

CANTERBURY DIOCESAN SYNOD

A Meeting of the Diocesan Synod held 6.30pm on Tuesday 4th July 2023 at the Cathedral ISC Auditorium, Canterbury

1. **Welcome:** by *Miranda Ford Chair of the House of Laity* who especially welcomed those whose first Synod it was. Thanks were expressed to the Dean and the Cathedral Chapter for the hospitality this evening.
2. **Notices:** Advance notice was given about the Canterbury Diocese COP morning, 9am at the Cathedral on 30th September.
3. **Apologies:** There were 16 apologies from the members of the House of Clergy, 12 from the House of Laity.
4. **Bishop Rose** led our opening worship with a reflection on the Mustard Seed from Matthew 13
5. **Bishop Rose** commented that the last Synod she was concerned to hear that people said they were afraid to speak. Within the protocols of Synod, to which we all have the link, please do not be afraid either to speak in Synod or to speak to me.
6. **Minutes:** *Miranda Ford, Chair of the House of Laity*
Minutes of the Diocesan Synod meeting of 11th March
Item 6 - It was agreed to replace the word 'appropriate' with 'agreed'.
David Kemp spoke to the poor service Synod was receiving and cited the slow response for information about membership of SPB, the lateness of the formal notice, last minute papers and poorly prepared papers, both previously on the three bold outcomes, and today on the parish share.
Item 12 – it was agreed to replace £10 with £10k
With these corrections the minutes were approved as a true record of the meeting.
7. **Matters arising:** *Miranda Ford, Chair of the House of Laity*
There were no matters arising discussed that aren't on the agenda (Third bold outcome being the major matter arising)
8. **Minutes from the Archbishop's Council** on 4th February, 22nd April, 25th May and 10th June were received.
9. **Third Bold Outcome** - Colin Evans. The good news is the first investment request has been successful – in total £1m. £560K to support the development of mission plans and two cohorts of the Ministry Experience Scheme £460k for seven youth ministers across the diocese and agreement in principle to support a church plant.
Colin presented the revised proposal and described the journey taken since the March Synod and the measures which will sit underneath it. Two bold outcomes were agreed, the proposal for the third bold outcome is now: **“that every parish, benefice and deanery showing signs of revitalisation”**. Proposed: Bishop Rose, Seconded: Andy Bawtree for: 46, against: 2, abstentions: 16.
Annual Meeting of the Canterbury Diocesan Board of Finance
10. **Peter Wyllie: Accounts for the year end 31st December 2022**
 - a) **The Trustees Report and the Accounts were presented.**

Neil Logan Green: What can we learn from the accounts? The income from property sale income hides the lower parish share received which embedded underlying loss of £0.5. Please

can we balance the books? We cannot afford to pay the increase of 5% its not that we won't, its that we can't, we should oppose the 5% and the financial plan for 2030

Peter Wyllie: please submit any specific questions in writing and we can consider them in more detail, we will take note of the issues in presenting the 2024 budget. Fundamentally we need to grow the church to grow our revenue.

Stephen Taylor: The Church Commissioners are investing in the dioceses of the Church of England to see growth in people and sustainability.

Philip Goodey: There is an emphasize on growing the church, the bible speaks more of growing the kingdom of God. Can we nuance the emphasis to be more about the kingdom and less about the institution.

Steve Sheath: Thank you to the finance staff for the work in doing a very difficult job. My concern is historic debt – does the CDBF have a policy for dealing with historic debt?

Doug Gibb: –the specific parish share arrears will be dealt with later – but we have no blanket policy, rather taken on a parish-by-parish basis particularly when pastoral schemes are being considered.

Mike Gallagher: – congratulated finance dept for the accounts, but they don't answer the problem of financial sustainability. We have been emphasising growth for decades and we are worse off now than we have ever been. The rural churches are struggling with getting people to do things – we have no capacity. It is a structural problem and no amount of work with figures can change this.

Bishop Rose: In a rural church at the weekend I saw signs of growth spiritually, lets not talk ourselves down. The books can only be balanced by what is received – and we have to work on this together.

Simon Rowlands: We are still recovering from Covid in numbers, especially children we are still in catch up.

The Chair put forward that this Synod receives the accounts for 2022 – for: 64, against: 0, abstentions: 2.

Barney de Berry – point of order – the Synod should recognise the faithfulness expressed in the parish share that has been received. – Agreed

Chair proposed that Synod:

Instruct the directors to reappoint Buzzacott as auditors of the Board for 2023: clearly carried.

Authorise the directors to fix the remuneration of the auditors: clearly carried.

Receive the Diocesan reports for 2022: clearly carried

11 Presentation of the Indicative Budget for 2024

Peter Wyllie: The Budget was presented, and explanations were given about some changes in accounting on different lines. For example, the curate costs have increased slightly as they now include the moving in grant and removal costs. Previously these we not itemised. We are making an assumption that salary and stipend costs will be 5%. The Diocesan House shared costs will increase by 2.9% as we have been able to make more central saving and not pass on the full 5% increase. We are anticipating a higher rental income from vacant properties.

Steve Lillicrap: Deanery support has been £2k per deanery there is a reduction in the budget of 50%.

Doug Gibb: There are deaneries that have reserves (average £14k across the diocese) and so some won't need £2k whereas others will. But the deaneries that need the £2k will be able to have access to it. Strategic support will also be available to deaneries in person to assist them in articulating their growth ambitions.

Harry MacDonald: It is unclear whether the trajectory for curates is rising or falling.

Doug Gibb: – the stipendiary curates will average 12 over the three years but each year has numbers either higher or lower than 4. But the average is 4.

Jon Marlow, our DDO, gave details of the healthy plans for ordaining deacons in the years ahead.

Bishop Rose: It is all our responsibility to encourage people into ministry not just the DDO

Neil Logan Green: When can we propose an amendment to the budget?

Andy Bawtree – Chair: This is a presentation of the indicative budget – the formal proposal (and therefore- any amendments) will come in November.

9 **Financial Plans for 2023-2030**

Peter Wyllie: The trajectory doesn't assume any significant variables in any given year. The most useful will be the 3-year P&L planning –the years beyond that are very difficult to know what the financial climate will be like. However even though we can't predict surprises, I propose we plan to have more detail for a three-year plan.

Anthony Everett: welcomes the proposal.

Harry MacDonald: Committed to carbon net zero by 2023 – where does this appear?

Doug Gibb in the £100,000 for strategy a small amount is in there for carbon net zero, and the national church are inviting dioceses to bid towards the end of the year for support in achieving this.

10 **New Parish Share Proposal**

Peter Wyllie: The proposal to explore moving the shared costs calculation from Average Weekly Attendance to parish unrestricted income. We can trial the figures through the Roadshows and see what the effect will be for parishes.

Rachel Webbley: It seems to be much more work and if we are going to implement this in 2024 we need more time. The 2021 AWA figures did not reflect a true picture (post pandemic) and presenting it in this way feels manipulative and that groups are being played off against each other. The meetings that consulted on this process (Deanery Treasures and AD & LC's) are not minuted and it feels secretive. AWA is not complicated and people in the pews know what it means and looks like, whereas unrestricted income is a jargon word not commonly understood. Grateful it is work in progress but the allegation that attendance figures can be manipulated is offensive and if true, examples should be given. It is a high risk, chaotic proposal and risks us going from the frying pan into the fire. To claim that Roadshows could offer any kind of scrutiny is cynical, synod needs to be careful that we don't endorse this going forward.

Mike Gallagher – as a Deanery Treasurer who attended the March meeting - we didn't have any details about what the proposal was.

Harry MacDonald: i) in 2020 the parish share proposal said there should be no further review until 2025 and in total the report was 40 pages and explored what several other dioceses did. ii) There are ways in which parish funds could be designated or restricted. iii) Some churches with a higher unrestricted income could be spending it on a youth worker or some other mission project, it seems look like the diocese would use this formula to take away this extra money. iv) there are no alternatives offered.

Steve Sheath: I was a part of the previous working party, two observations – other dioceses experimented and their income crashed and they return to a system similar to ours. One item that the last working group didn't address were the costs that parishes can't escape from eg insurance costs. Going forward this needs to be taken into account.

Anthony Everett: – point of order do we need to repeal the 2020 synod date restriction?

Stephen Taylor – Does any Synod member recall, as I do, that the 2020 Synod that received the last report, rejected the specific date of 2025.

David Kemp: – agreed that the 2020 Synod said we could explore changes to the parish share in 2023

Doug Gibb: – responded to some of the points made – Yes, we are on a journey, this suggestion may or may not be a better solution and we can reject this in November but if we reject it now we deprive ourselves of obtaining the details we need to make the comparison. Regarding using the 2021 figures, yes they do not reflect to true figures attending church because they were collected so soon after the pandemic, but the same is true for all our churches. The new model won't be extra work for parishes as all parishes produce accounts anyway, there is nothing extra to do. The Synod is being asked if we should consider this model and continue to consult on it, the roadshows can consider these new figures worked out parish by parish based alongside the AWA figures and they may offer alternatives. We want to explore if it could be a better method – it may not be. But if we don't explore it we won't know. We can't make any decision tonight with incomplete data so we need to obtain more figures for further consideration. Anecdotally there are attendance figures that are wrong. I accept there are ways of moving funds into restricted funds, but there are rules about these. Similarly with designated funds which are very different. The Roadshows can provide clarity about this.

David Kemp: I want to propose a formal motion - There are two flaws with this proposal, 1) it implies churches don't want to grow so they will avoid paying a greater parish share and 2) it penalises generosity. Manipulating finance is just as possible as attendance figures. The proposal lacks figures – parish share can feel like a tax – but this proposal makes it a tax. Legacies are not mentioned in this paper, these can be restricted or not. Unrestricted income is not a simple matter. There are many possible ways to avoid it being recorded as unrestricted. A head count is more straight forward.

Are we fiddling with the deck chairs when we should be focusing on the financial crisis ahead of us. I urge you to support the motion standing in my name.

Proposal: ***“This Synod does not believe that the proposal set out in Appendix H to replace Average Weekly Attendance in Parish Share calculations with Unrestricted Income is in the best interests of the parishes or the Diocese and therefore instructs the Archbishop’s Council to ensure that the proposal is withdrawn”***

Jeremy Worthen: I feel chastened as a member of Archbishop’s Council – I take David’s point about the need to do some serious thinking and consulting. But the impact of this motion is to close that debate down. We need to be focusing on growing people. We need to keep the conversation going.

Bishop Rose: Generosity and the parish share is a voluntary gift. I still wrestle with parish share being a voluntary gift – when the stipends and other statutory payments are not voluntary. The point of generosity is necessary and should be at the heart of how we live and treat one another,

as in the Acts of the Apostles. How can we have voluntary gifts that pay for stipends? If the gifts aren't paid – then what do we do?

Andrew Sewell: the tone of the debate doesn't feel like its about good people seeking the best solutions. Which it is. It would be sad to throw out a proposal without looking at it properly. The principle is supply driven not demand given i.e. we give in response to God's generosity. I don't want to penalise growth.

Jacob Nicholson: can we have clarity about the implications about voting for this proposal – because it will close down the debate.

Anthony Everett: it seems that Synod doesn't only want to have one proposal on the table. Can we set up a sub committee to explore other options? Could this be phrased to amend the proposal? To add, to bring forward a wider ranging review of parish share.

David Kemp: I'm happy to have an amendment added on to the end, after the word 'withdrawn' to add Anthony Everett's amendment 'and the Archbishop's Council to bring to this Synod in November a proper proposal for a review of parish share in its entirety'.

Andrew Sewell: the problem with the amendment proposal is that it prejudices the outcome.

Rachel Webbley: AS has already spoken to this motion.

Chair: AS was speaking to the amendment.

The amendment to motion was put to the vote, proposed Anthony Everett. seconded by Harry MacDonald.

Vote: for: 53, Against: 3, Abstention: 12

Chair: any questions or comment on the amended motion?

Stephen Taylor: one of the reasons for this particular journey of parish share consultation is that the Deanery Treasurers and Parish Treasurers have the past have felt excluded from conversations about future monetary changes. So an embryonic suggestion of this particular change was offered to a meeting of the Deanery Treasurers and was broadly welcomed. One of the Deanery Treasurer's took this idea away and shared it with their parish treasurers who also thought it could have merit but needed more detail. The journey has continued gathering details along the way and this synod is a part of the journey, it isn't receiving a proposal but being given an insight into a journey for its information. The roadshows after summer, if permitted, will road test and compare figures and thereafter the Finance and Assets Committee and the Archbishop's Council would prepare a properly shaped and figured proposal. It was never intended to be a proposal tonight (and isn't) but rather an opportunity to inform Synod of a direction of travel.

Mike Gallagher: I acknowledge that it was shared as an idea – but I didn't realise we were expected to take the idea back to our deanery treasurers (ST responded that wasn't the plan, but one did)

The amended motion was put the vote – proposed David Kemp, seconded by Harry MacDonald
For: 50, against: 3, abstentions: 6

11. Repayment Plan for Parish Share Arrears:

Peter Wyllie: For clarity: arrears are technically not a debt.

For information there is now a plan for parishes with outstanding parish share payments from 2021 and earlier, for every £1 contributed towards historic arrears, £2 will be deducted from their historic arrears balance, and £1 will be added to the deanery's generosity pool to support other parishes within the deanery. To make any such contribution the parish will need to be up to date with their in-year parish share payments.

Simon Rowlands – can we see at a deanery level, the amounts of money that parishes have in their reserves?

Chair – the question is noted and the repayment plan are noted.

12. Motion to Add Confirmation Numbers to Statistics for Mission.

David Monteith: Where do we pay our attention? – God is bringing new people to faith. Asking questions about confirmation invites faith conversations to happen, and we pray will be a part of

helping our church to grow. I propose: *“That this Synod requests that the number of candidates presented for confirmation should be recorded, so if they chose, they could be used by parishes, deaneries or dioceses as one of their measures.*

We ask that General Synod support the recording of confirmations, alongside baptisms, weddings and funerals in the annual Statistics for Mission, online return”.

Seconded John Morrison

Harry MacDonald: Should we be adding adult baptisms too?

David Monteith - they are already included

Rachel Webberley: I would be happy to take this to Synod.

Vote: In favour 65 against 0 abstentions 0

13. To Agree the New Deanery Synod Rules to Align with the Church Representation Rules 2022

Stephen Taylor – Apologies for the late arrival of the advice from the Diocesan Registry – but it was tabled as soon as it was received. Consequently, it needs further tidying up – proposal to agree the content now (so Deanery Synod can use it) and to bring the polished version to November Synod

Harry MacDonald: Who is the Deanery Data Protection Officer in a deanery – does a deanery need one? Should this be included in the rules?

Vote: Synod content

14. Members Questions and Answers

a) Revd Andrew Sweeney (Ospringe Deanery) asks the following questions:

Implementation of diocesan strategy

Will the strategic leadership team revise our diocesan strategy to include the following, now in regular reporting to Synod:

- *A clear statement about the future of stipendiary ministry, with a commitment to its funding and resourcing, explaining what part the classic model of parish church and community play in our strategy alongside our planned bold outcomes, and how the bold outcomes will enable a more secure future for the parish system, providing “A Christian Presence in Every Community”?*
- *A risk assessment detailing the risks so far recognised to the success of our strategy, and their mitigations?*
- *A statement of progress in engaging the deanery M&M committees, including a report on the success of the resourcing and training of Area Deans and M&M committees, given that most of the people in those posts are being asked to take on a significant management load to deliver our strategy?*
- *Data that reports on how many of our deaneries are confident about delivering (a) at least one, and (b) more than one of our proposed bold outcomes?*

Colin Evans, Strategic Programme Manager responds to the points raised:

- We have asked deaneries, through the deanery planning process, to set out what they think they will need to become “flourishing and sustainable.” We would envisage that this would include stipendiary ministry to support the growth that is implicit in “flourishing,” but it will be for deaneries to determine what they believe the local mix of lay and ordained ministry will need to be over the coming years.
- The Bishop is committed to stipendiary ministry having a vital role in the parish system;

however, there needs to be a realism about the cost of this and, where necessary, thinking about other ways of making priestly ministry available. The bold outcomes will aid discussion about the reality of each situation.

- We have a corporate risk management policy and guide that sets out our risk management arrangements. The normal process would be that significant risks would be reported to Archbishop’s Council and, through the minutes of that meeting, to Synod. Our strategy is still in a developmental phase and deanery planning is a critical part of that. As the development of the strategy progresses it is envisaged that there would be regular reports to Synod on our collective progress, which would incorporate any key risks. The key risks and mitigations that have been/are being worked on are:

Key Risk	Key Mitigations
Deaneries not having robust plans to become flourishing and sustainable.	Regular meetings with Area Deans & Lay Chairs collectively, by archdeaconry and individually, with a focus on trying to understand what support would be helpful. Establishment of Action Learning Sets for groupings of Area Deans & Lay Chairs to provide mutual support. Alignment of diocesan resources to support deaneries in developing plans. Inclusion of additional support capacity for deaneries in our first investment requests to the Strategic Mission & Ministry Board
Not being able to attract investment from the Strategic Mission & Ministry Board (i.e. funding from the Church Commissioners)	Articulating the alignment of our diocesan strategy to the national vision & strategy (a condition for investment) Articulating our Bold Outcomes for 2030 to make our aspirations clear and to ensure that they are “fundable”. Encouraging deanery planning to support our aspirations.
Strategy seen as being “top down” and consequently not owned across our diocese	Deanery planning process and offers of support. Regular messaging to emphasize mutuality and the importance of deanery planning. Deanery roadshows.

- We are encouraging deaneries to think of their plans as live, iterative documents. They have been requested to have a next iteration by September. Area Deans & Lay Chairs were asked at a residential in January how confident they were of producing drafts by September. Roughly a third were very confident and a third were not confident at all with the remaining third being in the middle. To date we have received 6 out of 15 but we are aware of several in various stages of drafting. Archdeacons have been, and will continue to work, with deaneries to determine what support they need to help them.
- The process for this is covered elsewhere in this agenda when we consider the revised third bold outcome.

b) **Revd Andrew Sweeney (Ospringe Deanery)** asks the following question:

Diocesan unity

Is the Bishop aware of any threat to our unity in our diocese regarding the introduction of Prayers of Love and Faith, and what does she feel is necessary for us to maintain our unity?

Bishop Rose responds:

There is something bigger calling us to unity – and this is Christ’s call. I am committed to that call and will walk and journey with everyone and my prayer is that as a diocese we can hear Christ’s call together.

In the Anglican Church we follow Jesus’ command to work together for unity. Unity is not uniformity and we need to understand and acknowledge that there is difference. If we commit ourselves to journeying together, even when we hold different views, then there needs to be no threat to our unity.

c) **Revd Andrew Sweeney (Ospringe Deanery)** asks the following question:

Diocesan finances and future risks

Has the DBF conducted a risk assessment for parishes deliberately withholding parish share payments (as opposed to parishes being unable to pay them) and what steps are being taken to mitigate the risk?

Doug Gibb, Director of Finance responds:

We are aware of one parish that has withheld an element of Parish Share using theological principle as the justification. The Board knows the potential impact of such action. Communication is ongoing to explain that if a parish does not intend to pay Parish Share (or an element thereof) then other parishes will need to pay a higher Parish Share in the following year to compensate.

d) **Revd Andrew Sweeney (Ospringe Deanery)** asks the following questions:

Funding for Stipendiary Ministry

- *Will the DBF provide a brief explanation of the factors that determine the funding of stipendiary ministry for the benefit of Synod, including the following in their answer? The headline policy, legal and technical factors;*
 - *The relationship between the Diocesan Stipendiary Fund (DSF) and the amount spent on stipendiary ministry?*
 - *The current return on investment (ROI) from our DSF?*
 - *Whether the use of Total Return Accounting for our Diocesan Stipends Fund is appropriate, and what benefits this practice brings?*
-

Doug Gibb, Director of Finance responds:

- The aim of the DBF is to provide ministry in every parish within the diocese. Such provision must necessarily take into account the ability of parishes to pay and also the need to have an attractive offering to attract clergy. The diocese receives a grant in the form of Lowest Income Community Funding from Archbishops' Council which provides funding for those parishes who would otherwise be unable to pay for stipendiary ministry. The level of stipend is determined by balancing affordability with the clergy cost of living of clergy and is guided by the Central Stipends Authority of Archbishops' Council – we must in any case pay the National Minimum Stipend. The level of pension contribution is again a factor without our control. We are required to provide for council tax and water rates and we determine the amount we require to maintain our property portfolio.
- The income from the DSF is applied to shared costs but the DSF can also be used for the maintenance of benefice houses.
- The expected dividend return for 2023 is 3.88%.
- It may be appropriate but as the fund can be used to provide for the maintenance of benefice houses this is a much simpler approach which is our preferred option.

e) Revd Andrew Sweeney (Ospringe Deanery) asks the following question:

National Safeguarding

Can the Bishop give us any comfort that the Church of England will one day have a truly independent safeguarding service so that in our ministry and mission we can confidently proclaim that our church can be trusted?

Bishop Rose responds:

Members of Synod will be aware of the recent announcement from the Archbishops' Council that since it has not been possible to put the Independent Safeguarding Board (ISB) on a more sustainable footing, the Council has agreed a reset. As the statement from the Archbishops' Council states 'This will involve ending the contracts of two of the members of the Board, Jasvinder Sanghera and Steve Reeves, and of the acting Chair, Meg Munn. The Council will be putting in place interim arrangements to continue the independent oversight of existing case reviews. Those reviews will be carried out by independent experts qualified to conduct case reviews, just as at present, and they will be independently commissioned.' (21/06/2023)

As a Church, both national and local, we are absolutely committed to developing fully independent scrutiny of safeguarding and from my personal experience this is a vital part of good safeguarding. We need to ensure the Church of England is a safer place for everyone, to be transparent and accountable and to hear the voices of victims and survivors.

While I am not across the full details of this week's decision, I know the Archbishops' Council would not have taken this decision lightly, as their statement shows and I am pleased that members of the Archbishops' Council will be arranging an opportunity to meet with victims and survivors to hear concerns and discuss the situation.

The intention for truly independent scrutiny of safeguarding practices is the aim of the Archbishops' Council and I believe that steps are in place to ensure that this is the case.

Andrew Sweeny's questions and answers were tabled at Synod– further supplementary questions were then asked:

(a) Implementation of diocesan strategy...

Thank you, Colin, for your written answer. The Strategy Team is clear that “it is for deaneries to determine the mix of lay and ordained ministry.” Many of us commend the attempt to build a diocesan strategy from the bottom-up based on local need, vision and opportunity, but in fact there is no local authority or power to command ministry on demand - the Church of England is not a congregational church. So do you agree that the biggest risk to successful implementation of our diocesan strategy could be that we are attempting to delegate responsibility to deaneries without delegating corresponding power and authority to make effective decisions? Would the Strategy Team be willing to discuss that idea with Area Deans and Lay Chairs?

Answer Colin Evans: We are delighted that people are recognising the importance of building our strategy “bottom up”. Deanery plans are a vital way for deaneries to set out their local ambitions and to identify what support they will need to move towards a flourishing and sustainable future. In our approach we have stressed the importance of mutuality. This recognises that we are all dependent on each other. [1 Corinthians 12:12-31](#) captures this so well! Mutuality means working together to achieve our shared aims. Within the concept of mutuality, we all have different roles and responsibilities around common goals. It may require us to think differently about our vocabulary; words like “authority”, “power”, “command” and “on demand” may not be our best servants!

Some responsibilities cannot be delegated. For example, requests for Church Commissioners' funding have to come from the diocese as a whole. However, our requests, like our first successful one, will be based on the support needs that are emerging from all of the deanery plans. Likewise, the appointment of clergy is the responsibility of the Bishop. However, the Bishop and her team are focused on enabling deaneries to become flourishing and sustainable. A well-thought-out plan for ministry as part of a deanery plan is easy to get behind. Sustainability still needs to be kept in mind. New stipendiary ministry posts have an impact on the diocesan budget and Parish Share. It is therefore important that requests for new posts demonstrate how they can become sustainable. All requests for Church Commissioners' funding have to demonstrate sustainability, typically within five years, which can be quite challenging!

There are many risks to the successful development and implementation of our strategy, but the biggest is not delegation of power and authority. This is mitigated or managed through mutuality. The biggest risk right now is not having robust, well-thought-through plans from every deanery that are sufficiently ambitious to turn decline into flourishing. That is why there is support available to help Area Deans and Lay Chairs with the ongoing development of plans with their deaneries. There are regular meetings within archdeaconries or smaller groups to discuss any barriers and difficulties so that we can look to resolve them together. The door is always open; mutuality requires it!

(b) Diocesan unity...

Thank you, Bishop Rose, for your written answer. Has your position changed now that (as we learn from the answer to question (c)) it is clear that we are not able or willing to walk together in unity?

Answer: +Rose – what I have said in my answer still stands – that is what I am about.

(c) Diocesan finances and future risks...

Thank you, Doug for your written answer. What is the worst case scenario, in terms of the number of parishes that are threatening to withhold parish share, and what would the financial

impact of that scenario be, in absolute terms and in its effect on our ability to continue operating?

Answer Doug Gibb: We are currently only aware of one parish intending to pause some of their Parish Share and the financial impact of this is already be covered within our potential parish share shortfall which is reviewed at each meeting of the Finance and Assets Committee of Archbishop's Council. As such it would not at the current level have any effect on our ability to operate.

Bishop Rose closed the meeting with a blessing.