DIOCESE OF CHELMSFORD
DIOCESAN SYNOD

There will be a meeting of the Diocesan Synod via Zoom on Saturday 3 October 2020

AGENDA

Timings
09:30
OPENING WORSHIP
Led by the Archdeacon of Colchester

09:45
1. NOTICES
Bishop’s Instrument permitting remote meeting of Diocesan Synod – attached

09:50
2. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING AND NOTES OF DIOCESAN SYNOD GATHERING HELD ON 6 JUNE 2020
Attached

09:55
3. PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS

10.10
4. RACIAL JUSTICE TASK GROUP UPDATE
Verbal update from Rt Revd Peter Hill and Rt Revd Roger Morris

10.20
BREAK

10.30
5. QUESTIONS see notes for details

10.50
6. STEWARDSHIP PROJECT UPDATE
Paper DS(2020)08 attached

11:10
7. 2021 BUDGET
Paper DS(2020)09 attached

The Chair of the Chelmsford Diocesan Board of Finance to move that:

‘That this Synod
a) approve the Diocesan Budget for 2021 with total budgeted expenditure of £21,686,000
b) note the action plan for 2021 to address the budget deficit
c) approve the apportionment of the total Share of £16,764,000 (before credits) on the same basis as 2020.’
8. UPDATE AND DISCUSSION ON CLERGY DEPLOYMENT WORK
Verbal update from the Revd Canon Dr Roger Matthews (Interim Chief Executive and Diocesan Secretary)

9. BISHOP'S COUNCIL, DMPC AND FINANCE COMMITTEE REPORTS
Paper DS(2020)10 attached

10. DIOCESAN ENVIRONMENT GROUP AND REDBRIDGE DEANERY SYNOD MOTIONS
Paper DS(2020)11 attached

**Diocesan Environment Group motion**
The Archdeacon of Chelmsford to move the motion that:

‘This Synod:
1) take note of the motion regarding Carbon Neutrality passed by General Synod.
2) ask the Diocesan Environmental Group to present to the next Bishops Council on 5th November a project plan which seeks to scope the task set by General Synod and outlines a strategy for engagement with deanery synods and chapters across the diocese as well as with the education department, property team and Diocesan Advisory Committee.
3) ask the Diocesan Environment Group to report annually to Diocesan Synod on progress towards net carbon zero emission, in order that Diocesan Synod can report to general Synod in 2022 and then subsequently every three years.’

**Redbridge Deanery motion**
The Revd Gareth Jones (Redbridge) to move the motion that:

‘This Synod:
1) encourage each Parochial Church Council in the Diocese of Chelmsford to engage with the ARocha Eco Church scheme, aiming for at least a bronze award,
2) invite the Bishop of Chelmsford to register Chelmsford Diocese’s intent to become an Eco Diocese, and
3) commission the Diocesan Environmental Group to coordinate progress towards Eco Diocese status.’

13:30 CLOSE
NOTES

Questions: In accordance with Standing Order 29 five days prior notice is required. Questions must be received no later than 9am on Monday 28 September 2020 by email only to nwhitehead@chelmsford.anglican.org

In accordance with Standing Orders 74 and 75, members are encouraged to use this opportunity to seek information from any officer of the Synod or senior member of Diocesan staff relating to their duties or from the President of Synod or the Chair of any body constituted by the Synod or on which it is represented. Questions shall relate to the duties assigned to officers, or in the case of the Chair of any body, to the business of that body. Questions shall not ask for an expression of opinion or for the solution of an abstract legal question or a hypothetical problem.

In accordance with Standing Order 74, a member may ask up to two original questions at one meeting. Any member may ask a supplementary question in relation to the original question; the Chair may allow up to three supplementary questions, giving the member who tabled the original question preference.

Questions for written answer are also possible, and are often the best way of obtaining a detailed response, particularly on a complex issue: answers will be given to the questioner within 24 days of the Synod and will be reported in the Minutes.

Speeches – members are requested to announce their name and deanery before they address Synod.

Please forward apologies to Nathan Whitehead tel. no. 01245 294412 or nwhitehead@chelmsford.anglican.org
THE BISHOP OF BARKING ("the Bishop") acting pursuant to powers delegated to him by virtue of an Instrument made on 28 April 2020 under section 14 of the Dioceses, Pastoral and Mission Measure 2007 HEREBY MAKES THE FOLLOWING PROVISION in exercise of the powers conferred by section 10 of the Churchwardens Measure 2001 and rule 78 of the Church Representation Rules

Application

1. This Instrument is made on the date on which it is signed by the Bishop and has effect from that date until
   (a) 31 October 2020 in relation to paragraphs 9, 10, 11 and 12 (APCMs and meetings of parishioners)
   (b) 31 March 2021 in relation to paragraphs 1 to 8 and 13 to 23.
   or until such date (which may be sooner or later and which may vary in relation to different provisions of this Instrument) as the Bishop may by Instrument direct.

2. This Instrument is supplemental to the Instrument made by the Bishop of Chelmsford on 24 March 2020 which remains in force.

3. This Instrument provides a legal basis for certain meetings to be held and conducted by electronic means and thereby for valid decisions to be made by such means.

4. The provisions of this Instrument are permissive, not mandatory, and are in addition to, not substitution for, the normal arrangements for physical meetings.

5. The relevant provisions of this Instrument apply in the Diocese of Chelmsford ("the Diocese") to
   (a) each parish,
   (b) each deanery; and
   (c) the diocesan synod.

6. The provisions of this Instrument shall have effect notwithstanding any inconsistent provisions in the standing orders of the diocesan synod or any deanery synod.

7. In exercising the powers conferred by section 10 of the Churchwardens Measure 2001 the Bishop is acting in his own right in respect of those parishes in the Archdeaconry of West Ham, the Archdeaconry of Harlow and the Archdeaconry of Barking, and at the request and with the concurrence of
the Bishop of Bradwell in respect of those parishes in the Archdeaconry of Southend and the Archdeaconry of Chelmsford; and

the Bishop of Colchester in respect of those parishes in the Archdeaconry of Colchester and the Archdeaconry of Stansted.

Interpretation

8. In this instrument –

“the Measure” means the Churchwardens Measure 2001;

“CRR” means the Church Representation Rules;

“APCM” means the annual parochial church meeting required to be held by Rule M1(1) of the CRR;

“convenor” means the person responsible for convening the relevant meeting to which this Instrument applies;

“meeting of parishioners” means the meeting of parishioners required to be held by section 5 of the Measure;

“meeting” means, as may be relevant in the context, a meeting of parishioners, an annual parochial church meeting, a parochial church council meeting, a meeting of a deanery synod or a meeting of the diocesan synod;

“PCC” means parochial church council; and

“electronic means” means electronic means of communication which allow a person to hear and be heard by the other persons participating in the meeting and, where practicable, to see and be seen by those other persons.

Annual parochial church meeting

9. The modifications set out in Schedule 1 shall apply to Section A of Part 9 of the CRR.

10. The modifications set out in Schedule 2 and Schedule 3 shall apply to the conduct of an APCM held (whether wholly or in part) by electronic means.

Meeting of parishioners

11. The modifications set out in Schedule 1 shall apply to sections 3, 4 and 5 of the Measure.

12. The modifications set out in Schedule 2 and Schedule 3 shall apply to the conduct of a meeting of parishioners held (whether wholly or in part) by electronic means.

Meetings of the parochial church council and standing committee

13. The modifications set out in Schedule 1 shall apply to Section B of Part 9 of the CRR.

14. The modifications set out in Schedule 2 and Schedule 3 shall apply to the conduct of a meeting of the PCC and (where applicable) of the standing committee of a PCC held (whether wholly or in part) by electronic means.

15. The provisions of paragraphs 13 and 14 of this Instrument shall have effect in relation to the proceedings of a standing committee of a PCC only insofar as they are not inconsistent with a direction of the relevant PCC.

Deanery Synod
16. The modifications set out in Schedule 1 shall apply to Rule 26 of the CRR.

17. A vote may be taken by such fair and reliable electronic means as the area dean and the lay chair acting jointly may determine, provided that those means produce a clear result that may be recorded in the minutes by the secretary.

18. The modifications set out in Schedule 3 shall apply in respect of a contested election for which the electorate is the membership of the deanery synod or of one of its houses, occurring at a meeting held (whether wholly or in part) by electronic means.

**Diocesan Synod**

19. The modifications set out in Schedule 1 shall apply to Rule 44 of the CRR.

20. A vote, whether of the whole Synod or by Houses, may be taken by such fair and reliable electronic means as may be determined by the Bishop, the chair of the House of Laity and the chair of the House of Clergy acting jointly, provided that those means produce a clear result that may be recorded in the minutes by the secretary.

21. The modifications set out in Schedule 3 shall apply in respect of a contested election for which the electorate is the membership of the diocesan synod or of one of its houses, occurring at a meeting held (whether wholly or in part) by electronic means.

**Notice of meetings held by electronic means**

22. When giving notice of a meeting in accordance with the requirements of the Measure or the CRR (as the case may be), the convenor may state in that notice that persons entitled to attend the meeting may do so by electronic means, and in that event
   (a) the notice shall set out full details of how a person may participate in the meeting, or provide a link to a website on which such details are set out;
   (b) the notice shall set out how nominations for any elections on the agenda for the meeting may be submitted (being insofar as is practicable in accordance with the Measure or CRR, as the case may be); and
   (c) Form M1 may be amended to give effect to any requirement of this Instrument.

23. If a convenor considers that closures or restrictions affecting a church or licensed building by reason of the COVID-19 pandemic are likely to have a significant effect on the ability of persons entitled to attend a meeting to receive notice of that meeting, the convenor shall consider what reasonable additional steps might be taken to publicise the meeting and in particular shall, wherever practicable, arrange for notice of the meeting to be given on the website of the parish (where such exists).

---

**BISHOP OF BARKING**

*Date: 15 September 2020*
SCHEDULE 1
(Holding a meeting by electronic means)

1. A reference to a meeting includes a reference to a meeting which persons may attend, speak at, vote in, or otherwise participate in without all of the persons, or without any of the persons, being together in the same place.

2. A reference to a place where a meeting is held, or is to be held, includes a reference to more than one place, including electronic, digital or virtual locations, web addresses or conference call telephone numbers.

3. A person is to be regarded as present at a meeting at any given time if the person is at that time able to hear and be heard, and where practicable see and be seen, by the other persons present.

4. A reference in this Instrument to being present at a meeting includes a reference to being present by electronic means, including by telephone conference, video conference, live webcast and live interactive streaming.

SCHEDULE 2
(Procedure for voting where meeting held by electronic means)

1. A vote on a resolution may be taken by such fair and reliable electronic means as the meeting may decide or, in the absence of such a decision, as the chair of the meeting may direct provided that those means produce a clear result that may be recorded in the minutes by the secretary or clerk.

SCHEDULE 3
(Procedure for contested election)

1. A contested election may be conducted by the issue of a voting paper by email, by post or by hand to every person who, at the time at which the contested election was announced, was both (a) entitled to vote in the relevant election, and (b) present (as defined in this Instrument) at the meeting.

2. Where a contested election is announced, the meeting shall appoint a presiding officer for the purposes of conducting the election, and in the absence of such appointment, the chair of the meeting shall be the presiding officer.

3. A voting paper issued under paragraph 2 shall be supplied to every eligible voter within seven days of the close of the meeting and shall clearly state the date by which the voting paper must be returned to the presiding officer (being the date 14 days after the close of the meeting or such earlier date as the meeting may have decided having regard to the need for fairness in the election).
Present: The President and 105 Members

The Archdeacon of Southend led the opening worship.

1. Notices

The Chair drew attention to the notices on the day paper. Filming would take place throughout the meeting.

In addition to the notices, the Chair highlighted that the Essex Clergy Charity had a stall at the meeting with packs to be collected by the Deanery representatives.

Amending Canon No. 39 was promulgated.

2. Minutes of Diocesan Synod Meeting Held 15 June 2019

The minutes were approved.

3. Presidential Address

The Bishop of Chelmsford delivered his Presidential Address. The text of the address can be downloaded from here:


4. Moving from Subsidy to Sustainability

The Chair pointed out that Synod was not being expected to make a decision on this item. Members would be invited to comment on the proposal and also to submit viable alternative solutions to the proposal.

The Chair invited the Chief Executive and Diocesan Secretary to address the Synod. The following points were made in his introduction:

- Members were reminded of the need for action. There was a growing general fund deficit; £0.7m in 2017 and £1.4m in 2018. There had also been reductions in funding from national church; £2.1m per annum net by 2025. To be a Transforming Presence in the long term we have to find sustainable ways of resourcing ministry.
- At the March 2019 Synod Bishop Stephen spoke about the ministry deployment strategy. At that Synod it had also been noted that the Finance working group
were addressing process, roles and responsibilities and communication and training.

- Since the March 2019 meeting the following things had happened:
  - Process: In June, Diocesan Synod approved changes to the share process and a different shaped budget for 2020
  - Roles and responsibilities: The Deanery Finance Forum has been resurrected and we are consulting on a new set of Finance roles and responsibilities.
  - Communication and training: A prototype booklet has been produced explaining the cost of ministry
  - Deployment of Stipendiary Ministry: exploration of a range of options, with consistent feedback that vacancy process changes would be the most effective and proportionate. A new policy has been drafted.
- The new policy was detailed in paper DS(2019)07 and will be discussed at this meeting.
- Between this meeting and March 2020 it was proposed to do the following:
  - Revisit MMU and Deanery plans
  - Continue work on communications
  - Model impact of using investment income for mutual support
  - Review any other proposed solutions
- At the March 2020 Synod a decision on way forward will need to be made.

Members were then invited to share their reflections on the proposal. The following members made a contribution:

- Revd Canon Darren Barlow (Thurrock)
- Colin Setchfield (Waltham Forest)
- Revd Dr Tim Platts (Colchester)
- Revd Dr Sue Lucas (Newham)
- Revd Simon Law (Basildon)
- Philip Carnelley (Redbridge)
- Revd Dr Sara Batts-Neale (Braintree)
- Robin Stevens (Chelmsford North)
- Revd James Rodley (Harlow)
- Piers Northam (Harlow)
- Revd Brenda Wallace (General Synod)
- Nigel Dyson (Harwich)
- Christine Cox (Harlow)
- Revd Canon David Banting (General Synod)
- Mary Durlacher (General Synod)
- Revd Canon David Hague (General Synod and Havering)
- Revd Susan Iskander (Chelmsford North)
- David Martins (Newham)
- Revd David Lower (St Osyth)
- Revd Dan Pierce (Chelmsford North)
- Revd Jack Dunn (Redbridge)
- Canon Roger Ennals (Colchester)
The following points were made:

- In Thurrock Deanery 6 out of 9 benefices score under the average for LinC support. Transitional support of £400,000 is given. This is not sustainable. None of the benefices cover the full cost of ministry. This could be viewed as Thurrock’s problem, but the Church of England has long supplied ministry to all communities. It could be said that Thurrock need to find the ministers, but there are not a lot of professionals in the area to do this.
- There were concerns about how this would impact on clergy recruitment.
- This will have a negative impact on MMU formation.
- We struggle to get people to be Churchwarden. Serving Churchwardens may ‘throw in the towel’ on this.
- What is the projected income on parish share?
- This will have an impact on MMU formation. Previously this was administered through the Deanery, which was arbitrary.
- We need to be careful with our use of figures. £80,000 will seem absurdly high and may lead to embarrassment.
- Should we rethink the decision on increasing the number of stipendiary curates?
- The proposal is clear and easy to follow. It would help if a simple summary on how deficits have been covered and the projected costs.
- The pension scheme deficit will be cleared in due course, will this result in £800,000 of savings?
- It is delightful to be in a place where the ‘diocese’ is not thought of as the big ‘other’. There is work to be done to recognise what it looks like to be the body of Christ. The Barking Area roadshows are a start, but this needs to go to the grassroots.
- One member spoke of an exercise he did whilst parish treasurer. The giving of each church member was analysed and rather than giving £5.80 a week the members needed to give £24 a week. This lead to a discussion about tithing.
- Could we have clarity on how this proposal fits with MMUs?
- In membership organisations there is often a mentality of ‘I pay your wages’. This will give ammo to the bullies in the parishes and therefore needs careful explanation.
- One member spoke of their experience in their parish. Older members were dying off and younger members were not as committed financially as previous generations. Stewardship is important.
- The analogy of each member giving 50p more is flawed. Some people need to give more, others need to give less.
- We need to put the money in to the areas where there are poor and marginalised people.
- The £80,000 figure is fundamentally flawed and it is wrong to include fixed costs that would exist even if there were no clergy.
- How do we protect against the increasing expectation on clergy? This is not a good example of living well together. We need to move away from the language of clergy being a burden.
- We are one body and this is a problem for us all. The measures are punitive and we are too parochial. We should pay for each other.
• There was a request that this also include consideration on the impact on clergy wellbeing.
• One member pointed out that an increase of 50p a week in their parish would equate to £600. We need to think outside the box and consider what functions Deaneries and Churches can put on to raise money.
• Don’t put across the message of £80,000.
• We are the people of God and servants to people. There is great concern about the burdens on Churchwardens, Self-Supporting Ministers and others. There is not much evidence that these are supported and cared for. If we don’t care for each other, how do we care for the world?
• MMUs are more mainstream in strategy and governance. This does need to be more grassroots focused, with relational development and respect of traditions.
• Ordained Local Ministry would relieve the demand on sacramental worship.
• The proposal to communicate with patrons is welcomed.
• There is no mention of Minister Churches. These are a gift and resource.
• The MMUs mean that the Deanery is now in an ambiguous place.
• Forecast of demographic change is missing. This might impact ministry deployment and church closures.
• In other denominations, they have to pay for the ministry they receive.
• Can we have more information on Church attendance? Churches may have to be closed, they are expensive buildings.
• What is the percentage of total income that should go to the parish share?
• Will parishes be able to keep the fees from occasional offices?
• Why do PCCs maintain the inside of the houses?
• Where will the House for Duty priests come from?
• If we have such a drastic focus on clergy and not parishes we may have viable organs with no body.
• One member commented that they should have voted against the percentage increase in share for those not covering their cost of ministry. We are all in this together and there should be increases for all.
• Costs can come down, we can reimagine ministry with House for Duty Bishops and Archdeacons. There are also opportunities in Lay Ministry, an example of one Church which has grown since moving to a lay led model was given.
• The proposal is predicated on the assumption that the parish share is met from income. For many parishes it is met from reserves. It would be helpful to have more information on parish reserves and investments.

The Chief Executive and Diocesan Secretary thanked members for their contributions and invited members who had not had their say to email him.

The Bishop of Chelmsford responded to those points he was able to in the time allowed. In summary:

• This is not ‘us’ vs ‘them’.
• A lot of the responses assumed clergy reduction, the Bishop stated he did not assume this and that he felt we will rise to meet the challenge.
• The proposal can be criticised, but members must be prepared to come up with a viable alternative. It is up to us as the people of God.
- £80,000 does not refer to the priest, it refers to the ministry received. It is the resource for the whole people of God.
- We believe we can make a difference but we need help from everyone.

5. PASTORAL ADVISORY GROUP PRINCIPLES

The Chair suspended Standing Orders and invited the Revd Ade Eleyae to address the Synod in relation to the Pastoral Advisory Group Principles. The following points were made in the introduction:

- The principles had been formed by the national Church’s Pastoral Advisory Group (PAG). The purpose of the PAG is to help the Church model the Archbishops’ desire for “radical Christian inclusion founded in scripture, in reason, in tradition, in theology and the Christian faith as the Church of England has received it”.
- The Church wants to ensure that it offers pastoral care to all people, especially in the context of changing perspectives on gender, identity and sexuality.
- One of the tasks of the PAG has been to set out some principles of pastoral practice for how the Church of England can live well together within the parameters of its current position on marriage and the different deeply held convictions that individuals and churches hold on these matters. The outcome of this work has been the production of the Pastoral Principles for living well together.
- The principles offer the opportunity to examine our life together. There will be different reactions in different places. We want to encourage all to engage.
- The principles document identifies six ‘evils’:
  - Prejudice
  - Silence
  - Ignorance
  - Fear
  - Hypocrisy
  - Power
- At least some of these evils will be at work in your church, even if not with respect to LGBTI+ people. Who is missing? Who is present? Who is silent?
- The principles do not suggest we should not disagree, but we do need to see the lack of hospitality and the risk of becoming gatekeepers for the House of God. We often end up engaged in arguments over whether people should be here or not.
- However flawed the document may be, it offers us the opportunity to look at our flaws and our conduct toward those who are different.
- The ‘elephant in the room’ is how we apply this whilst holding on to our convictions. Is it possible to extend hospitality with those who we disagree?
- The principles can be used by clergy and laity, for welcome and study groups.
- Parishes were advised to use discretion when using the principles at local level. If this will result in extreme reactions they should not be used. It also helps to depersonalise. The best starting point is that we are all human beings and all have intrinsic value having been made in the image of God.

Synod members were then invited to discuss some questions in small groups.
The Chair drew an end to the group discussions and invited members to contact Revd Ade Eleyae if they wish to discuss further.

Members were invited to share their responses. The following members did so:

- Revd Jane Richards (Basildon)
- The Archdeacon of Harlow
- Mark Tiddy (Bishop’s Nomination)
- Canon Roger Ennals (Colchester)

The following contributions were made:

- One member shared their personal experience of how they and their family members had been made to feel unwelcome in the Church. They were currently encouraging their Church to become an Inclusive Church.
- The extent to which we can have this conversation extends to how far Churches are willing to have the conversation. In some Churches this is very difficult.
- Another personal experience was shared and the importance of us helping each other to think differently was emphasised.
- The feedback from the Youth Synod was that young people say they regularly witness prejudice. This is not always easy or safe to challenge. The terms ‘gay’ and ‘lesbian’ are still used as insults. The six principles are the least challenging way to look at this and are a big step forward. People should respect the beliefs of others until they disrespect someone else. The Youth Synod endorsed the passing of the motion for this item.
- Listening is important. It is not the job of the clergy to solve this.
- We should be very careful in our use of language. This is Christ’s Church, not ours.
- Relationships do break down and that is why we have Bullying and Harassment Advisers. In some cases it would help if these Advisers were involved at an earlier stage than they sometime are.

The Chair reinstated Standing Orders.

The Bishop of Chelmsford expressed his gratitude to the Revd Ade Eleyae. He then moved the motion:

‘This Synod note the Pastoral Principles for Living Well Together and commend them for discussion and use across the diocese.’

The Chair put the motion to the vote. The motion was overwhelmingly carried.

6. **MISSION AND MINISTRY UNIT MOTION UPDATE**

The Chair invited the Revd Canon Dr Roger Matthews to address the Synod. In his presentation the following points were made:
The paper detailed the progress made on the motion passed in March. If there were updates that had not been captured in the paper these should be forwarded to the Head of Service Delivery.

We are aiming to conclude MMU formation in 2021. However this must not be the end and we cannot end up with fossilised structures.

Missional and ministry needs will change. It is really important that we don’t take our eyes off what God is doing.

Finance is becoming more prevalent in these discussions and it is important that we don’t take the edge off of developments.

There was a renewed call to prayer and to put mission front and centre of the developments.

The Bishop of Chelmsford commented that there was no such thing as a ‘self-selecting’ MMU. The proposals are coming from the ‘bottom up’ but they do have to be considered by the Deaneories and the Area and Diocesan Mission and Pastoral Committees. Sustainability is much more likely within an MMU.

Members noted paper DS(2019)09.

7. **DEANERY SYNOD ELECTION FORMULA**

The Chair moved the motion that:

‘This Synod
a) note the feedback from the consultation on the formula for use in the 2020 Deanery Synod election formula and
b) approve the formula, as set out in paper DS(2019)10 for use in the 2020 Deanery Synod elections.’

The following members spoke in the debate:

Diana Kennedy (Waltham Forest)
Revd Canon David Banting (General Synod)

The comments and questions were:

- How do Churches that are linked with Churches in other Deaneries fit in to this? How do we contact people? The Chair encouraged the questioner to contact their Archdeacon.
- The cap on Churches with large electoral rolls should not be applied? In response it was noted that this was indeed proposed that it not be applied.

The Chair called for a vote. The motion was overwhelmingly carried.

8. **BISHOP'S COUNCIL AND FINANCE COMMITTEE REPORTS**

Paper DS(2019)11 was received.
9. QUESTIONS

Q.1: Nick Ellis (Hinckford) to ask the Chief Executive and Diocesan Secretary:

Why, when considering the sale of Diocesan owned land or property does the Diocese not consult the relevant incumbent, churchwardens and PCC as part of the decision making process as the impact of such sales can affect the mission and ministry in the parish?

A.
We always seek to work collaboratively with parishes when considering potential development opportunities for glebe land. The timing of any consultation with the incumbent and PCC is a judgment call that has to be made on a case by case basis given that we do not want to cause unnecessary local concern about early exploratory work which may come to nothing. In taking this approach we seek to follow the Church Commissioner guidance below:

"It is always a matter of judgement as to how far a DBF should proceed with identifying potential development sites and undertaking preliminary discussions with potential developers before alerting the clergy, churchwardens and PCC concerned to the possibility of glebe development. There is an understandable wish not to cause unnecessary local concern where the possibility of development is at an exploratory stage and may come to nothing. However, the DBF should always try to avoid the parish first becoming aware of possible development from a source other than itself."

Supplementary

Q. Why did this process not take place in Pebmarsh?

A. The parish were written to in 1998 about the potential for the development. These proposals often take decades to reach fruition and the change of personnel will mean that the corporate memory has been lost.

Q2. Nick Ellis (Hinckford) to ask the Chief Executive and Diocesan Secretary:

Why are arrangements not in place for co-operation between neighbouring dioceses so that retired clergy who have met all safeguarding training requirements in one diocese are not obliged to meet the same requirements in the neighbouring diocese?

A.

We do liaise with other dioceses where PTO Clergy have received their training and vice versa, but this will involve a level of communication between the 2 safeguarding teams for that to happen. The only difference in training is that we have
incorporated two national specialist modules (DV and Safer Recruitment) into our C3 module.

In respect of DBS checks we need to ensure than all those with PTO have a DBS for each Diocese they have PTO in as they are separate organisations. The only exception to this is if the individual has signed up to the update service and therefore have a ‘portable’ DBS.

Q3. Canon Christine Horton (Chelmsford South) to ask the Diocesan Bishop

Would the Bishop explain the reason for, and benefits of, making Archdeacons Chairs of all twinning committees (Sweden, Kenya, Trinidad and Tobago etc.), rather than them serving on those committees and not allowing lay or other clergy, naturally and democratically, to remain or evolve as Chairs?

A.

I am grateful for Christine’s question as it gives me the opportunity to thank her publicly for all that she has done to contribute to the development of our partnership with the Diocese of Karlstad as chair of the link group and I am pleased that she will continue to serve as a member of the group in future.

Historically, our link groups have formed organically and there has been no single system of appointing chairs.

Our partnerships with the World Church are increasingly important to us. We now have numerous initiatives with our 5 partner dioceses in the Anglican Church of Kenya and with Karlstad Diocese in the Church of Sweden. And, although there is less direct activity, we maintain good relations with the Diocese of Trinidad & Tobago and the Archdiocese of Iaşi (pronounced Yash) in Romania.

The idea of asking each archdeacon to take a specific interest in one of our partner dioceses emerged in 2018 and has been formalised this year. This will bring greater awareness of our international partnerships to discussions at both Bishop’s Staff and Bishop’s Council which will be especially important in preparation for Canon Roger Matthews’ retirement next year. It is for this reason that it makes sense for an archdeacon to take responsibility for the link committees if only for a season. This will not reduce the involvement of others in the developing life of each partnership.

Over the next few months we will be establishing a new International Committee to be chaired by Bishop John. This group will bring strategic coordination to all our international interests including the current link committees. It is, therefore, an open question as to who will be best placed to chair the individual link committees, and this may well change in the future as it has in the past.
Supplementaries

Q. Selecting Archdeacons to chair these groups does send out a message that there is a glass ceiling for laity. How does this sit with initiatives to strengthen lay involvement?

A. We hope to build a better partnership through these groups. These decisions may only be for a season and will change in the future. Lay and Ordained people will take responsibility.

Q. What consultation happened with the chairs of these bodies before the decision was reached?

A. This was not known but the answer will be established.

Q. Are there new ways of making appointments that can lead to greater diversity of church tradition?

A. Yes, there is this possibility for the international links.

Q4. Margaret Henning (Hadleigh) to ask the Chief Executive and Diocesan Secretary:

Parishes invest their funds with the Diocese. Can you please explain how these funds are invested and what is done to ensure parishes get a good return on their investments, at least as good as if they invested the funds themselves?

A.

The Chelmsford Diocesan Board of Finance holds legal title for some trust funds on behalf of parishes as custodian trustee. These are trusts which the Chelmsford DBF is obliged to hold as custodian trustee, either because this is specified in the trust document or because they are legally obliged so to do.

The parishes are managing trustees. As such they retain the management of the funds. The Chelmsford Diocesan Board of Finance is able to hold funds on behalf of parishes with the following fund managers: CCLA and M&G.

It is the decision of the managing trustees as to which type of fund is chosen. Both CCLA and M&G have a variety of funds: investment funds (equities, bonds etc) and traditional cash deposit accounts from which the managing trustees can choose. Both CCLA and M&G regularly deal with the investment of charitable funds, and managing trustees are very welcome to contact them to discuss their investment options.

Supplementaries

Q. How do we make sure parishes make best use of their investments?
A. This depends on the risk appetite of the PCC. The recent CCLA session held encouraged parishes to consider whether they can invest in other opportunities.

Q. Why has one parish received a ‘brush off’?

A. We apologise if a parish has received a ‘brush off’. The person was invited to raise their concern and see if it can be addressed.

Q5. Revd Dr Sara Batts-Neale (Braintree) to ask the Chief Executive and Diocesan Secretary:

Given that in March this year the Chancellor of the Exchequer announced that no new homes should have gas boilers from 2025 has the Diocese considered using this as an opportunity to further enhance our environmental credentials by formulating a plan that when gas boilers need replacing in Diocesan houses, they should be replaced with non fossil fuel alternatives?

A.

Thank you for raising this point, so far only one air source heat pump has been installed in a vicarage. The Houses Committee is continually looking at ways to improved environmental performance and at its last meeting approved the installation of charging points in any vicarages undergoing a rewire or where the occupier has purchased an electric car. I will ensure that non fossil fuel replacement boilers are discussed at the next Committee meeting.

Q6. Diana Benge Abbott (Bishop’s Nomination) to ask the Chief Executive and Diocesan Secretary:

How many people across the diocese, (in addition to the Lead Minister of the BMO for the Diocese of Chelmsford Deaf Church*) lay or ordained, have been made redundant, or apparently forced to resign or take unsought early retirement, in 2019? What support was given to them during the consultation period beforehand and in the following months?

* Reference: The report of the July meeting of the DMPC includes the line: Approved the extension of the BMO for the Diocese of Chelmsford Deaf Church. NB The new Lead Minister of the BMO holds the role in addition to that of a busy parish and other extra-parochial roles such as college chaplain.

A.

There have been no redundancies within the Chelmsford Diocesan Board of Finance over the past year and no one, lay or ordained, has been forced to resign or to take early retirement.

Where redundancies have occurred in the past, we have managed the process in accordance with our internal policies and statutory provisions. We also have
supported people by being flexible with notice periods, providing time off for job searching and interviews and we have offered support via external specialist coaching for interviews.

A handful of people have left the diocese during 2019 by mutual consent but it would be inappropriate to comment on individual cases.

The Bishop had recently appointed an Equality Adviser and part of their role will be to consider how we respond to issues of disability.

Q. How can we learn lessons as people move on?

A. We are always willing to learn lessons.

CLOSE

The Bishop of Chelmsford publically commissioned the Revd Ade Eleyae as his Equality Adviser. Prayers were offered for this new role.

The President closed the Synod.
DIOCESE OF CHELMSFORD
DIOCESAN SYNOD

Notes from the virtually gathering of the Synod held on
Saturday 6 June 2020 by videoconference

PRESENT : The President and 109 Members

The Chair welcome members of the Synod to the virtual gathering. The following
statement was read out:

In the current circumstances and given the need to be able to make progress with Diocesan
matters, the Bishop’s Council decided to proceed with a meeting of members of the
Diocesan Synod and the Annual General Meeting of the Chelmsford Diocesan Board of
Finance using Zoom.

When this body is acting in its capacity as the CDBF, we will be relying on legislation and
case law relating to companies for meeting by virtual means and passing formal resolutions
by correspondence (which includes email). The validity of a virtual meeting of the CDBF is
beyond doubt, and so we can discuss business and discern the will of the members. The
hand raise function will be used to hold an indicative vote where appropriate. The formal
decisions will then be made by email correspondence with the members of the CDBF so
there is absolute clarity and legal certainty.

In respect of the Diocesan Synod, there is no clear basis for proceeding in such a way,
and so this is, strictly speaking, a meeting of members of the Synod rather than a formal
meeting of the Synod. However, we propose to adopt the same approach and principles as
for the CDBF meeting to provide clarity on the views of members. We believe this is a fair
and reasonable way of proceeding, notwithstanding the lack of a formal legal basis, so that
Synod members have an opportunity to consider important business, and urgent work in the
Diocese may continue, informed by Synod members’ views.

The Chair then requested that members ensure their full name is showing and that
members of the public who had joined the call add ‘(public)’ to their name.

The Chair explained that members will be muted to begin with and unmuted to
contribute. To speak or vote the hand raise function must be used. Members of the
public may not address the synod, without chair’s permission, or vote.

The Archdeacon of Barking led the opening worship.

I. NOTICES

The Chair highlighted the contingency date for a meeting of the Diocesan Synod on
3rd October 2020. The venue will be confirmed
2. MINUTES OF DIOCESAN SYNOD MEETING HELD 23 NOVEMBER 2019

The minutes were noted.

3. PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS

The Acting Bishop of Chelmsford delivered his Presidential Address. The text of the address can be downloaded from here:


4. TOWARDS FINANCIAL RESILIENCE
5. PARISH SHARE AND BUDGET 2021 PROPOSAL
6. AN APPROACH TO REDUCING STIPENDIARY NUMBERS

The Chair explained that he would now invite those speaking to the papers for items 4, 5 and 6 to speak as one block. He would then invite members to ask questions on any of the papers before taking indicative votes on each of the papers.

He invited the Interim Chief Executive, the Revd Canon Dr Roger Matthews, to speak to paper DS(20)04. He began by thanking members for all the messages of support he and Maureen Cole had received. He then went on to highlight the following points:

- There is nothing new under the sun. He reflected on finding a slip in a book he had inherited as Chief Executive which invited evidence to a Diocesan Commission set up to look at the financial challenges facing the Diocese.
- The Diocese faces a continuing budget deficit and parish share shortfall. COVID 19 has exacerbated this.
- Paper DS(20)04 addresses financial resilience to ensure we can continue to operate in the current circumstances. The Diocese had been greatly helped by a loan from the national church to cover stipend payments.
- We are unable to bring the budget for the following year for approval given the current circumstances and the uncertainty over the parish share scheme.
- Going forward there are two options, decrease costs or increase income and we probably need to do a combination of both.

The Chief Executive then handed over to the Archdeacon of Barking, who was leading a workstream looking at stewardship within the Diocese. He commented that there was a lot of hard work, being led by our Mission and Ministry Advisers, Many parishes are taking the challenge seriously, but there is room for an uplift in stewardship and discipleship. There are two specific pieces of work going on at present. The first was localised and contextualised intervention and support. The other is a Diocesan stewardship programme. There is encouragement on giving, but we are not out of the woods at all. We have found opportunities.
The Chief Executive continued his presentation:

- We have worked on reducing expenditure by furloughing CDBF employees. Pleshey had received a grant from the hospitality sector. 40 Diocesan employees had been furloughed and at the present 34 remained on furlough. The Education Advisers had been brought back given the wider opening of schools and the Bookshop and Print Unit staff had also returned to work.
- The Chief Executive is open to suggestions on reducing costs and he invited members to contact him if they had offerings.
- The Finance Committee has set up a Finance Task Group and this group will meet for the first time during the week after the Synod gathering.

The Chief Executive then introduced the Interim Chief Operating Officer, who spoke to paper DS(20)05 making the following points:

- The cash position of the Diocese is not great. For three consecutive years the CDBF has ended the year with a deficit of or in excess of £1 million.
- The May parish share performance has meant that we have been able to delay the commencement of the stipends loan from the national church to July. Without this support we would not be able to pay stipends.
- The CDBF will likely need to sell some of its investments.
- Parish share is the best way of solving this issue. We have to get ourselves out of this and as Christians we should be able to do this.
- The National Church are preparing a grant scheme. The purpose of this will not be to bail Dioceses out but to help them reach the point of sustainability.
- The reason the budget for 2021 cannot be presented is because we do not know how we will come out of this current crisis.
- There is an existing challenge with the parish share scheme which will need to be addressed. At present each year is starting with £300k unallocated. The MMU allocation system is not working.
- Therefore, the proposal is to match the budget for 2021 and to conduct a share scheme review. The review cannot start now but it will commence before the end of the year. For next year MMUs will return to benefice calculations.

The Chief Executive then addressed paper DS(20)06 highlighting the following points:

- This is the most sensitive paper, given the focus on stipendiary numbers.
- We have been working toward these figures since 2011. The initial focus was not financial, but availability of clergy due to average age and retirements.
- We are grateful to those Deaneries who have already reached their 2025 figures.
- The Darlow funding withdrawal had led us to look at how many posts we can afford going forward. The answer was that we need to look at reducing the affordable number of stipends from 215 to 202. This is on the assumptions that giving continues at its present level.
- The approach set out in the Subsidy to Sustainability paper remains valid and it will be brought back in an integrated way.
• The Appendix regarding vacancies should not have been issued and was withdrawn as it is no longer up to date or accurate.

• The paper suggests a planning process to bring the 2025 target forward to 2021. This process also has the benefit that if further cuts are required there will not need to be a major re-planning exercise.

• The suggested coding is not an assessment of the clergy in post or the parishes themselves.

• It is proposed that 150 posts are allocated as green posts. Why 150? This was because it is a third less 202. We are aware of the sensitivities around this but if we plan on this basis we can adapt as necessary.

• The specifics of each Deanery will be refined with the respective Archdeacon. There will be time to reflect on the proposals at the Area and Diocesan Mission and Pastoral Committees in the Autumn, before the November Synod.

• Specific attention was drawn to paragraph 5. We are greatly helped by the currently high vacancy number (48.5). However, we recognise the burden here and the vacancies are not in the right places. Some are strategic and need to be filled.

• It is hoped that redundancies will be avoided through redeployment and early retirements.

The Chair then invited members to ask questions on any of the papers or the presentations. The following members asked a question or commented:

Revd Martin Bailey (Havering)
Revd James Rodley (Harlow)
John Bloomer (Chelmsford North)
Mary Durlacher (General Synod)
Nick Ellis (Hinckford)
Revd Simon Law (Basildon)
Revd Susan Lucas (Newham)
Revd Clive Hillman (Hadleigh)
Revd Susan Iskander (Chelmsford North)
Revd Stephanie Gillingham (Chelmsford South)
Philip Carnelley (Redbridge)
Revd Helen Gheorghiu Gould (Harlow)
Colin Setchfield (Waltham Forest)
Revd David Lower (St Osyth)
Revd Canon Paul Hamilton (Brentwood)
Revd Ernie Guest (Rochford)
Revd Christine Newmarch (Witham)
Canon Vevet Deer (Waltham Forest)
Revd Canon Darren Barlow (Thurrock)
Revd Canon Jane Richards (Basildon)
Revd Claire Robertson (Hinckford)
Revd Christiana Asinugo (Newham)
Piers Northam (Harlow)
Robin Stevens (Chelmsford North)
Bishop of Barking
The comments and questions were as follows:

- Paper DS(20)06 states that more detailed guidance is to be provided on the process for coding posts. What are the criteria? What if the next Diocesan Bishop disagrees with this approach? The Chief Executive responded that it was not so much the criteria that would be clarified but the Red Amber Green approach is not sensitive enough to acknowledge time limited posts and this needs to be developed further. The criteria are largely in existing Deanery plans. It would be impossible to do this top down and the new Bishop will undoubtedly be a factor but this is an agreed priority over the last ten years so they would have no choice but to accept it.

- There are 31 clergy in the Diocese who have freehold. They cannot be made redundant. How will they be treated? The Chief Executive confirmed that we are not proposing to do anything that is unlawful. We have tried to treat clergy as equal as possible despite this difference. It is hoped those on freehold will want to engage in this process.

- The process for pastoral reorganisation costs money and we need to factor that in? The Chief Executive confirmed it would be foolish to spend a lot on this, but we have great experience here.

- If we were to continue to collaborate as MMUs on parish finances will that be supported? The Chief Executive confirmed support for MMUs would be maintained.

- What other models have been looked at? This process seems to discourage the local clergy. The Chief Executive responded that the issue was the quality of leadership. It would be foolish to say that good leadership comes exclusively from stipendiary clergy.

- There was an article in the Sunday Times suggesting there would be major national review of the Church of England. Is this true? The Bishop of Barking confirmed there would be no immediate national review. The reference was to a missional strategy that the Archbishop of York will lead on regarding the quinquennial goals.

- What impact will this have on parishes who are currently trying to raise money for significant repairs and maintenance? The Chief Executive confirmed he was very aware of the tough balance between share payments and other costs parishes have. There are no immediate proposals on this point and the Archdeacons are looking at what could be done next. Buildings are an issue for all parishes in the Church of England and it is being considered nationally.

- If we took up the challenge of giving £1, £2 or £5 more would this discussion become irrelevant? The Chief Executive confirmed that if we step up to the challenge the position would change. However, we must be mindful that availability of clergy remains an issue.

- What process is in place for local consultation on strategic posts? The Chief Executive responded that the process is for Archdeacons to work with Area Deans and Lay Chairs and build on the existing Deanery plan.

- Is it essential that we sell investments now? The Chief Operating Officer commented that we don’t want to sell investments in the current market but it is necessary. The market position is not as bad as some think. One of the investment portfolios is only down by 2%.
• It is good to see the bull being taken by the horns. The number of vacancies is concerning, does the quoted figure included those clergy currently suspended? The Chief Executive confirmed that the figure does not include those clergy currently suspended. It was noted that there is some evidence to suggest that clergy are less likely to move under the current conditions.
• Do we need all the buildings and parishes we currently have?
• There is a risk that we may make decisions on the basis of the pre-COVID context.
• Some have been exhausted by the work put into the forming of MMUs. How can we support clergy and lay leaders?
• Renting properties for curates is not always very practical. The Chief Executive commented that we are not going back to the days of all houses being rented. We are hoping to utilise some of the existing housing stock.
• We are making a presumption that the current system will stay the way it is. Some Dioceses have been quite radical, should we also take a more radical approach?
• Interim Ministry is a positive approach not a tool of reduction. If we are not careful, we will undermine trust in this approach.
• Can we look at competitively pricing of some Diocesan services, such as payroll?
• We should consider providing resource to skill parishes in applying for grants and fundraising.
• It would help to have a high-level message sent out that the Church needs help.
• Can we have a definition of ‘strategic potential’?
• Will the RAG rating be transparent? The Chief Executive confirmed that the RAG ratings will be public and this would help with ownership.
• Will the numbers of stipendiary curates be reduced so we don’t set ourselves up to fail? The Chief Executive commented that this was essential and work with ordinands was underway to ensure they go in to the process with their eyes open. However, we need to ensure people still come forward for stipendiary ministry.
• The Church Commissioners have a significant amount of money it would help to see some of this released particularly to support poorly resourced parishes. The Chief Operating Officer commented that the Church Commissioners have provided some support already.
• It is helpful to know that the Diocesan level resources are also being looked at. The local Church needs to know this is happening. Could we have an explanation on this so we know we are all in this together?
• We were not in as bad a position as some other Dioceses last time, but we are now. What are we feeding back to the National Church, especially in relation to the former Darlow money?
• In a URC paper they have stated that the first call on money must be for ministry costs. Can we add this to our core message?
• Can the Diocese give guidance to parishes regarding advertisement? If there is to be a moratorium we need to know now so that finances are not wasted.
• COVID 19 has meant a loss of income and jobs for many.
• One of the reasons why giving has dropped in some places is because giving is normally by cash and people do not do online banking.
• Self Supporting Ministry posts are very hard to use as the basis for firm long term plans as the individuals may not be around for very long. The Chief Executive acknowledged this was the case, however, the hope is that parishes will ‘grow their own’ as has been experienced in a number of parishes with the Locally Deployed SSMs.
• We need to have a concern for the morale of our stipendiary clergy.
• We need to be very careful in our language and communication. The cost of coffee argument is not much use in some areas. Also, the proportions can be unhelpful for some. £5 is not a lot of money to some, but it is to others.
• A member commented that if the Diocese rented a house where they lived it would cost in excess of £10,000 a year.
• Why do we not invest more in property? Whilst other investments lose value, property often holds it value. The Chief Operating Officer commented that there is investment in property, but we cannot release that for liquidity.
• We could benefit from having a business arm of the Church of England.
• Can things be put in place to help us do things differently. There are church buildings with low numbers attending them and maybe there could be some support in how to think differently about those situations.
• Non-stipendiary ministers are a gift, but they do have other commitments that they need to balance.
• We need to focus on a thriving Church. Once the Church thrives, we will not have money issues.
• Whilst we should look at buildings, we do need to have physical space to forge meaningful relationships. Would common ownership be a solution, so the parish is not saddled with the costs?
• We need a balance between fundraising and giving. We often go for the ‘supermarket’ model which is not the way to address the issues we face. We need to focus on sacrificial giving and responding to God’s sacrifice.
• We are formed in order to be sent and we need to face reality spiritually and prayerfully.
• For some, particularly new members, they need to have something concrete in mind when considering their giving.
• The national Church will give financial support to Dioceses who are looking to radically review how they do things.
• We need to prepare for significant well being and mental health issues, but we must not panic, we need to reflect and then act.

The Chief Executive thanked members for living in the reality of the present situation.

The Chair reminded members this was not a formal meeting and therefore there would be no formal vote on the papers. However, he asked for indicative votes on the recommendations in the three papers.

Paper DS(20)04 was noted
Paper DS(20)05 was noted and the direction of travel supported by an overwhelming majority.
Paper DS(20)06 was noted and supported by a clear majority with 10 voting against supporting the outlined plan and 15 abstentions.
7. QUESTIONS

Kathy Playle (General Synod) to ask the Acting Bishop of Chelmsford

Q. How can we find a balance between the new initiatives and new church plants the diocese has envisaged alongside cutting clergy numbers in most deaneries?

A. The diocese of Chelmsford has a bold aspiration to plant 101 new Christian communities in the next 10 years. We have already made a good start. These new Christian communities will come about in two ways:

First, there are those which will receive grant funding from the Church of England’s Strategic Development Fund. Although this funding is time-limited, it enables us to plant churches in new ways and particularly in large, less advantaged urban areas. It has no immediate impact upon clergy numbers in a deanery, though in time if the plants are to continue they need to be financially sustainable, using the same model of generous giving and mutual support that is the pattern across the whole diocese.

Secondly, there are those usually smaller initiatives of developing new Christian communities within parishes and Mission and Ministry Units, which are funded from within. They already come under the oversight of the local clergy and PCCs and are often lay led. They, therefore, do not affect local funding or parish share assessments. In addition, initiatives such as St Cedd’s Lay Pioneer Centre in Romford are training lay pioneer ministers who can be of resource to the diocese in this important ministry.

There is, therefore, already both a balance and a creative inter-relationship between the outside resources of the Strategic Development Fund and our own resources and initiatives. We should remember that the purpose of the Mission and Ministry Unit is not just to provide a sustainable future, but also one which can grow the church. This happens through a focus on evangelism, blessing and service.

Any diocesan family - and we are a family of churches - needs to find a way of building a sustainable future and living within its means. We can only do this together through sacrificial, proportionate giving and mutual support, as well through developing new patterns of mission and ministry.

Clergy numbers will go up and down as we respond to these challenges, as we give and as God leads. The number and balance of paid leaders we have at any point in the journey, lay and ordained, is largely in our own hands and pockets. It would be terrific to see stipendiary numbers increase, but that is only something that we can do together as a Christian family.

Supplementary questions

Q. We have a reputation to restore. Is it possible to do this through ‘drive through’ Churches and other initiatives?

A. The Acting Bishop of Chelmsford confirmed his support for consideration of new ways to reach people.
Q. How will we continue to support the SDF funded projects?

A. Local Churches have agency to do this. As we have discussed our resources are limited however Joel Gowen put a rigorous process in place and this needs to work for both new and existing Churches.

Q. What happens if the SDF plants are not financially sustainable?

A. Most of the SDF plants are less than 2 years old. However, they will need to be reviewed on the RAG rating and decisions will need to be made.

8. CDBF AGM

See separate minutes

9. SEE OF CHELMSFORD

Canon Robert Hammond, Chair of the Vacancy in See Committee, summarised the developments in the process to fill the vacancy in the See of Chelmsford. He covered the following points:

- The process of identifying the next Bishop of Chelmsford is rooted in prayer. A Diocesan prayer was prepared and released.
- The Vacancy in See Committee is the body which approved the Diocesan Statement of Needs and Crown Nominations Commission (CNC) elections on behalf of the Diocese.
- It has been consulting widely. At present in excess of 400 responses had been received.
- The Committee comprises the Area Bishops, the Dean of Chelmsford, two Archdeacons, the General Synod representatives and lay and clergy reps elected by the Diocesan Synod.
- The Archbishops’ and Prime Minister’s Appointments Secretaries also consult with community, civic and other leaders.
- The Role and Person Specifications are drawn up and candidates are proposed for the role. There is then a process of shortlisting and interview.
- The Archbishop of Canterbury requested we continue the process in the current conditions and is very pleased that we were able to do this.
- The committee met for the first time in March. The consultation started in May and will close on 4 July. The response rate so far means this will likely be one of the largest diocesan consultations undertaken in the history of the Church of England.
- On 30 June the committee will elect the six diocesan representatives to the CNC.
- The first meeting of the CNC will take place in October and the second in November.
- The new Bishop should be announced at the end of the year or early in the new year. They would then probably take up their post in spring 2021.
• Regarding the consultation, young people had taken part in it including an interview with Bishop Peter. Social media and emails have been used to encourage people to engage with the process. There were six questions formed to help people with their responses. A working group, chaired by the Archdeacon of Colchester, had been set up to analyse all the responses.
• The Archdeacon of West Ham is leading a small working group pulling together factual information to describe the Diocese.

Members were then invited to comment on what they wanted to see in the next Bishop. The following members commented:

Piers Northam (Harlow)
Canon Vevet Deer (Waltham Forest)
Revd Helen Gheorghiu Gould (Harlow)
Revd Canon Jane Richards (Basildon)
Revd Susan Lucas (Newham)
Revd Canon Paul Hamilton (Brentwood)
Philip Carnelley (Redbridge)
Revd Simon Law (Basildon)
Revd Clive Hillman (Hadleigh)
Revd David Lower (St Osyth)
Ursula Davies (Newham)
Diana Benge Abbott (Bishop’s Nomination)
Revd Martin Bailey (Havering)
John Bloomer (Colchester)
Pat Bash (Braintree)
Revd Canon John Dunnett (General Synod)

Their contributions included:

• We need someone who is there for all, particularly as we emerge from the pandemic.
• Someone who listens to both clergy and laity and who accepts the diversity of this Diocese.
• It would be fantastic to see a spiritual team leader.
• We should not get too hung up on their gender, it would be better to have the right man than the wrong women.
• A traditionalist catholic should not be ruled out.
• Someone robust enough for mutual flourishing and supportive of the five guiding principles.
• Someone who can think strategically.
• An Anglican who will uphold the beliefs of the Church of England.
• A respectful person who will not change what is working, but also support new opportunities. They should also have the strength to say when something in not working.
• A Bishop with a track record in Church growth, with parish experience and a good evangelist.
• Someone who recognises the equal opportunities for BAME people.
• A Bishop passionate about the environment and assisting those with a disability.
• We need to avoid someone who is primarily a manager. They should be an overseer and pastor. They should commission managers to manage. They should not be ashamed to preach the Good News.
• Someone who is inclusive and embraces the Diocese.
• Someone willing to engage with both churched and unchurched, especially in business and the workplace.
• A person who can relate to all not just a particular sector of society.

The Vice Chair of the Vacancy in See Committee spoke of their experience of serving on the CNC for eight years as a national elected representative. In the consultation process we have seen some predictable contributions, but it has been broad and no one will be able to say they did not have the opportunity to comment. On behalf of the Synod he thanked Canon Robert Hammond for his diligence and effort.

Canon Robert Hammond reminded members that there would be a day of prayer tomorrow. The committee are inviting prayers written for the discernment process and he encouraged people to submit their prayers.

10. BISHOP’S COUNCIL AND FINANCE COMMITTEE REPORTS

Paper DS(2020)07 was noted.

CLOSE

The Chair thanked members for engaging with the virtual gathering.

The President thanked the Vice Chairs, the Chair of the CDBF, the Chief Executive and the Chief Operating Officer for their contributions to the meeting.

The President closed the Synod.
1. INTRODUCTION

The Acting Bishop of Chelmsford has asked that the Diocese works through a project to develop stewardship across the Diocese. The Stewardship Project Team, comprising the Archdeacon of Barking, the three Mission and Ministry Advisers and the Director of Communications have been meeting regularly to design and develop a series of resources and a program which will be rolled out through the Diocese from Advent Sunday through to Candlemas.

We are working on the basis that much of this work will be carried out mainly using digital means of communication. We are currently planning extensive use of video, social media, website resources and downloads available to resource parishes and to support the MMAs in their work with parishes. The advantage of such an approach is that it provides wide ranging flexibility, but the likely investment in the project has already been

2. BACKGROUND

It is clear in reflecting with the MMAs that the engagement with the principles of Christian Stewardship is mixed across the Diocese. A significant number of parishes have an engaged, theologically resourced and prayerfully based approach to stewardship as an integrated aspect of the life together as Christian disciples. There are a small number of parishes where, for a variety of reasons, any current intervention is unlikely to be fruitful. There are also a substantial number of parishes which the MMAs have identified as the focus of their work in the coming months. These are the contexts within which a renewed approach to stewardship and the deployment of the MMA resource is likely to have the greatest impact.

We do not think that a single, one size fits all, approach will best serve the diverse needs and opportunities within the Diocese at this time.

For this reason we have concluded that the focus of the project should be to provide a wide range of material, some of which may be used by any parish - whatever their approach to stewardship - and some specific resources which will assist the MMAs in their work with particular communities.

We have been able to draw on the considerable wisdom of our Director of Communication, who brings experience of organising digital media campaigns in the past.

3. MAJOR THEMES

The major themes we will be exploring will be:
Promoting sacrificial giving as a part of our Christian discipleship.

Refreshing our ecclesiology to renew our commitment to shared responsibility.

Resourcing parishes to equip them with effective practical tools - especially the promotion of the Parish Giving Scheme.

4. LIKELY TIMESCALE

We are building the project to draw upon some of the key themes from the seasons of the liturgical year.

Kingdom Season - Anticipation, thanksgiving
During this time we will use social media, The View and other opportunities to raise a sense of expectation and raise awareness of the forthcoming project.

Advent Sunday - Watching and waiting
The project will be launched liturgically, hopefully with contributions from across the Diocese.

Advent 2,3 and 4 - Preparing, expecting accountability, saying ‘yes’ to God
We will use the Sundays in Advent to encourage prayer and reflection, especially aiming to resource deepening discipleship. We will be using video and online study materials as well as a continued social media presence.

Christmas - Generous and unqualified giftedness
Christmas presents an opportunity to be reminded of the impact of the incarnation and to resource reflection on how we can begin to respond that reality.

Epiphany - We are all a part of this
We will now aim to develop our understanding of what it is to respond to this giftedness. Connecting God’s generosity with the potential for our own.

Epiphany 1,2 and 3 - Discipleship/ conversion/ our life together
Using video, social media and other online resources we will be developing our understanding of what it means to be together in the Diocese. We will aim to use case studies and provide a range of resources on line.

Candlemas - Completion / looking forward/ expectation
We will celebrate the end of the focussed work of the project with an online liturgy and another address by +Peter.

5. RECOMMENDATION
Synod is invited to discuss, note and support this project.
1. INTRODUCTION
This paper introduces the draft 2021 budget for the general fund. The budget has been prepared several months later than previous years but there is still much uncertainty regarding the outturn for 2020 and the expected financial picture for 2021. It is expected that income in 2021 will be down substantially. Expenditure for 2021 is budgeted to reduce but not by as much as income. Further work is currently being undertaken reviewing costs. The outcome will not be known until after the budget has been presented to Synod in October. A proposed action plan is included in this paper (section 6) which outlines an approach to enable the CDBF to manage the income shortfall budgeted for 2021 and get to a balanced budget by the end of the year.

2. 2021 BUDGET SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2021 Budget</th>
<th>2020 Budget</th>
<th>2020 Forecast</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£'000</td>
<td>£'000</td>
<td>£'000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INCOME</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish Share Allocation</td>
<td>16,764</td>
<td>17,073</td>
<td>16,764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less share shortfall</td>
<td>(3,000)</td>
<td>(3,200)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13,764</td>
<td>17,073</td>
<td>13,564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutual Support Fund</td>
<td>4,426</td>
<td>5,064</td>
<td>4,425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Income</td>
<td>18,190</td>
<td>22,137</td>
<td>17,989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPENDITURE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Ministry Costs</td>
<td>13,556</td>
<td>14,078</td>
<td>13,280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Ministry &amp; Curates</td>
<td>4,267</td>
<td>4,245</td>
<td>4,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services to Parishes</td>
<td>2,347</td>
<td>2,299</td>
<td>2,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other costs</td>
<td>1,516</td>
<td>1,515</td>
<td>1,415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Expenditure</td>
<td>21,686</td>
<td>22,137</td>
<td>21,195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Shortfall</td>
<td>(3,496)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(3,206)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. 2021 INCOME & THE MUTUAL SUPPORT FUND

The main source of income remains the generosity of individuals and parishes through Share. It is proposed, recognising the impact on parishes of COVID-19, that the share assessed on parishes remains at the same level as 2020.

Under the share scheme, all other income goes into the Mutual Support Fund. This is then used to meet the difference between the cost of ministry and the share allocated to parishes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2021 Budget</th>
<th>2020 Budget</th>
<th>2020 Forecast</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£'000</td>
<td>£'000</td>
<td>£'000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUTUAL SUPPORT FUND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Church Support Transition</td>
<td>1,190</td>
<td>1,468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Church Support Deprived Communities</td>
<td>808</td>
<td>757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diocesan Support from Investment income</td>
<td>970</td>
<td>1,392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share Shortfall Provision</td>
<td>(100)</td>
<td>(100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income from Statutory Fees (net)</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Fee Credit</td>
<td>(408)</td>
<td>(408)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant posts</td>
<td>1,541</td>
<td>1,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutual Support Fund Total</td>
<td>4,426</td>
<td>5,064</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The main source of income for the Mutual Support Fund is National Church Support. This has been reducing since 2017 as a net effect of an increase in the hypothecated support for low income communities (LinC) and the greater reduction in transition funding. This pattern will continue through to 2026 when support for low income communities is expected to be approximately £1m per annum and transitional support £nil. The 2021 budget incorporates a reduction of £227k over the 2020 budget.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£'000</td>
<td>£'000</td>
<td>£'000</td>
<td>£'000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LinC</td>
<td>735</td>
<td>757</td>
<td>808</td>
<td>836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition</td>
<td>1,617</td>
<td>1,468</td>
<td>1,190</td>
<td>991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,352</td>
<td>2,225</td>
<td>1,998</td>
<td>1,827</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The next most significant source of income for the Chelmsford Diocesan Board of Finance (CDBF) is income from investments. The CDBF Trustees had agreed a goal of increasing the level of investment capital – and therefore investment income flowing back to parishes – over the next decade. This was achieved in 2017. The 2019 and 2020 budgets included aggressive budget targets for increasing investment income. However, it was acknowledged that the threat to our ability to increase investment income for the benefit of all came from the risk of Share shortfall depleting reserves and investment capital:

The encouraging downward trend on share shortfall was reversed in 2017. Share shortfall increased from £809k in 2016 to £1,342k in 2019. Currently the shortfall in 2020 is forecast to be in excess of £3m. £5m has been realised from our existing investments to fund the forecast deficit and bolster CDBF liquid reserves. As a consequence, the targets for investment income have not been met. The 2021 budgeted investment income is 30% less than that budgeted for 2020 at £970k (2020 £1,392k).

Then there is the income received by the Chelmsford Diocesan Board of Finance (CDBF) for statutory fees (weddings/ funerals). Over half of the total flows back to parishes in the fee credit or direct payments to non-stipendiary officiants. We had been seeing a gradual reduction in fee income which correlates with a reduction in the number of recorded weddings. Net income is significantly lower as although fees received have reduced there is a time lag on the fee credit meaning that the fee credit will not see a corresponding reduction until the 2022 share assessment is calculated.

Finally, the Mutual Support Fund receives the financial benefit of the vacancy rate. This shows an increase as the budgeted vacancy rate has increased to 11.8% from 9.7%.

4. 2021 EXPENDITURE

Expenditure for 2021 is budgeted to decrease by 2% to £21.7 million.

Current and future ministry represents 82% of total expenditure, at a cost of £17.8 million. The total requested through the Share scheme is £16.8 million. It remains the case therefore that our general fund income is insufficient to cover the direct ministry costs and ministers in training. The balance comes from other income and our Mutual Support Fund. Stipends are not budgeted to increase in 2021. The increase of 2% budgeted in 2020 was actioned in April 2020. The direct cost per stipendiary minister increases by just 0.5% with increased costs for clergy housing offset by savings on vacancy costs. Vacancy costs includes rent receivable on vacant clergy houses, which is budgeted to increase to £600k (2020 budget £430k). The cost of a stipendiary together with equivalent figures for other types of minister is set out in the budget in the appendix.

The budget for 2021 is based on 257 FTE stipendiary posts, a reduction of 11 on the 2020 budgeted figure of 268. 227 posts are expected to be filled during the year resulting in a budgeted vacancy rate of 11.8% (2020 9.7%).

Overall total ministry costs, excluding curates, reduces by 3.7% in 2021 to £13.6 million. Following the decision at the last Diocesan Synod, we are currently processing the outcomes of the review of Key Strategic Posts that the Archdeacons and Area Deans have been undertaking and will have a better picture in the next few weeks. This will inform
our plan to reduce clergy posts and is expected to result in a further reduction in 2021 Ministry Costs.
Future ministry costs cover ordinands and lay ministers in training, plus the costs of curacies. In 2018 we budgeted for a record number of stipendiary curates, reflecting a ‘bulge’ in candidates completing training. Numbers were slightly lower in 2019, partly due to that bulge effect. Our budget allowed for 14 stipendiary curates in 2019, growing to 16 for 2020 and beyond. The budget for 2021 allows for a maximum of 16 curates. We will review this decision for the future.
Costs for future ministry increase by 0.5% to £4,267k.

Services to Mission and Ministry Units and Parishes show a net increase of 2.1%. This is due to recognise the costs of University Chaplaincy under Children and Youth work. In previous budgets these posts were included as parochial posts. The Area Teams show a reduction of 3 posts with corresponding reduction in costs as youth workers are now part of the central Children and Youth work budget. Overall, there is a reduction of two posts in this area as the focus of our work and its funding changes.

The other expenditure heading shows a slight increase on 2020. Savings on diocesan services and reduced contributions to the National Church are entirely absorbed by increased expenditure on communications and reduced trading income.

5. BUDGET ASSUMPTIONS 2021

The following assumptions are set out for agreement:

- **Stipends** and salaries levels to remain at 2020 level (increase of 2% in 2020)
- **Stipendiary establishment** of 257 FTE showing a reduction in posts of 11 compared to 2020. Vacancy rate increased to 11.8% from 9.7%. Budgeted parochial stipendiary clergy in post 227, a reduction of 19 compared to 2020 budget (2020: 246)
- No change in the total number of **Stipendiary Curates**: intake of 16 in 2021
- **National Church** contribution to remain at 2020 actual. Due to over budgeting in 2020 this results in a decrease in the 2021 budget
- **Clergy repairs and other housing costs** are set at the same level as in 2020 but increase as costs are spread over fewer houses.
6. ACTION PLAN

The budget has been produced based on current forecasts of income and expenditure and decisions made to date. The Finance Executive will meet fortnightly and then monthly to monitor and develop a detailed action plan to:

- strengthen the General Fund
- increase revenue
- reduce costs
- improve the cash position

While the plan is evolving, current priorities are:

a) strengthen the General Fund
   o reviewing designated and restricted funds, to identify funds which can be released, and transferring such funds to the General Fund.

b) increase revenue
   o identifying opportunities to increase revenue from:
     ▪ giving, including future review of parish share process
     ▪ property income
     ▪ investment return

c) reduce costs, 2021 budget £21.7m,
   o reviewing the following areas:
     ▪ direct costs of ministry, £13.6m
     ▪ future ministry training and curates’ costs, £4.3m
     ▪ services to mission and ministry units’ costs, £2.3m
     ▪ other expenditure £1.5m

d) improve the cash position
   ▪ seeking national church support where applicable
   ▪ if necessary, selling a further £3.5m investments. *
   ▪ reviewing the clergy housing portfolio to identify surplus houses, making them available for sale and reinvesting the proceeds to generate income.

* It is recognised that the sale of investments is not sustainable for future years. If we sell investments at this level, they would only cover us for a further 5 years.

7. MOTION

‘That this Synod
a) approve the Diocesan Budget for 2021 with total budgeted expenditure of £21,686,000
b) note the action plan for 2021 to address the budget deficit
c) approve the apportionment of the total Share of £16,764,000 (before credits) on the same basis as 2020.’
### CHELMSFORD DIOCESAN BOARD OF FINANCE - GENERAL FUND BUDGET 2021

#### £'000 A Direct Costs of Ministry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>Increase/Decrease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>51,097</td>
<td>51,346</td>
<td>2,250 (4.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stipendiary</strong></td>
<td>27,290</td>
<td>27,526</td>
<td>2,250 (8.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>House for Duty</strong></td>
<td>983</td>
<td>983</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of People (Stipendiary)</td>
<td>257.0</td>
<td>257.0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of People (Other)</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total for Stipendiaries</strong></td>
<td>51,097</td>
<td>51,346</td>
<td>2,250 (4.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total for House for Duty</strong></td>
<td>10,906</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>-10,633 (-97.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total for SSM &amp; Lay</strong></td>
<td>568</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>-316 (-55.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direct Costs of Ministry</strong></td>
<td>13,556</td>
<td>13,283</td>
<td>-273 (-2.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B1 Future Ministry Training &amp; Curates</strong></td>
<td>4,245</td>
<td>4,267</td>
<td>22 (0.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditure</strong></td>
<td>21,686</td>
<td>21,686</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D Mutual Support Fund</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(955)</td>
<td>(955) (-100.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income Shortfall before Share Shortfall</strong></td>
<td>(309)</td>
<td>(496)</td>
<td>(187) (-61.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Share Shortfall Forecast</strong></td>
<td>(3,200)</td>
<td>(3,000)</td>
<td>(200) (-6.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income Shortfall including Share Shortfall to be funded</strong></td>
<td>(3,509)</td>
<td>(3,496)</td>
<td>(13) (-0.4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This paper summarises the business of the Bishop's Council since the report circulated to the June Synod gathering.

**July 2020**

**Bishop's Council**
- Approved the establishment of a Task Group to support churches in carrying out such a review of their paintings and monuments and to ask parishes to find one thing they can do as a way of supporting the anti-racism protests and to make amends for the part the country played and the benefit it received from the slave trade.
- Received an update on the Vacancy in See process.

**DMPC**
- Approved the proposal to commence formal consultation for:
  - A Bishop's Mission Order for the Church at Barking Riverside,
  - The union of the benefice of Great Ilford St John and Aldborough Hatch.
  - The transfer of the churchyard of the former church of St James in West Tilbury (now a residential property) to the CDBF for disposal.
  - The closure of the church of St Nicholas in Little Wigborough.
- Approved the further suspension of the right of presentation of the benefice of Becontree St Thomas, the benefice of the Halstead Area, the benefice of Walton le Soken, the benefice of Southend and the benefice of Little Baddow. Approval of a new suspension of the benefice of Stanford le Hope with Mucking was also granted.

**Finance Committee**
- Agreed to recommend a 0% increase in stipend for the next year.
- Agreed to hold the parish share allocations to exactly the same for 2021 as 2020.
- Agreed a major review is needed to launch a new parish share approach for 2022.
September 2020 – an additional meeting

Bishop’s Council
• Approved the agenda for the additional Diocesan Synod meeting on 3 October 2020.

Finance Committee
• Received an update on the parish share process for 2021.
• Approved key assumptions on the budget and an accompanying action plan for 2021.
• Received a verbal update on the position of Sparrows.

Diocesan Mission and Pastoral Committee
• Approved terms of a new lease for the closed church of Becontree St Peter.

Synod is asked to NOTE this report.
The Five Marks of Mission

As Anglicans, we’ve been called to follow the five marks of mission. All are deeply relevant to environmental action:

1. To proclaim the good news of the kingdom.
2. To teach, baptise and nurture new believers.
3. To respond to human need by loving service.
4. To seek to transform unjust structures of society, to challenge violence of every kind and to pursue peace and reconciliation.
5. To strive to safeguard the integrity of creation and sustain and renew the life of the earth.

We have tended to ignore the 5th BUT the 5th cannot be separated from the other four.

- There is good news in the message of the Bible and the message of the gospel for the whole of creation.
- We must teach people of God’s passion for the whole of creation and our responsibility as his people.
- We need to see the desperate plight of the poorest and the marginalised as they are impacted the most by climate change and all of us across the Diocese will be severely affected unless urgent action is taken in the next decade.
- We need to recognise that climate change contributes to civil unrest and to migration. We need to be passionate about seeking justice and peace.

Diocese of Chelmsford has a history of engagement in the 5th Mark of Mission. These include decisions made previously by our Diocesan Synod.

In March 2003 Diocesan Synod passed a resolution
“ This synod requests Bishops Council in consultation with deaneries and parishes to develop an environmental policy for the Diocese which will reflect the Fifth Mark of Mission and to report back to synod before the end of 2004”.

In November 2004 The Diocesan Synod resolved
“that this synod commends the attached paper ‘Sustain and renew the life of the earth for widespread use throughout the Diocese…..”

In June 2010 Diocesan Synod passed a Resolution on the Environment
“It is possible… to live differently.

In 2015 The green collar campaign led by the Diocesan Environment Group gained support both through synod and also across the diocese by raising awareness and enabling
prayer throughout the year. The wearing of the green collar was noted and approved by other dioceses with bishops and clergy across the country adopting wearing the green collar. This campaign focused on the meeting of world leaders in Paris in November/December 2015.

2019 was a year of increased awareness and saw discussions at Bishop’s Staff and the letter from Bishop Stephen in September as well as the involvement of clergy and lay people from across the diocese in Christian Climate Action (the Christian wing of Extinction Rebellion) as well as involvement in local school strikes.

This renewed interest gained momentum in 2020 with commitment from parishes across the diocese this has led to silver eco church awards by both local parish and our Cathedral Following on from Bishop Stephen’s letter in 2019 we have seen increased commitment to creation care and eco church in each episcopal area. On 18th January we held our first event in the Barking episcopal area at Wanstead which saw some 86 people attend and engage with different themes of creation care, the global south and eco church, and a very successful online conference took place in June, co-ordinated by Chelmsford Cathedral and the Bradwell area. During Lent a series was run with input from our bishops thinking about our response as Christians to the environmental and climate crises which runs alongside the Archbishop of Canterbury’s Lent book by Ruth Valerio “Saying yes to life” and the Church of England’s Lent App and resources #LiVELENT. Although sadly the second half of the Lent course could only be accessed via the diocesan website due to Covid 19, much of this was made available online.

At the February meeting of General Synod, a motion was passed committing the entire Church of England to achieving carbon neutrality by 2030, the details of which are set out below. Each diocese is required to address the implications of this motion. During Lockdown the DEG has been engaging with others across the diocese to formulate the right response to this motion within Chelmsford Diocese. This has included discussions with DAC, as well as with property and education departments, and senior management. The secondment of Revd James Gilder as Diocesan Environment Officer, in addition to his role as assistant curate of Chingford St Edmund, has enabled a project plan to be drafted which aims to address the entire scope of the task, as set by the national Church. A detailed plan has been produced in draft form, along with a project timeline document, and these are available on request.

The project plan suggests that the diocese takes a practical approach to reducing carbon emissions, which does not require significant financial outlay or burgeoning bureaucracy. Clearly, a number of changes can be made, for example, to green utilities, which will be both environmentally friendly and cost-effective at the same time, and it is intended that churches be given information on these measures and encouraged to do what they can, as a first step, over the next two years. It is also intended that a clear plan be put in place for those parts of the diocese’s work such as schools and properties, that comprise the most significant part of our overall carbon output, to make similar changes. Conversely, it is recognised that many church buildings are ancient and much beloved as they are, and it would make no financial, aesthetic or environmental sense for such churches to make substantial changes to their heating, for example, given the minimal amount of use that some are put to.

In summary, the plan aims to achieve very significant reductions in the carbon generated by the work of this diocese, in the most pragmatic way possible. It recognises that the
reduction of carbon emissions should be treated as a significant priority within the Fifth Mark of Mission, but it also seeks to achieve this through a pragmatic approach, appreciating fully the current financial and strategic position of the diocese, and the conflicting demands of time and energy that are placed upon all those in our churches, schools and diocesan departments.

........................................

**Motion Passed at General Synod February 2020**

General Synod debated and then passed the following motion.

_That this Synod, recognising that the global climate emergency is a crisis for God’s creation, and a fundamental injustice, and following the call of the Anglican Communion in ACC Resolutions A17.05 and A17.06;_

(a) call upon all parts of the Church of England, including parishes, BMOs [Bishop Mission Orders], education institutions, dioceses, cathedrals, and the NCIs [National Church Institutions], to work to achieve year-on-year reductions in emissions and urgently examine what would be required to reach net zero emissions by 2030 in order that a plan of action can be drawn up to achieve that target;

(b) request reports on progress from the Environment Working Group and the NCI’s every three years beginning in 2022 and;

(c) call on each Diocesan Synod, and Cathedral Chapter, to address progress toward net zero emissions every three years.

This is a huge but necessary challenge which will require a fundamental change to the way do church.

**Motion**

1. To invite Synod to take note of the motion passed by General Synod.

2. To ask the Diocesan Environmental Group to present to the next Bishops Council on 5th November a project plan which seeks to scope the task set by General Synod and outlines a strategy for engagement with deanery synods and chapters across the diocese as well as with the education department, property team and DAC.

3. The DEG to report annually to Diocesan Synod on progress towards net carbon zero emission,, in order that Diocesan Synod can report to general Synod in 2022 and then subsequently every three years.

*Redbridge deanery have brought their own motion to Synod. A motion welcomed by the DEG as complimentary to its motion.*
The Eco-church scheme provides a vehicle by which a parish may engage in discussion and explore their thinking and the way in which they use and care for their buildings and their land. The A Rocha UK and Eco church website provides a range of resources to enable discussion, reflection and an audit followed by advice on actions that are needed both in church life as well as personal lifestyle.

https://arocha.org.uk/

https://ecochurch.arocha.org.uk/

During 2019 interest was shown through debates and invitations for people to speak at deanery synods on the environmental crises. Alongside the motion from the Diocesan Environmental Group there is a motion from Redbridge Deanery. This is important as it demonstrates that this is not just led from the top down but there is a growing movement at parish and deanery level and reflects a growing desire to develop an awareness and action across our parishes and deaneries.

The DEG commends Redbridge Deanery for debating and then bringing the following motion to Diocesan Synod.

Redbridge Deanery Synod

This synod

1. Encourage each Parochial Church Council in the Diocese of Chelmsford to engage with the A Rocha Eco Church scheme, aiming for at least a bronze award

2. Invite the Bishop of Chelmsford to register Chelmsford’s Diocese intent to become an eco diocese

3. Commission the Diocesan Environmental Group to coordinate progress towards Eco Diocese status.

Information on what is expected of an Eco-Diocese can be found here - https://ecochurch.arocha.org.uk/denominational-awards/eco-diocese/