**Board of Trustees Meeting**

On Tuesday 12th April 2016

At the LGBT Foundation offices, 5 Richmond Street, Manchester

| **Agenda Item** | **Discussion** | **Action to be taken by** | **Date by** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Welcome** | Peter welcomed everyone at 18.40 |  |  |
| **Attendance** | **Board Members:**  Peter Walter (PW) Chairman  Matt Tennant (MT) Vice Chairman  Daniel Burford (DB) Secretary  Steven Allen (SA)  Andrew Henshall (AH)  Dave Lawrence (DL)  Danny McKeown (DM)  Craig Owen (CO)  Will Forshaw (WF) *Co-Opted Board member*  **In attendance:**  Simon Pearce (SP)  Nas Khalid (NK) | | |
| **Apologies** | Alastair Warner (AW) Treasurer |  |  |
| **Minutes from last meeting** | The draft minutes of the previous meeting of 8th March 2016 were approved. |  |  |
| **Office Board Update** | It was commented upon that the office board update was really good but asked if the regional breakdown could be more detailed. The Board was advised that the current SQL queries can’t do that but will work with to create new ones.  It was also commented that our overall Membership is extremely positive and we’ve gone from having around 1000 Members for a long time to a regularly increasing Membership.  Reaction from the Board to the Meetup.com trial was positive. The Board was asked if we can start rolling out in other regions. The Board was advised that a Scotland group has been created and he’d looked at other areas but it’s important that we have events to share and going forward we may need to get volunteers on board to assist.  It was suggested investigating whether Meetup.com offer an API so events can be taken from our website automatically.  The Board asked for a ‘Refer a friend’ update and was advised that we had around half-a-dozen pending requests but management of these was becoming complicated as we don’t pay out until the Direct Debit has been setup and a payment been taken – which typically takes 6-8 weeks. The Board also questioned validity of the scheme (do people really need financial incentive to tell their mates?)  Questions were raised about the state of upcoming hostel bookings with particular concern whether there were any more ‘problem’ events. The Board was advised that there were one or two but that we’re at the end now and new bookings were now coming through.  A question was raised about breakdown of reasons for Concession (ie how many are under 25, how many claim DLA/PIP). The Board was advised that we don’t currently have that data but will start collating it going forward.  The Board was also asked if we had information about where Members go on events.  The Board summarised that the Board Office Update was extremely useful. |  |  |
| **Accounts** | The Board was advised that in the last financial year we were showing a loss of £18,000 (figure not yet audited) whereas the previous financial year we made a profit of £11,000.  The Board went on to summarise that in rounded numbers, membership income was down by £7,000, bar takings were down £4,000, website servicing costs were up £3,000, event incoming and expenditure were consistent, Access (website) costs were up £3,000, staffing was up £8,000 and depreciation was up £7,000.  Our reserves have therefore been reduced from £103,000 last year to £85,000. This is still £15,000 above our target.  The Board was advised that we had a forecast of a projected profit this year of £26,000 but advised that more work is needed on the forecast.  The Board was asked if we needed to revisit how much reserves we need based on new staff, no office. The Board was advised that we could run the exercise again but that there was not muchto be gained by doing so. |  |  |
| **Website** | The Board was advised that we need to look at two subjects; the route to website v3 in particular whether we should employ a member of staff or go to a third party agency again and whether we commit to spend money now or wait for funding or sponsorship.  Concerns were raised about having an individual working with us who could leave at any time and was leaning towards working with a smaller agency.  The Board asked what was to stop a new agency doing the same as CTI.  It was suggested we may not have managed CTI very well in the past and promoted having an employee working with us as they would be devoted to our project around the clock and possibly help support our existing website in the meantime however expressed a concern about whether we’d get someone with the appropriate breadth of knowledge.  It was commented that we didn’t provide enough resource last time.  The Board asked what would we do differently this time. The consensus was that we need to make the spec tighter and to be rock solid on deliverables/agreements.  It was suggested not using such a large agency and not an individual but something in between. He gave an example of the small group of developers who lost out last time to CTI.  It was commented that we need to get more quotes and also that we must tighten the spec first. It was agreed that we must put the time into writing the spec. It was also suggested having a third party contractor write the new spec on a freelance basis.  The Board asked what is the state of the current website? It was advised that is it broke in many places and it’s taking a lot of effort from the office team to keep it running. The Board was advised that the code is broken but shouldn’t get any worse.  The Board summarised that with great urgency we need to increase the detail of the spec and that looking for a third party was a good start.  The Board was advised that any spec needs to checked internally before going out to tender.  It was asked if we could share the file online and ask for input from others.  A question was raised about how much capacity do we have as volunteers to undertake the project. |  |  |
| **Website Finances** | After looking into charity options we will spend £300-£400 for a charity database which will provide us with the options to look at multiple grants/funds.  We have a basic outline quote from Access (£60K) and we can use this quote to look at applying for funding.  It was mentioned we thought we also had to face the fact that if we don’t get any funding are we prepared to spend the money we need to fix it, with the same token we are also showing that we are exploring other options of funding rather than just dipping into the reserves.  It was also mentioned that we may be in a position where the website costs more than what we have in reserve.  It was suggested that we look at using a company that would take a commission for helping us obtain a fund.  It was actioned that we would put together a group to pool our ideas on a conference call and applying for funding and this would run in parallel with the building of the spec.  It was also suggested that we would put in a timeline for 3 months’ time to assess where we are with applications: have we put in applications for funding, are we at second stage of applications? and alongside this have the figure for the costs involved with staging of the website development. |  |  |
| **Coordinator Roles** | The Board was asked whether adding more roles would ultimately make it more complicated, and were roles not working because of a lack of clarity or because leaders weren’t completing their current roles fully.  The Board discussed the role of a coordinator would be organising the recruitment of new leaders and managing the planning of events, and instead of redesigning regional boundaries, provide a bit more flexibility to the roles and clarifying the communication lines.  It was also mentioned that Tom Smith would be looking at stepping down from the SWSW Coordinator roles and there has been some discussion about the role with other leaders and Paul Ridleagh had come forward to help fill this position.  The board all thanked Tom for his hard work as co-ordinator. |  |  |
| **AOB** | Support for funding concession event pricing from the OutdoorLads Foundation was supported unanimously. The office will report back over a three-month trial period.  A concern was raised about only meeting face to face quarterly, a proposal was made to meet up face to face bi-monthly and then review in a 6-9 month times.  A suggestion was also made to have a tele-conference every other month and if there was no need for this it could easily be cancelled at last minute.  It was suggested that it was more important to meet for an actual reason with a suggested action.  The Board will take a look at the plan in more detail and feed back.  The leaders’ away weekend was raised briefly. It was suggested that we spent £1300 this year on training  from a £3000 budget, and it was requested that the Board looks at putting together some guidance around what a budget of £800 would help produce. |  |  |
| **Meeting closed** | The meeting closed at 21.00.  **Next teleconference on Tuesday 10th May 2016 at 18:30.** |  |  |

**Dates of future Board Meetings**

**May** 10th Teleconference

**June** 16th LGF

**July** 12th Teleconference

**August** 9th LGF

**September** 13th Teleconference

**October** 1st AGM

**November** 8th Teleconference

**December** 13th LGF