

1. The purpose of this note is to inform the Archbishops and the chairs of task groups about a work stream being initiated by the Joint Employment and Common Services Board (JECBSB) concerning how the NCIs can best serve parishes and dioceses. Your support in principle for the work, and your suggestions as to specific issues and areas of attention, will be appreciated.

2. The structure of the NCIs is deliberately complicated. Legislation has been used to create checks and balances. The chairs and CEOs of the NCIs have worked closely on collaboration, driving synergy and developing common cultures.

3. There are many hypotheses as to what creates culture. One of these suggests that culture, as well as owing a good deal to history, is driven by:

- The organisation's clarity of role and objectives and, therefore, the clarity owned by the departments and individuals therein;
- The performance management practices in terms of individual development, coaching and accountability;
- The behaviour of the leaders of the organisation and whether it aligns with the statements on purpose and performance management.

4. The role of the Church Commissioners and Pensions Board is relatively clear but that of the Archbishops' Council is more complex and ambiguous. There are areas where the Council provides central support, others where it delivers a service, others where it is – or possibly should be – leading change or at least helping bishops to do so. And while some roles may be clear, we need also to be confident that those roles work together in a complementary way.

5. Since my appointment 9 months ago I have been increasingly concerned by the constant pressures on the Archbishops' Council personnel who are pulled in many different ways but operate in an environment where any increase in costs is unwelcome. Indeed, the fact that the Council is virtually entirely dependent on Vote 2 for its income means an ever greater focus on doing less; in the last decade this levy on dioceses has increased by only 3% in cash terms, a decrease of a third compared with RPI.

6. Various factors are driving the need to consider a change of approach:

- The Task Groups now underway will produce agendas for change and modernisation which need to be resourced and delivered;
- The research programme “from anecdote to evidence” brings home the degree to which current policies are not achieving their desired outcomes;
- The recent working session with the Lloyds Banking Group (initiated by the Archbishop of Canterbury) highlighted what is possible and the scale of the

opportunity. We were challenged to do once only those things that are best or can only be done once. We were also warned that success requires focus, determination, organisation and adequate resourcing;

- One example for me is to drive accessibility to the Church through digital and mobile technology for which we have virtually no competence or capacity but which is increasingly the channel of choice for the younger generations (and many of the older as well). Secondly, with the support of the Council, the Secretary General made an attempt to simplify governance and committee structures within Church House in 2009 but has not had the capacity to return to the issue following rejection at the Synod. Thirdly, there is little scope to deliver thought leadership to the dioceses so that a central source of information and advice can enable the optimisation of practices at local level.

7. Moreover, discussions within the JECSB reveal consensus that there is considerable scope for enhanced performance, greater contribution and heightened efficiency through the development of shared values, greater clarity of leadership and stronger management.

8. Our current value strengths are agreed to include integrity, commitment and compliance but there is a deemed lack of challenge and surfeit of paternalism. Values of innovation, creativity, change resilience and persuasiveness are lacking. All of these point to the need to review our competencies, capabilities and capacity as well as the range and focus of the work undertaken by NCI staff. And the quality and determination of our leaders will be critical to success.

9. The JECSB has therefore commissioned the CEOs and other senior executives to urgently begin a work stream which will:

- Review the current objectives of each NCI and make proposals for amendment, identifying where there are areas of work where there is scope for development, refocusing of effort or new initiative and where we need to work together and with others in some new or different way;
- Take account of the emerging findings from the Task Groups, and the views of key stakeholders and our own people to determine priorities for developing or diminishing competencies, capabilities and capacity in particular areas of our work.
- Identify the desired set of values to deliver the above, and the means by which such culture and values can be developed, embedded and sustained;
- Identify the personal qualities and virtues upon which such culture and values will depend, to be established both as essential criteria for recruitment and as key priorities for development.
- The operating, resource and financial implications of all the above which will in turn enable recommendations on future funding. Within this we will particularly focus on scope for improved cross-NCI working.
- Pull all of this together into a work plan with clear deliverables, timescales and accountabilities.

9. It will be critical that this work is completed in late 2014 to chime with the outputs from the Task Groups and to ensure that the resource can be brought in place in time to deliver the change programme which results. As previously stated, I shall be pleased to consider any suggestions to improve or clarify these outlined terms of reference.

10. While this work will be undertaken under the aegis of the JECSB we will again espouse the principles of transparency and connectivity.

John Spence

27 June 2014

Participants in 24 hour away day

| | |
|-------------------|--|
| Michael Arlington | Chair Southwell and Nottingham DBF |
| John Ball | Diocesan Secretary, Chelmsford |
| Charlie Beddowes | Executive Assistant to Secretary General |
| Kay Brock | Chief of Staff Lambeth |
| Andrew Brown | Secretary, Church Commissioners |
| Maureen Cole | Diocesan Secretary, Derby |
| Mike Eastwood | Diocesan Secretary, Liverpool |
| William Fittall | Secretary General, Archbishops' Council |
| Bernadette Kenny | Chief Executive, Pensions Board |
| Jacqui Philips | Director, Central Secretariat |
| Pete Broadbent | Bishop of Willesden |

The event was facilitated by Dr Peter Shaw

The Church of England's Central Structures

1. The NCIs of the Church of England now consist of 8 separate legal entities namely the Archbishops' Council, Church Commissioners, Pensions Board, the recently established Church of England Central Services Company (ChECS)- which is wholly owned by the three main NCIs and has Andrew, Bernadette and me as its joint chief executives- the National Society, Lambeth Palace Library and each of the Archbishops in his corporate capacity. The Corporation of Church House which owns Church House Westminster runs a successful conference centre and is the NCIs landlord but is not an NCI and is outside the scope of this review.
2. Bishopthorpe, Lambeth and Lambeth Palace Library have largely been outside the scope of this exercise, except to the extent that they, like the parishes and dioceses, are customers for the work done at Church House. The National Society has not been looked at separately since it is the managing employer for only one quite junior member of staff (for historic reasons to do with pensions) and is, at least in England, primarily an agent of the Archbishops' Council (separate work has been done to put the relationship between the National Society and the Archbishops' Council on a new, clearer basis).
3. Each of the three main trustee bodies – the Archbishops' Council, Church Commissioners and the Pensions Board – is established under legislation. Their powers and duties can be changed by the General Synod (as happened with the National Institutions Measure 1998, which created the Council and changed some of the powers of the Commissioners).
4. In addition the Synod can request each or all of the trustee bodies to consider acting in a particular way – for example in relation to ethical investment. But neither the Synod nor the House of Bishops, which is one of the three houses of Synod, can direct the trustees how to discharge their statutory and other fiduciary responsibilities.
5. In addition, none of the trustee bodies can give directions to the other. The Archbishops' Council statutory role of coordinating the work of the Church of England more generally falls far short of a power of direction. The three main bodies need in practice to work very closely together. That they do so owes much to the relationship between the three chief executives and the three 'chairs'.
6. The Council has a number of functions which require it to operate very closely with the other main NCIs on specific issues. Thus, for example the Council is responsible for remuneration (including pensions) policy in relation to the clergy. But the Pensions Board administers the pension schemes. Similarly the Archbishops' Council and Church Commissioners have to work together on the use of the Church of England's national endowments since the Church Commissioners manage it and decide how much can be distributed to the dioceses but the Archbishops' Council decides how it is distributed.
7. Most staff across all 8 NCIs are jointly employed by all of them. The main exceptions are the Chief Officers, the Church Commissioners' 34 asset management staff, the 68 staff employed by the Church Commissioners on local property management for the Hyde Park Estate and the 124 staff employed by the Pensions Board in their residential homes.
8. This exercise has focused on the work done in Church House, where there are 362 members of staff¹ and the member level bodies to whom they report (which are not just the NCIs- see paragraphs 26-28 below). The managing employers of these 362 are:

¹ A very small number of these are in fact based elsewhere, for example the national rural officer, some Commissioner property staff and a few others who work from home.

- **ChECS 136,**
- **Archbishops' Council (including National Society) 101,**
- **Church Commissioners 68** (of whom 34 on asset management and 34 others) and
- **Pensions Board 57.**

9. The heads of the various service functions which, for accounting purposes, are now brigaded in ChECS are line managed by one or other of the three chief officers depending on the function. Each of the functions provides services for each of the other NCIs, including in some cases Lambeth and Bishopthorpe.

10. The shared services functions provided by ChECS (IT, HR the Legal Office, Comms, Finance and Accounting, Internal Audit, Records Management) are overwhelmingly delivered for the NCIs to enable them to do their business rather than being services provided directly to dioceses and parishes, though some staff in these teams are involved in policy development and other work that involves much engagement with dioceses.

11. But when ChECS was being established recently as a legal entity in its own right it was deliberately set up in a way which would, in future, make it easier for services to be provided, tax efficiently, to dioceses and parishes if a demand developed in future.

12. It's also important, when talking of the NCIs' role in providing services for dioceses and parishes not to elide that with the work of ChECS. There is much service delivery to dioceses and others from Church House which is being provided directly from the Council, Commissioners and Pensions Board rather than ChECS.

13. These services are not, provided on a contractual basis. The work of the Pensions Board teams is funded from pension contributions, rents paid by tenants, a contribution from the dioceses through the apportionment for retired housing and some charitable funding. Nearly all of the Archbishops' Council funding comes from what is levied from the dioceses through the apportionment. In the case of the Commissioners their costs are met from the returns on their investments.

Current Provision

1. The following information resources are currently available on the Church of England website or related web portals:

- **Parish Resources website**

This includes very substantial and comprehensive information on regulatory and legal matters aimed mainly at PCC's and parish clergy. Subjects covered include the following:

- Charity Commission requirements
- Employing paid and voluntary workers
- Office administration
- Managing finances, including regulatory requirements
- Procurement, parish giving, managing Church buildings

Some of this information is put together by Archbishops' Council staff, some is information culled from external bodies such as the Charity Commission, and some material is authored by external consultants. It is also worth noting that the Parish Resources website is a separate portal to the Church of England website, as a decision was taken that the current Church of England website is too complex to be accessible and searchable by the dioceses and parishes.

<http://www.parishresources.co.uk/>

- **The Legal Office**

The Legal Office pages of the Church of England website contain various materials, mostly in the form of legislation (notably the Canons and the Church Representation Rules). They also contain recently given Opinions of the Legal Advisory Commission, which are in addition to the CHP volume of Opinions last published in 2007. The Legal Office produces a variety of briefing materials on an *ad hoc* basis on new legislation which are of use to dioceses and parishes, but in some cases they are sent direct to relevant officers in the dioceses (including, depending on the subject matter, bishops, archdeacons, diocesan secretaries and diocesan registrars) rather than being posted on the website. In general these materials relate to new Measures and other ecclesiastical legislation but sometimes also address other issues (eg changes in immigration law).

<https://www.churchofengland.org/about-us/structure/churchlawlegis.aspx>

- **Mission and Public Affairs**

The 'Views' pages of the Church of England website hold a variety of materials outlining the Church's thinking on current domestic and foreign policy matters. These range from General Synod documents, to interviews with Bishops, the Church's responses to Government consultations, to publications produced by the Church of England and related bodies.

<https://www.churchofengland.org/our-views.aspx>

- **Liturgical Materials**

Liturgical materials for use by parishes (eg services for WWI commemorations) are on a separate page on the Church of England website. The Transforming Worship website is resourced by the Liturgical Commission with topical liturgical materials and assistance with the Common Worship library.

<http://www.transformingworship.org.uk/>

<https://www.churchofengland.org/ww1>

- **Safeguarding Policies**

These are available on the Safeguarding web page of the Church of England website and are updated as they are revised.

<https://www.churchofengland.org/clergy-office-holders/child-protection-safeguarding.aspx>

- **Cathedral and Church Buildings**

The Church Care website provides information for all those in the dioceses and parishes who are managing a church building,

<http://www.churchcare.co.uk/>

2. There is therefore quite a substantial corpus of high-quality information on a range of matters from the National Church for use by dioceses and parishes. However, the following observations could be made about it at present

- **No single portal:** The information is quite widely dispersed across a number of different parts of the Church of England website and indeed across different external websites. There is no single access point for information and it has to be gleaned from a variety of sources.
- **Difficulty in finding the information:** The information is not easily searchable on the Church of England website and is not always that clearly flagged on the front page.
- **Lack of a common format:** The presentation and format of the material varies and there is no common ‘branding’ of national Church information and material.
- **Varying quality of presentation:** The websites themselves are of varying visual quality and technical sophistication.
- **Use of a single medium:** Although there are some film and audio clips, most of the information is in Word-based format. Given the changes in how people are now used to receiving information (particularly younger generations), is it worth reviewing whether the word-based medium is always appropriate?
- **Inconsistent follow-up:** Contact details are usually provided with the material, but the exact form of any follow up information service is not always specified.
- **Passive presentation:** Most of the information is ‘pull’ information which has to be proactively searched for by the end-users. The Church Care and Parish resources websites do have Twitter feeds updating their followers on new information, but this is not the case for the other websites.

Conclusions

3. The main issues appear to be with the web-medium used, the presentation and branding of information, communication and follow-up. Areas for further consideration could therefore include:

- How the provision of national Church information could be aligned with the overall website project so that this wealth of information is presented in an easily accessible, attractive and coherent way at a single access point.
- The way that this information is presented and the need for some kind of common ‘branding’ which makes it clear that this is information provided as a service to dioceses and parishes by the national Church. It might be helpful to have a short common ‘template’ for all national Church material. This would be particularly helpful for position papers on policy issues.

- Has sufficient due diligence been done on any liability implications of providing such information eg advice which is mistaken, or which inadvertently leads to maladministration by the end-user etc?
- Should more investment be put into a follow-up service eg a single information helpline for those who need further assistance, rather than several different contact points?
- Much of the material takes the form of quite lengthy Word documents. Could some of this be shortened or presented in different ways eg short films, online tutorials, vox pops, two-page Position Papers on policy issues etc?
- Information suppliers: should the information be put together by internal staff or by external providers (external law firms, training advisers, subject matter experts)? What would be the advantages or disadvantages of outsourcing more information provision?
- Could there be more coordination between the different departments providing material so that it is presented on a single site and with a more unified presentation style?
- How is the material communicated? Although some of the websites offer mailing lists or Twitter feeds, others rely on end-users finding them through search engines or the Church of England website's current (highly unreliable) search mechanism. If a more unified approach is taken to pulling information together, could new media be used more effectively to update end-users on new and useful guidance as it becomes available or current?

Projects to exploit new digital opportunities- Supplementary material

a. Digital Engagement

1. The Communications Office has significantly increased its production of digital material and use of social media since its major restructuring in 2013. But this has merely served to flag how much more could be done.
2. We see scope for an NCI led project to develop the enhanced use of digital media to provide an easily accessible, clear and compelling national message about the Church of England - what it is and what it teaches. The target audience would be groups of people who do not know about the Church and do not have any particular faith affiliation. Once developed this would require ongoing resourcing.
3. The need is to address the urgency of the decline in attendance at Church of England services and the absence of the 16-25 age-group from active engagement. The digital revolution offers the Church an opportunity to engage with non-Church audiences – and this audience in particular - using methods and messages which inform and educate as the starting point for encouraging deeper interest over time.

Rationale

4. We do not currently target this group nationally in any effective way, whether through our content or the methods we use. The overhaul of the current website - only four years old but now woefully out of date – demonstrates the pace of change and the need for investment. This website is confused (much of the content is for Church members, including some highly specialised audiences such as Synod members and pension scheme members) and hard to navigate.
5. In addition to unmediated access to print and word based communication there is an increasing opportunity for info graphic, video and audio presentation of the Church's message. We can make good use of the new opportunities offered by social media (Facebook, Twitter, YouTube etc) as well as to create an externally facing website (ie for the general and public user). The internal audience (the clergy, parish and diocesan staff and trustees, NCI staff and trustees, Synod members) would be served through a separate and tailored 'extranet' service which would better meet their specific needs.

Issues/risks

6. This is a world of new possibilities, from brand promotion to video production, social media to search engine optimisation, media training to digital campaigning. We will need to be clear about priorities and where we will get the biggest bang for our buck.
7. Our Comms team already have good experience in using this generation of media channels and the technologies are low cost. There is a cost in getting the production values right, where we will need additional expertise which we will probably have to buy in (possibly on a contract basis).
8. We will need to identify and build the right measures to judge how effective we are being. In particular, there is a limited to low IT requirement (apart from the on going work to get our current national websites into shape) so this will not distract from other priority work.

9. We will need to ensure that we have correctly segmented and targeted our audience – the 16-25 audience, for example, is a big one and may need to be differentiated. The main and potentially substantial cost is in terms of production values and staff expertise (possibly bought in on contract project basis) and measurement tools for effectiveness
10. This is a fast paced world which is constantly changing so we will need to monitor audience preferences for different kinds of digital engagement. What works on Monday may well be out of date by Tuesday.

b. Your Church

11. We want to improve the content of and accessibility to the information which is published and provided by the NCIs, building on good initiatives already in place such as the Parish Resources website. It would be easy to use and search and would be up to date, improving both our own and Church users' efficiency.
12. We would start here, but there is scope to extend to add a range of more interactive services, including: a secure forum to share knowledge and ask for help on specific issues; functionality to transfer data quickly and securely, to be held once and used many times; replacing Crockford's with a fully on-line service; creating an on-line Church positions website as a replacement for the current hard copy (and more costly) hard copy approaches.
13. The service would be centred on a new Church of England 'extranet' site – a website designed for Church people (clergy, parish, Diocesan and NCI staff, office holders and trustees, Synod members) which would be focused on the needs of its users. There would be a separate (but co-hosted and with a similar look and feel) public site or internet for the general public.
14. This necessary foundation stone will cost between £100 – 200k based on recent estimates for replacing and redesigning the current website (which is confused and very hard to navigate). We think that this might also offer the possibility to reduce the current number of Church run websites (there are 100s) with scope for significant savings in hosting, maintenance and design costs.
15. We would design and develop the main elements sequentially to manage risk (particularly cost, lack of capability and scope creep) and build buy in from potential users, only adding new functionality when the business case and the demand is established. The main elements might look like this:
 - **'Church Wikipedia'** - an accessible library of all the material produced by the Church centrally. **Annex D** sets out an initial analysis of the range and material already produced in Church House and identifies some of the particular issues that might arise in bringing it together into a more usable and accessible format
 - **'Church Tell us once'** – a portal which a parish priest, official or employee or a Diocese would enter to give us required business (as distinct from personal) data and information. Once inside, it would be held securely and in a way that enables access by all those who need to use it. It could also be the platform for communications on Church governance bodies, including provision of papers and dates of forthcoming meetings (an approach already being used by both the Pensions Board and the Church Commissioners. Their existing sites would migrate on to the new service).
 - **'Church Myview'** – a section for use only by individuals in their personal capacity to manage their 'account', such as updating their details or checking payroll and pension information.

Rationale

16. Diocesan colleagues have identified this as an area where we are already beginning to do some good work (the Parish resources website) which they think could be developed and expanded. We know that users struggle to access up to date and accurate information. We are aware that there are now a number of different websites for different purposes, which adds to the difficulty. The IDFF had suggestions for services and functions which might migrate on-line and there is clearly an appetite for change here and a willingness for the NCIs to bring the work together (although the user voice will be a critical part of whether this is successful).
17. Different NCIs ask for and routinely collect information (sometimes the same or very similar) from parishes and Dioceses and also send out (probably large, although we have no single central record) volumes of material. All of this is burdensome for busy people, causing them expense and delay.
18. The concept is to use this early work already started on a possible management information portal and develop the single place to do business – an interactive and intelligent facility which over time will enable the development of a comprehensive data warehouse and support a range of processes and applications. There needs to be a single piece of work to think through the potential scope, benefits and risks. We believe that there is a national project here, not a series of individual activities driven by different viewpoints in Church House
19. We need to ensure that we provide cost effective services focused on end users and meeting their particular needs. This should provide both business and cost benefits (particularly opportunity costs, but there may be some direct savings as well). There are also opportunities to save money at the centre– collecting once and using many times will give us economies of scale and probably also non-financial benefits around accuracy, business continuity and data security.

Issues/Risks

20. We already have the Parish Resources website which is well used and could be expanded and developed. There is experience elsewhere of building these ranges of functionality from which we could learn and some NCI managers have direct experience of developing and or running similar services.
21. We would need to agree ‘single identifiers’ for both people and institutions. Data security and protection implications would have to be carefully worked through. This will all need to be sourced and run as a programme, with appropriate governance, leadership, investment and capability. It is too big and will cost too much to be added on to business as usual responsibilities or fitted into any existing governance structure.

c. Church IT sourcing

22. There would be single/small number of call off contracts, centrally negotiated and managed, for buying IT infrastructure, support and applications and potentially as well access to some central expertise or consultancy for advice on identifying and supplying appropriate solutions to business needs and problems.
23. Diocesan colleagues have asked for this, which goes with the grain of the separate procurement initiative that has already produced benefits for parishes over the past three years. The dioceses are aware that they are all buying kit and software and that few of them have the internal capability to manage an efficient and effective sourcing exercise.

Rationale

24. Although we do not currently collect this data (we would do this in developing a full business case), we think that the cost per user of the standard suite of office support is likely to vary widely. Some will be paying over the odds for what they are getting and some will potentially be paying for too little and getting poor service as a result.
25. We are also pulling together a number of Church House proposals to buy customer relationship management (CRM) and electronic document management (EDM) applications. As well as saving money by buying these only once for the NCIs we will develop knowledge and experience that we will share with Dioceses.
26. Finally, few (if any) Dioceses have the scale that warrants their employing the kind of intelligent IT strategy resource that supports the identification of the right solution to business problems. The NCIs themselves are only just getting there. This is the kind of consultancy expertise that could be developed and held in one place for use by all.

Issues/Risks

27. We already have some in house capability and expertise on procurement. This could be developed, with input from Yasmin Thompson (who has solid commercial, public sector and not for profit sector experience of this).
28. There are a number of Dioceses who are already collaborating on IT sourcing, so there is a good prospect of early traction here. With their support and experience, we would build a business case setting out the scope for cost savings and 'hassle'. Control would remain with the Dioceses (since they will be using a call off arrangement, not having to negotiate with some monolithic central IT function – which we are emphatically not proposing).
29. The NCIs need to prioritise delivery of our infrastructure renewal which is likely to mean that this work will need to be phased later in 2015 (although we could get on with collecting comparative data and also construction of the procurement model).
30. We would need a tendering exercise to identify and select the firms to go on the call off contracts which would be a call on senior management resource and would have to be properly managed. We would need some kind of contract management capacity/expand the current procurement team.

Published by the General Synod of the Church of England

Copyright © The Archbishops' Council 2015

£5