

## **GENERAL SYNOD**

---

### **JULY GROUP OF SESSIONS 2023**

---

#### **ELEVENTH NOTICE PAPER**

##### **ITEM 14: RESPONDING TO THE CLIMATE EMERGENCY**

1. Using figures for the number of full time equivalent incumbent and incumbent status posts in Statistics for Ministry 2020 as a guide, the estimated costs of works to houses occupied by incumbents and incumbent status clergy in all dioceses at the same average cost as calculated using the sum provided for by Oxford diocese as envisaged in Mr Shepherd's amendment is around £210m.

##### **ITEM 17: ARCHBISHOPS' COUNCIL ANNUAL REPORT: FURTHER MOTION**

2. The estimated cost of the independent inquiry into the safeguarding bodies, functions, policies and practice in and of the Church of England led by a senior lawyer called for in paragraph 7 of Mr Drake's further motion is up to £200,000, assuming it would take up to twelve months to finalise a report. The estimated cost of staff time to engage with such an enquiry, for example by responding to requests for information and questions, is estimated at £75,000. Given the wide scope of the further motion, in addition to this there would be significant costs of diocesan staff time but these have not yet been quantified.

##### **ITEM 26: ELECTIONS REVIEW GROUP: REPORT FROM THE BUSINESS COMMITTEE**

3. The estimated cost of contacting all diocesan electors by post as well as email is between £32,000 and £46,000. This is based on the assumption that the average number of electors is 1,000 per diocese, depending on whether first or second class post was used. This cost would be incurred once every three years.

##### **ITEM 28: REVIEW OF THE MISSION AND PASTORAL MEASURE**

4. There is already national work that is being taken forward by the Bishop of St Edmundsbury and Ipswich on the issue of trust and it is important

that work is not duplicated. This is being done as part of the Transforming Effectiveness programme.

5. It is difficult to reach a specific figure the impact of the work called for in Mr Johnston's amendment as much would depend on the detailed terms of reference and how and where it would be taken forward. But it is considered likely that at a minimum it would require a dedicated team for a fixed period of time consisting of at least three people – a project leader, a stakeholder and communications person and administrative support, though possibly more depending on scale. Addressing points (ii) and (iii) would mainly be governance issues and would need to be mapped (e.g. in terms of where decisions affecting parishes are made) and to identify models and ways parish issues/matters could be addressed in the central administration (presumably the NCIs).
6. The first point about looking at trust between dioceses and parishes could involve an extensive consultation exercise of some kind – if all dioceses and over 12,000 parishes were involved it would be a major investment and require external support (e.g. from a consultancy agency) as well internal staff to run and manage a process, which would be more expensive if it involved place based visiting. Realistically some kind of basic desk research and sufficiently significant sampling might cost in the region of £250,000, but a full scale exercise could run to £1-2m depending on scale, intent and duration.

## **ITEM 29: REDUCE PAROCHIAL FEES FOR MARRIAGES**

7. If Mr Appleton's amendment and the amended main motion are both passed, the lost parochial fee income for PCCs and DBFs would be less than the estimates provided in the fourth notice paper. But as no data is held on the proportion of services that might be described as 'a simple 'basic' marriage service' (however that might be described), so it is not possible to be more precise than this.
8. All PCCs in parishes where marriage services take place in any given period would "be adversely affected" by the change proposed in item 29 unless donations at such services exceeded the current fee level. To "bring forward a national package of financial and other support" as called for in Mr Margrave's motion would mean providing national funding for all such parishes. This would likely entail compensating them for lost fee income currently paid direct to PCCs and also for income currently paid to DBFs to the extent it resulted in increases in parish share if it were decided to avoid reductions in direct and indirect support for ministry. Thus distributions from national Church funding of up to £16.5m p.a. would be required if the parochial fee for marriage services was set at nil, reducing to up to £13.5m p.a. on the assumptions made in paragraph 30 of the fourth notice paper.
9. In addition significant administrative effort would be needed to review and collate the data required to establish the sums due to each PCC and pay it to them if Mr Margrave's amendment were passed. It is estimated that the cost of additional staff resource to undertake this work would be around £130,000. There would also be a one-off cost of establishing, verifying and entering the bank details of each PCC with the cost of additional staff resource estimated at £45,000.