

# Ghar Parau Foundation

## Awards Meeting (Round One – March 2020)

### Minutes

**Purpose of meeting:** Annual Awards

**Date & time of meeting:** 22nd March 2020 11:30

**Location:** The Old Methodist Chapel, Gt Hucklow, Derbyshire. SK17 8RG

Invitees	Name	Responsibility	
Chairperson	Andy Eavis	Trustee & Chair	AE
	Nick Williams	Trustee	NW
	Paul Ibberson	Trustee & Treasurer	PI
	Phil Rowsell	Trustee & Secretary	PJR
	Rebecca Lawson (Year - 4)	Elected Member	RL
	Rob Middleton (Year - 3)	Elected Member	RM
	Fleur Loveridge (Year -2)	Elected Member	FL
	Vacant	Elected Member	
	Michael Butcher	BCRA Foreign sec	MB
	Howard Jones	BCA Treasurer	HJ

Item No.	Description
1.	<b>Matters for AOB</b> Cave Link
2.	<b>Apologies for absence</b> All present ! PR, PI and NW attended the meeting in person. All others attended via Skype.
3.	<b>Minutes of previous meeting</b> The minutes of the 29th September 2019 were agreed to be a true record of the meeting.
4.	<b>Matters arising from the 31-03-2019 minutes and action list</b> New Sports Expedition Grant (Action No 26-03-2018-10) PJR indicated that after discussions with the GPF Trustees they had concluded that with the new charitable aims of the foundation, while a fund could be managed by GPF that it would not be subject to the benefits of charity status e.g. gift aid etc and possibly thought better that a different route was sought. <b>Action:</b> Closed

5.

## **Financial Report –Winter 2020**

### **Accounts 2019**

The 2019 accounting year was split to reflect the de-linking of the Foundation from B.C.R.A. Hence accounts were produced for the 9 months to 30 September 2019 and then for the 3 months to 31 December 2019. It is the intention going forward to produce accounts for the 1 January to 31 December calendar year.

Accounts to 30 September 2019 produced a surplus of income over expenditure of £8,288, mainly as a result of donations from Hidden Earth (£6,000) plus other donations of £959 and net fundraising income of £1323. Net income of £6,300 from B.C.A. was distributed, along with G.P.F and Alex Pitcher awards in line with investment income. At the period end £1,825 of grant retentions were outstanding and £700 of B.C.A. funding was deferred to 2020. No changes in investments took place in the period.

The 3 months to 31 December 2019 produced a surplus of £3,210 due to donation and fundraising income. No awards were made as there was no awards meeting in the period. £10,000 of the opening cash balance was reinvested in a United Trust bond in order to boost the income stream. As at 31 December 2019, there remained £825 outstanding against grant retentions along with the £700 deferred B.C.A. The value of the Accumulated Fund at the period end was £113,199.

Both sets of 2019 Accounts were duly accepted and authorised for distribution.

### **2020 Funding and Awards**

Interest in 2020 is expected to be in the region of £1,250 and it is proposed that this sum be allocated for distribution during the year. Additionally, £7,000 has been received from B.C.A. for distribution and to this can be added the £700 deferred from 2019. Thus a grand total of £8,950 is available for the two awards meetings in 2020. It was proposed and accepted that £725 of G.P.F monies and £1,500 B.C.A. be retained for Round 2, thus £6,725 should be allocated at this meeting.

### **Cash and Investments**

The current cash balance includes £30,000 of donation income. As the current account interest rate stands at 0.05%, it was proposed and accepted that the Treasurer should transfer the £30,000 to a suitably safe vehicle (likely to be the Mansfield Building Society deposit account) which would generate additional income whilst retaining accessibility and FSCS cover.

### **Other**

Although a few loose ends remain from the administration of the de-linking exercise, most items are now complete. £1,100 was received from R.B.S. in respect of the switching incentive and the Yorkshire Bank account is running smoothly. A new tax reference has been received to process Gift Aid reclaims and the previous one has been closed. The first reclaim under this new setup will be submitted later in the year.

6.	<p><b>Spring 2020 Round One Awards</b></p> <p>It was decided that in spite of the Covid-19 outbreak which will probably result in many of these expeditions being cancelled or postponed that the grant allocation process should go ahead. While each expedition would be made aware of the committee's decision on funding, that the grant would be retained by GPF until such time that the expedition was actually known to be going, in which case funds would be released.</p> <p>During the discussion it was noted that it would have been useful to know the MEF funding amounts. This year the MEF allocation meeting had been moved back again and as a result was after the GPF meeting such that the MEF results were not known. It was suggested the GPF contact MEF and establish if this would this be an annual change and what date could MEF guarantee that they would have met by so GPF could consider moving their meeting back later.</p> <p><b>Action 22-03-2020-01 Contact MEF and inquire about their future meeting Schedule.</b></p> <p>PJR to send an email to ask about the timing of MEF meetings, and relay back to the committee so the date of the next Spring 2021 meeting can be determined</p> <p>Action <b>Raised</b></p>
----	---

GPF Grant Allocation Meeting: Winter 2020

Meeting date: 22-03-2020



	BCA	GPF (incl. AP)	China Caves	Other	Exped Total (no AP)	Alex P £75 allocated (applied)	Grand Total
Funds (2020)	£7,700	£1,250	£0	£0			£8,950
Retained for R2	£1,500	£725	£0	£0			£2,225
Available now	£6,200	£525	£0	£0			£6,725
Allocated	£6,200	£525	£0	£0	£6,200	7 (7)	£6,725
Left	£0	£0	£0	£0			£0

#	Exped Name	Country	Field Man Days (UK cavers)	Award/MD	Award/PP (UK)	Info	BCA	GPF	China Caves	Other	Exped Total	Alex Pitcher #	Pitcher £	Grand Total	GPF Feedback	App Log	MEE Feedback
001	Maitzeno 2020 (Maitzeno Cave Project)	Spain	1000 (20)	£0.60	£30.00		£600				£600			£600			
002	Puncak Jaya 2020: The Gates of Hell Expedition	Indonesia	300 (11)	£5.83	£159.09		£1,750				£1,750	1 (1)	£75	£1,825			
003	Izvor Uicanke Cave Diving Expedition 2020	Croatia	63 (6)	£6.35	£66.67		£400				£400			£400			
004		France	100 (11)	£0.00	£0.00						£0			£0			
005	Dachstein Expedition	Austria	450 (8)	£1.22	£68.75		£550				£550	1 (1)	£75	£625			
006	Sila Narave (Force of Nature)	Slovenia	601 (9)	£1.16	£77.78		£700				£700	2 (2)	£150	£850			
007	Tresviso 2020	Spain	700 (35)	£1.43	£28.57		£1,000				£1,000	1 (1)	£75	£1,075			
008	CUCC Toles Gabirge Expedition 2020	Austria	851 (42)	£1.41	£28.57		£1,200				£1,200	2 (2)	£150	£1,350			

Expedition	Feedback
<b>GPF2020a-001</b>	<p>Matienzo 2020 (Matienzo Cave Project)  <b>Grant Award:</b> £600</p> <p>A long-established and perennially successful undertaking with a proven track record over many years in all aspects - exploration, survey, publication, training etc. The project regularly produces high quality reporting and has more recently invested in scientific projects. A potentially large number of cavers are involved (more than the 21 listed), many of significant experience. The only disappointing thing to say about this expedition is the virtual non existence of young cavers signing up to this expedition. While it is known that some University groups randomly turn up at short notice, it is a great shame that this wealth of caving experience, science and high documentation standards is not being taught to our younger generation of cavers.</p>
<b>GPF2020a-002</b>	<p>Puncak Jaya 2020: The Gates of Hell Expedition  <b>Award:</b> £1750 + 1 * £75 Alex Pitcher</p> <p>This expedition is based at high altitudes in an area that is little known to cavers, and so is a really exciting proposition with the potential to explore some of the highest caves in the world. Its good to see this is a longer duration trip than previously, given the ambitious nature and remote location. A good strong team with a blend of youth and experience which should be capable of addressing the physical, technical and logistical challenges. Costs are relatively eye-watering, although this is clearly heavily influenced by the necessary logistical support, which the team's prior experience has indicated as being a necessary investment. This is definitely one of the more ambitious and exciting expeditions that has been submitted to GPF over the last 10 years.</p>
<b>GPF2020a-003</b>	<p>Izvor Licanke Cave Diving Expedition 2020  <b>Grant Award:</b> £400</p> <p>An exciting expedition with much further potential for exploration. Quite technical diving which is always well published and recorded visually as a complete package. A fairly costly trip, not so much in terms of travel, but in terms of equipment, gas etc but is entirely necessary. It is a very short duration expedition and potentially could more be done with longer in the field?</p>
<b>GPF2020a-004</b>	<p>Diving Project in France  <b>Grant Award:</b> £500 Deferred to round 2 with the conditions laid out below.</p> <p>This expedition was deferred until the Autumn Round.</p>
<b>GPF2020a-005</b>	<p>Dachstein Expedition  <b>Grant Award:</b> £550 + 1 * £75 Alex Pitcher</p> <p>The continuation of a long and successful story, connecting the Dachstein plateau into the Hirlatz System below which has lead to 'the deepest cave system ever explored by a British expedition'. Their continued development of young expedition cavers must be highly commended. Not the most detailed application and possible room for improvement. There are currently not many young members signed up but more are likely due to disorganisation of students not signing up yet if previous years are to go by. Good to see that the Cavelink system was valuable.</p>

<p><b>GPF2020a-006</b></p>	<p>Sila Narave (Force of Nature)  <b>Grant Award:</b> £700 + 2 * £150 Alex Pitcher.</p> <p>This expedition is one of the most student-focused of those supported by the GPF and has an impressive track record of well documented exploration in a deep, complex system in Slovenia that the club has been visiting since the 1970s. However despite the team being impressively young (the oldest member being 30 this year!), they consistently achieve great exploration, along with science and produce well documented final report that are a flagship for other expeditions. The team seems a bit small for a 2-camp deep pushing attempt, but presumably these objectives will be matched to final personnel tallies.</p>
<p><b>GPF2020a-007</b></p>	<p>Tresviso 2020  <b>Grant Award:</b> £1000 + 1 * £75 Alex Pitcher</p> <p>A expedition becoming ever popular with young and old, which provided some good training from experienced hands. It gives the appearance of being two expeditions rolled into one, the top camp with SUSS university and the bottom with the slightly older contingent but with some cross over. Application reasonable but the objectives is just a list which is meaningless if unfamiliar with the area and caves. (Would have been better to have done a number of short summaries for each area). Final reports are always well written up. Surprising only one Alex Pitcher applied for such large SUSS (student) contingent. How many of these will actually attend will be interesting? There is mention of a possible Cave Link purchase but GPF would strongly suggest that they ask about sharing a Cavelink with the CUCC Totes Gebirge and the Dachstein expeditions as Treviso usually happens later (Sept).</p>
<p><b>GPF2020a-008</b></p>	<p>CUCC Totes Gebirge Expedition 2020  <b>Grant Award:</b> £1200 + 2 * £150 Alex Pitcher</p> <p>A yearly expedition which has (as indicated in the application) changed from being a CUCC expedition to now one of a number of universities. The majority of participants are below 25, with most of the remainder below 35. The objectives laid out well, with a wealth of scientific objectives. Not the greatest publishing record for such a well established expedition and it will be interesting to see how much of the proposed science is actually done and written up in a final report or published in the BCRA journal. Hopefully some publications are in the pipeline.</p>

<p>7.</p>	<p><b>Merdeka Award (Action No: 31-03-2019-11)</b></p> <p>Initial donations have been received and banked. Further sums expected late March/early April. It is the donors' wish that the total sum donated be ring-fenced for awards to expeditions to Mulu, but distributed over time rather than added to capital. The committee agreed that this would be acceptable in principle, although the details of the process are to be finalised. (A draft framework was discussed and subject to minor amendments should be ratified at the next meeting). Any additional sums arising - by way of Gift Aid, interest etc - are to be added to GPF funds and subject to the normal rules of distribution.</p> <p><b>Action:</b> Ongoing</p>
<p>8.</p>	<p><b>Risk assessment for GPF expeditions - criteria (Action No: 29-09-2019-1)</b></p> <p>NW had produced recommendations on how GPF should deal with expedition risk assessments. A</p>

	<p>proposal was included in the agenda (and again attached in these minutes). The Committee approved the proposal and it is now to be included within the application process.</p> <p>20/03/2020 NW to send PJR a number of examples of what is thought as a good risk assessment for inclusion in the website application process. One furnished action can be closed.</p> <p>Once examples received this will move to Website Action: <b>WS27/01/2020- 3 Grant Application Form - Risk Assessments and due diligence.</b></p> <p><b>Action: Ongoing</b></p>
9.	<p><b>Clarification of GPF Grant Criteria and Rules (Action No: 29-09-2019-5)</b></p> <p>PJR/HJ/RM worked on clarification of the GPF Grant Criteria and Rules and a proposal was included in the minutes (and again attached in these minutes). Most of the proposals were accepted as is.</p> <p>The Alex Pitcher award promoted a lot of discussion. The outcome of the discussions was that the following changes were agreed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) the limit of 2 applicants per expedition should be lifted and any number of applicants should be able to apply.</li> <li>2) the proposal of 50% up front and 50% on receipt of a feedback report was rejected and 100% of the award will be given up front.</li> <li>3) the Committee thought that it would be worth investigating the possibility of individuals applying for Alex Pitcher awards but within or as part of a expedition application; the sentiment being it would remove potential bias from the expedition leader, and encourage people to apply for the award. PJR would develop a process in consultation with HP and bring a proposal back to the Committee for agreement.</li> </ol> <p>The rest of the Alex Pitcher rules proposed were agreed.</p> <p><b>Action No 22-03-2020-02 Update of website with new rules and criteria.</b> PJR to liase with HP and ensure the new grant rules and criteria are added to the GPF website.</p> <p><b>Action. Raised.</b></p> <p><b>Action 22-03-2020-03 Revision of Standing Orders with new rules and criteria.</b> PJR and NW to review the current standing order and highlight any changes required in parallel with a similar <b>Action 22-03-2020-06 Criteria changes for Capital Pot.</b> (see below)</p> <p><b>Action. Raised.</b></p> <p><b>Action 22-03-2020-04 Application for Alex Pitcher by Individuals:</b> PJR and HP to develop a proposed method to allow individuals to apply for the award but within or as part of a expedition application.</p> <p><b>Action. Raised.</b></p>
10.	<p><b>Scoring/ judging scheme for ranking GPF expedition applications (Action No: 29-09-2019-3)</b></p> <p>PJR and FL presented a partially finished marking scheme was included with the Agenda (and again attached in these minutes), to hear the Committee’s comments and ensure that PJR and FL were on the correct lines. The scheme was in a two-part scenario, a marking scheme and a follow on scoring scheme. The marking scheme had a number of categories with a number of set answers of which one was to be selected. The categories were ones felt prudent to the application and the aims of the Foundation. Both PJR and FL had separately marked 4 previous applications and their selected answers were fairly similar. It was requested by PJR and FL that the rest of the committee try the marking scheme on a series of applications for comments on the process and see final results of all individuals. PJR and FL would send committee members</p>

	<p>a template and indicate a round that committee members should use the marking scheme.</p> <p>The scoring scheme show was just current ideas as this is a complicated process with many possible methods and opinions depending on what committee members see as important and the final result required of the scoring scheme. Due to time discussion on this topic was fairly limited.</p> <p><b>Action No :22-02-2020-05 Trial run of Application Marking Scheme.</b></p> <p>PJR and FL to send the committee a marking form to mark a chosen application round.</p> <p>25-03-2020 Form developed and sent to committee members, and the round chosen was Spring 2019</p> <p><b>Action: Closed</b></p>
11.	<p><b>Proposed changes in the spending criteria governing the GPF capital pot.</b></p> <p>PJR and NW proposed a new idea for the spending criteria for the GPF capital pot was included in the Agenda for comment (and again attached in these minutes). The general idea was that a "Capital Fund Lower Limit - CFLL" would be decided above which the committee could chose to distribute some of this "Capital Available for Distribution - CAD". Potential rules were suggested for the determination of CFLL and CAD. This document was reviewed by the trustees prior to the committee meeting and the basic concept was accepted. This was concept was further ratified by the Committee. Several different ideas however arose for how to determination the CFLL and CAD values on an ongoing basis. PJR also noted that to do so would require a change to the Standing Orders. PJR and NW were charged to continue to develop the idea and generate a firm proposal, with the required changes in the Standing Orders for circulation prior to the next meeting, for potential adoption at that meeting.</p> <p><b>Action No: 22-03-2020-06 Criteria changes for Capital Pot:</b> Spending: PJR and NW to produce a proposal including the required changes to the Standing Orders and to circulate prior to the next committee meeting for review</p> <p><b>Action: Raised.</b></p>
12.	<p><b>Expedition Science Weekend Update (Action No 26-03-2018-16)</b></p> <p>PJR informed the committee that the weekend had been planned by PJR and MB (with a programme on the website etc) and was set to go ahead at the TSG in Castleton on the 27-28th March 2020 with 7 lecturers involved and 18 people registered (not including lecturers). Clashes with a number of other events is believed to have potentially reduced numbers significantly. Unfortunately, due to Covid-19, the weekend has had to be postponed.</p> <p>Action: <b>Ongoing/Postponed</b></p>
13.	<p><b>Website</b></p> <p>PJR and HP have been working through the Website action list, with many of the actions now closed. Due to unfortunate time constraints as well as Covid-19, many of the new features of the website were sadly not reviewed or shown.</p> <p><b>1) Mount Everest Foundation Application Process and Review (High priority)</b></p> <p>To gain comments by all the Committee on the MEF applications, a new process has been developed similar to that used when commenting on the GPF applications with a ranking system from A+ to C-. These comments will be carried across for the GPF application which are reviewed a month later in the spring round.</p> <p><b>Action No 117</b></p> <p>29-09-2019 PJR indicated to the committee that HP had developed a process on the GPF Beta site. PJR had tested the process, but felt it was not quite correct and needed a little more thought. PJR and HP to continue this development but prioritise such that it is complete by 31st Dec 2019, prior to the next round which often sees MEF applications.</p>

	<p>22/03/2020 This had been tested using the data from the MEF 2020 round where the whole committee were requested to send PJR comments. The system has worked well on the Beta site and will be now ported across to the main site (This was not done prior to the 22-03-2020 meeting to avoid any corruption to the current site at a critical time for use by the committee.)</p> <p><b>Action: Ongoing</b></p> <p><b>Active Expedition Caver Member Application process via website.</b>  A new, less ad-hoc, method of selecting Active Expedition Caving Members was suggested at the Spring 2019 meeting, involving an application process via the website so that a greater pool of experienced expedition cavers could be considered. The process involves submitting a CV and information about their caving experience.</p> <p><b>Action No WS13/03/19-6 AECCM Application process (via website)</b></p> <p><b>29-09-2019:</b> PJR showed beta version to Committee and indicated with a few more minor tweaks this application system would go live. PJR to notify GPF committee members when this process is live. Posts will also be placed on UK Caving, the GPF website and Descent, with potential roll-out at other events such as CHECC.</p> <p><b>2020/02/03:</b> PJR gave HP standard CV form and final suggestions for Committee page. Buttons for attendance record and view committee members CV. System should go live before 2020-02-10. PJR indicated to the committee that the AECCM process had gone live.</p> <p><b>19-02-2020:</b> System went live and was tested by Mark Sims</p> <p><b>26-02-2020:</b> Announced to Committee after taking Mark Sims' feedback into account</p> <p><b>Action:</b> Closed (and was used successfully for application for 2020 AECCM position)</p>
14.	<p><b>Fund Raising &amp; Donations</b></p> <p><b>1) Donations</b></p> <p>a) Donations in 2019 (see Financial Report for 2019)</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">General = £959 + £1798 = £2757</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Hidden Earth = £6000</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">BCA = £6000</p> <p>b) <b>WS19/02/2020-3 BCA: make more prominent and indicate they fund GPF</b></p> <p>BCA and Hidden Earth have highlighted the fact that while they donate a lot of money to GPF this fact is not seen on the GPF website. PJR indicated that this is now reflected on the GPF part of the website under the 'about' page and BCA and Hidden Earth have been notified.</p> <p><b>Action: Closed 13-03-2020</b></p> <p><b>2) Ghar Parau Cards</b></p> <p>PJR still has a lot of GPF cards left</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">55 packs of the 2012 set</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">91 packs of the 2011 set</p> <p>If sold would raise a further £1168 to the GPF fund.</p> <p>In addition GPF have many single cards, many of which are Gaping Gill cards that could be sold at the winch meets (if volunteers would step forward!).</p>

	<p><b>3) Action No 29-09-2019- 8 Selling of final Robin Gray Painting</b></p> <p>RM indicated one buyer was playing hard to contact and had not paid for or taken the painting. RM to consider whether to re-sell the painting on Ebay. 10-03-2020 RM indicated that final painting had finally be sold and a cheque for £75 would be given to PI at the meeting</p> <p><b>Action: Closed.</b></p> <p><b>4) Action No 29-09-2019-10 Selling of Descent Magazines</b></p> <p><b>29-09-2019:</b> RM to investigate ways of selling the Descents and report back to the Committee via Email.</p> <p><b>Action: On-going</b></p>
15.	<p><b>Members - discussion of elected member replacement.</b></p> <p>PJR explained the new Active Expedition Caving Committee Member application process on the GPF website, and a reminder that it is an application to place your name in a pool that GPF can chose from rather than an application for a particular round. Several comments were suggested for potential changes to the web page that will be undertaken.</p> <p>Since the application process had gone live 4 applications had been received. Two places were available. a) immediate as already a vacancy and b) one after the autumn 2020 meeting where RL will be coming to the end of her term. Selected from the applicants were Phil Walker (to fill the current vacant spot) and Elaine Oliver to replace RL once her term is finished). An email should be sent to all applicants informing them of the Committee's decision. PJR noted that only new or successful applicants would receive an email after each selection process otherwise as the pool becomes bigger then the task may get too onerous.</p> <p><b>Action No 22-03-2020-07 Notification to applicants of AECCM results.</b> PJR to send the 4 applicants an email on the decision of the Committee</p> <p><b>25-03-2020:</b> Emails sent to the 4 applicants.</p> <p><b>Action: Closed</b></p> <p><b>Action No 22-03-2020-8 New AECCM access to Committee Pages.</b> PJR to give Phil Walker to access to the committee pages and send the introduction information for new members.</p> <p>25-03-2020: Phil given access and information sent.</p> <p>Action: <b>Closed.</b></p>
16.	<p><b>AOB</b></p> <p><b>Hidden Earth Treasurer Comments</b></p> <p>HJ indicated that Dave Gough had complained that GPF had put Hidden Earth (HE) donations into the Capital Pot rather than used for distribution. It was not understood if this was HE committee's overall view or just Dave Gough's.</p> <p><b>Action:22-03-2020-09 Email to Hidden Earth Committee:</b> PJR to send email to the Hidden Earth Committee, indicating that if Dave Gough's view was that of the Hidden Earth's committee then GPF apologises and also suggest that any future donation comes with specific criteria for the donation e.g. for immediate distribution or to do as GPF see fit etc so that there will be no mis-understanding in the future.</p> <p><b>25-03-2020</b> Email sent.</p> <p><b>Action: Closed</b></p>

	<p><b>CaveLink</b></p> <p>MB asked the situation of what happened to about Cavelink after he raised the indication that the Dachstein Expedition were thinking of spending the money on something else and that they had fallen out with CUCC over the matter. PJR said that he had got involved and that in the terms of the grant sent to them in the notification email this money had to be spent on a cave link system. It was also noted that the Cavelink System was much more expensive than first thought. After a protracted period of negotiation and an additional donation of £1000 by a generous donor, it was decided to buy 3 units (1 surface and 2 underground units). These (while not being GPF property) would be looked after by Wookey and were primarily thought of as both the CUCC and Dachstein units but would be made available to other GPF expeditions if timing was suitable.</p> <p><b>Action: 22-03-2020-10 Publicising of the availability of the Cavelink system.</b> PJR to make this fact known on the GPF website.</p> <p><b>Action:</b> Raised</p>
17	<p><b>Date of next meetings</b></p> <p><b>Autumn Meeting:</b> Hidden Earth 2020 (Details will be circulated when dates are known)</p> <p><b>Spring Meeting:</b> Date to be decided dependant on information provided by MEF on their forthcoming meetings.</p>

## Relevant Documents from Agenda:

**8. Risk assessment for GPF expeditions - criteria (Action No: 29-09-2019-1)**

**9. Clarification of GPF Grant Criteria and Rules (Action No: 29-09-2019-5)**

**10. Scoring/ judging scheme for ranking GPF expedition applications (Action No: 29-09-2019-3)**

**11. Proposed changes in the spending criteria governing the GPF capital pot.**

## **8. Risk assessment for GPF expeditions - criteria (Action No: 29-09-2019-1)**

PJR and NJW meet on the 26th Jan 2020 to discuss the suggested requirements for GPF to address risk assessments. From these discussions the following has been proposed to be included in the grant application form.

1) A new section call "Risk Assessment" is included on the applications form with the statement saying,

" GPF strongly recommends that all expeditions should complete a risk assessment.

A tick box is included below this statement on the form with the wording "Have you completed a Risk Assessment"

followed by

"NB: A risk assessment is not a requirement for receiving an award and GPF don't need to see your risk assessment as part of the application process. However, we strongly encourage expeditions to prepare one. Some examples can be downloaded from the links below."

## 9. Clarification of GPF Grant Criteria and Rules (Action No: 29-09-2019-5)

The sub group working on clarification of grant criteria and rules, are proposing the following definitions.

### 1) Classification of an Expedition.

An Exploration Expedition is classified as a trip involving 2 or more people for a period of 5 or more (in field) days to an caving area to undertake exploration caving and science outside the UK.

### 2) Qualifying Participant for a GPF Expedition

- A Qualifying Participant must be any of the following:
  - A UK National (or Citizen?)
  - A non-UK national in full time education in the UK
  - A member of a UK based caving club or BCA who is resident in the UK.
- The expedition can be multi- national, but generally only the Qualifying Participants will be considered for GPF Grant aid. There is proviso that up to 25% of non qualifying people may also be considered, if these are indigenous cavers from countries where their caving community is small and would benefit from participation in an international expedition. These indigenous cavers must be true expeditions participants, i.e. not guides, porters etc.
- The applicant (i.e. the leader of the expedition) has to be a Qualifying Participant. (N.B. In the case of a multi-national expedition involving Qualifying Participants where the leader is a non-qualifying, a Qualifying Participant can be designated as the leader of the UK contingent and thus apply for Grant aid).
- The application process does not permit joint expeditions leaders, (a single individual must be designated the leader of the expedition).

### 3) The Alex Pitcher Award

*The sub committee recommends that there is a change in the application process, currently by the expedition leader to, and individual based application.*

- *The application must be linked to a GPF expedition of the same application round.*
- *The application must be supported by both the leader of the expeditions and one other referee.*
- *It is a once in a life time award for people going on their first Exploration expedition.*
- *the condition of the award, is that a feedback report (consisting of a short report is submitted after the expedition by the individual of how the award benefited the beneficiary and how the expedition also benefited them (it is recommended that 50% of the award money is retained until this feedback is received).*

### To qualify for an Alex pitcher

The must first qualify under the rules laid out for a Qualifying Participant for a GPF Expeditions.

They must also be under 22 years of age or in full time education in the UK at the time of the expedition.

It is their first Exploration type expedition.

If under the age of 16, a letter of consent from parent would be necessary giving permission for them to partake in the expedition and apply for this award.

## **10. Scoring/ judging scheme for ranking GPF expedition applications (Action No: 29-09-2019-3)**

### **Development of Categories and responses within the categories.**

The categories with recommended list of potential selections. 4 expeditions were picked and both fleur and myself independently assigned **responses** to them (as can be seen above). In general, agreement was pretty close and after discussing differences and tweaking the wording of some of the **responses** then we feel that if done again we would be even closer.

The last category "Overall assessment" is the same idea as we currently do where the evaluator would put in their overall comments etc

The categories are shown overleaf.

## Suggested Marking Criteria for Application Evaluation

### (i) Exploration Novelty

*Is the expedition visiting a new or little visited area or returning to a well established location?*

Marking Clarification	Points	Dive a001	Alba a005	IUCC a010	Mulub 001
The expedition is visiting a country or region that is remote and/or difficult to access, and thus seldom visited by cavers to date					
The expedition is to a moderately visited country, but looking to establish a new area of exploration		P		P	
The expedition is returning to an often visited location, but tackling new objectives in that area.		F	P F	P F	P F

### (ii) Expedition Aims and Objectives

*Are the key expedition aims and objectives clearly articulately? Are they appropriate?*

Marking Clarification	Points	Dive a001	Alba a005	IUCC a010	Mulu b001
The expedition aims and objectives are clear, well thought through and appropriate for the size of the team and the duration of the expedition.		P F		P F	
The expedition aims and objectives are set out but it is not clear how they will be tackled or what are the priorities.			F		F
It is not clear what exploration the expedition will be tackling.			P		P

### (iii) Potential for Scientific Contribution

*Does the expedition aim to conduct research which will contribute to increasing our scientific knowledge of speleology e.g. surveying, cave life, cave environments, karst geology, hydrogeology and/or other related disciplines?*

Marking Clarification	Points	a001	a005	a010	b001
The expedition has a well thought out plan for scientific research with specific objectives to which human and other resources are allocated.					
The application mentions cave science but does not give any detailed plan or specific objectives.					
The expedition has minimal or no mention of plans for scientific research.		P F	P F	P F	P F

**(iv) Expedition Team**

*Does the caving team and its partners have the knowledge, resources and skills necessary to carry out the expedition aims and objectives?*

<b>Marking Clarification</b>	<b>Points</b>	<b>a001</b>	<b>a005</b>	<b>a010</b>	<b>b001</b>
Collectively the expedition has the experience to tackle the stated aims and objectives. The team is of an appropriate size for the work to be carried out.		<b>P F</b>	<b>P</b>		<b>P</b>
It is not clear that that the expedition team has all of the experience required to meet their aims and objectives.			<b>F</b>	<b>P F</b>	<b>F</b>
The expedition team are relatively inexperienced compared with their stated aims and objectives.					
Recommended that GPF funding is not given due to doubts in the experience of the team.					

**(v) Support for the Future of British Caving (Young Cavers)**

*Does the expedition personnel include younger cavers (or cavers new to expedition)? Is there a commitment to training and/or development of the the skills required for the expedition?*

<b>Marking Clarification</b>	<b>Points</b>	<b>a001</b>	<b>a005</b>	<b>a010</b>	<b>b001</b>
The team contains a significant number of participants (>30 %) under 22 years (or new to expedition caving) and the expedition has a clear training plan to provide these members with the skills and experience they need to contribute to the expedition.				<b>P F</b>	
The team contains a limited number of participants (10 – 30 %) under 22 years (or new to expedition caving) and has indicated some commitment to their training and development.					
Less than 10% of participants are under 22 years (or new to expedition caving).		<b>P F</b>	<b>P F</b>		<b>P F</b>

**(vi) Budget**

*Does the expedition have a well thought out budget, with appropriate costings and a plan to meet any shortfall in funding?*

<b>Marking Clarification</b>	<b>Points</b>	<b>a001</b>	<b>a005</b>	<b>a010</b>	<b>b001</b>
The application contains a detailed budget, with appropriate costings, covering all the components required to run the expedition. Other applications for funding and/or plans for funding shortfalls are clearly set out.		<b>P F</b>		<b>P F</b>	
The application contains a reasonably detailed budget, but a number of key components or detail are missing, or the proposed costings are not appropriate.			<b>F</b>		<b>P F</b>

The expedition budget lacks sufficient detail and appropriate costings. Funding for the expedition is not well thought through.			P		
---	--	--	---	--	--

**(vii) Overall Quality of Submission**

*Does the application convey clearly the work to be carried out and the context which the expedition is operating within?*

Marking Clarification	Points	a001	a005	a010	b001
The application is clear, well written and structured, providing information on the background, previous work, planned work during the expedition, and with appropriate maps and plans as required to help explain the proposed expedition.		P F		P F	
The application is written with sufficient information to understand the expedition's purpose and plans, however lacks the fine detail to allow a full understanding .					
The application is poorly written and structured and does not clearly explain the expedition's purpose and plans. Key information on the expedition is missing or requires additional research by the evaluator.			P F		P F

**(viii) Documentation Track Record**

*Does the expedition and/or the applicants have a track record of feedback and final report writing from previous expeditions. (N.B. A final report is not a requisite of the GPF grant award, however it is an important part of an expedition to fully record and document the finding of the expedition ).*

Marking Clarification	Points	a001	a005	a010	b001
Consistently published well documented final expedition reports, containing information on the findings of both cave and science undertaken.				P	P
No track record/new expedition Group					
The expedition has previously provided adequate feedback reports. Final expedition reports missing or poor quality.		P	P		
The expedition has previously not supplied feedback reports (or final expedition reports) in a timely manor.					

**(ix) Overall Assessment**

<i>Overall comments about the application and proposed expedition</i>

<i>Recommended for GPF grant aid ?</i>	<b>Y/ N</b>	<b>£</b> _____
--	-------------	----------------

**Marking Scheme**

This has the potential to cause much debate, and Fleur and myself has talked on the subject a reasonable amount but surprisingly having similar view. The scoring process of scoring an application is to show transparency and eliminate any potential of bias to a known or friends expedition (not that has ever happened). It also has to reflect the Charities aims which was a requisite of becoming an independent Charity.

The aims being:-

"to advance the education of the public in general ( and particularly amongst Scientists) on the subject of speleology through the provision of grants and to promote research for the public benefit in all aspects of that subject and publish the useful results"

There are many different ways to do a scoring scheme, linear weighted, combination etc. After discussion we both developed an independent score value for each category and again with reasonable agreement. While we have developed ideas for scores for each **response**, we have stopped short of publishing as we feel agreement on the important and hence its score/weighting would be best first to agree. Table shows both maximum score values for each category.

<b>Category</b>	<b>PJR GPF importance</b>	<b>PJR Score</b>	<b>FL Score</b>
<b>(i) Exploration Novelty</b>	High	15	15
<b>(ii) Expedition Aims and Objectives</b>	Med	10	10
<b>(iii) Potential for Scientific Contribution</b>	V High	20	10
<b>(iv) Expedition Team</b>	Low	5	10
<b>(v) Support for the Future (Young)</b>	V High	20	15
<b>(vi) Budget</b>	Low	5	5
<b>(vii) Overall Quality of Submission</b>	Med	10	10
<b>(viii) Documentation Track Record</b>	High	15	10
<b>(ix) Overall Assessment</b>			

We felt some of the scores with in the categories should be linear others not so to reflect a particular aspect of that category in conjunction with the charitable aims e.g.

**(i) Exploration Novelty:** An Expedition to a remote place..... may score proportionally higher than the other two answers e.g. 15, 5,0

**(iv) Expedition Team:** An application could score particularly low or even negative if it is felt the team do not have the necessary experience of there were grave concerns about the expeditions.  
e.g. 5,4,1,-100

**(viii) Documentation Track Record:** If the expedition team has previously produce well document final expedition reports with good scientific content e.g. 15,8,5,0

These obviously need to be further developed and discussed, as one will guess that all committee members views will all vary.

The final comment box **(ix) Overall Assessment** is as the current system but a place to take account of the number of people expected to attend the expedition, budget considerations etc (and is envisage in on the online system, would be shown in the header of this box for each application) as this will ultimately should reflect the amount of money given to the application.

Phil Rowsell and Fleur Loveridge  
March 2020

## 11. Proposed changes in the spending criteria governing the GPF capital pot.

### Suggestion for a new approach to GPF Capital.

#### Rationale

The current GPF fund stands around £100,000 (possibly set to increase £120,000 with the benefit of the Merdeka Award). The interest at present from this capital fund is approximately £1,000 p.a.. In the current times of low interest rates, this paper proposes a mechanism for spending some of the capital fund to increase the funding available to current expeditions in the expectation that further donations and bequests will top up the capital fund.

#### New proposal

1. The Capital Fund is deemed to be any money that is held GPF account that has not been ear -marked for immediate distribution or ring fenced in other Expeditions Funds e.g. China Caves Project, Mulu Caves Project etc.
2. A Capital Fund Lower Limit ("CFLL") would be decided, below which the capital fund would not be allowed to fall.
3. The CFLL will be subject to review by the GPF Management Committee if the current capital fund exceeds the CFLL by more than 10%.
4. Any amount in the capital fund which exceeds the CFLL would be available for distribution as grant funding for expeditions, subject to certain controls.
5. The funds available to spend from the capital fund (the Capital Available for Distribution ("CAD")) will be used to support grant making in special circumstances such as a significant increase in the number of applications in any one round, or the need to support a particularly important and expensive venture.

The CAD is to be treated as a reserve which will allow the Committee to be more flexible in response to special circumstances. It is not intended to be a 'normal' source of funding for regular distribution.

6. To ensure the CAD is not used up too quickly via overspend in the initial years, on agreement of a new CFLL, the committee will also decide a CAD limit available for distribution each year which would remain constant until the CFLL is reached or donations etc required a new CFLL to be decided.

#### Example of the above

*N.B. All numbers are fictitious and only for the purpose of showing how this process might work.*

- a. Assume the current GPF capital pot is £100,000
- b. The Committee agrees that the CFLL is set at £90,000.
- c. This would leave £10,000 as CAD.
- d. The Committee decides that no more than £2000 of the CAD is to be spent in any given year.
- e. Thus the additional CAD distribution will be available for at least five years.

Phil Rowsell and Nick Williams  
March 2020

### GPF Committee Action Summary List (01/04/2020)

Action Number	Action Description	Date Raised	Who	Rank	Date Closed
N° 26-03-2018 -10	<p><b>Student Trip Funding Sub committee.</b> PJR to produce a proposal for the GPF committee of how this sub committee will operate</p> <p><b>23-09-18:</b> On hold - PJR debating whether this is of value.</p> <p><b>12-02-20:</b> PJR discussed with trustees and it was decided that this would not fit the charitable aims of the charity.</p> <p><b>Action Closed:</b> Closed</p>	26-03-18	PJR	Low	12-02-20
No 31-03-2019-11	<p><b>The Merdeka Award - Updates</b></p> <p>In September 2018, the Mulu Caves Project was awarded a Merdeka Award, which is part of a series of awards presented by a consortium of companies in Malaysia. This award may be donated to GPF</p> <p>AE to keep Management committee informed of developments</p> <p><b>31-03-2019:</b> AE to keep Management committee informed of developments</p> <p><b>29-09-2019:</b> AE indicated that this money might be transferred into the UK during October, after which it would be donated to GPF. PJR suggested at the meeting that it would be good to try and agree the rules (if any of the donation and also a possible change to the current GPF distribution policy. These were explained at the meeting (see attached email). Due to time constraints of the meeting these were not fully explored. The GPF trustees to look at this in more detail, and report back to the GPF management committee.</p> <p><b>22-03-2020:</b> Initial donations have been received and banked. Further sums expected late March/early April. It is the donors' wish that the total sum donated be ring-fenced for awards to expeditions to Mulu, but distributed over time rather than added to capital. The committee agreed that this would be acceptable in principle, although the details of the process are to be finalised. (A draft framework was discussed and subject to minor amendments should be ratified at the next meeting).</p> <p><b>Action:</b> Ongoing</p>	31-03-19	AE	Med	On going
No 29-09-2019-1	<p><b>Safety and Risk Assessment questions for Grant Application</b></p> <p><b>29-09-2019:</b> NW to further develop suitable questions with appropriate input and circulate suggested questions to be included to the Website Grant application Form</p> <p><b>17/03/2020:</b> Included in Agenda for 22/03/2020 meeting for discussion</p> <p><b>22/03/2020:</b> The Committee discussed and approved the proposal and it is now to be included with in the application process.</p> <p>NW to send PJR a number of examples of what is thought as a good risk assessment for inclusion in the</p>	29-09-19	NW	High	22-03-20

	<p>website application process. One furnished action can be closed.</p> <p>Once examples received this will move to Website Action: <b>WS27/01/2020- 3Grant Application Form - Risk Assessments and due diligence.</b></p> <p><b>Action: Ongoing</b></p>				
<b>No 29-09-2019-2</b>	<p><b>Implication of adding Questions to the Website application form</b></p> <p><b>29-09-2019:</b> PJR to liase with HP and develop a strategy for inclusion.</p> <p><b>10-10-2019:</b> PJR to correlate all changes, agree at next meeting and on pass to Henry</p> <p><b>Action: Ongoing</b></p>	29-09-19	PJR	High	<b>Ongoing</b>
<b>No 29-09-2019-3</b>	<p><b>Grant Making Policy - Scoring process</b></p> <p><b>29-09-2019:</b> PJR and FL to develop a potential scoring process for further discussion.</p> <p><b>17-03-2020:</b> PJR &amp; FL have nearly completed a scoring process and should be submitted to the committee for review prior to the 22-03-2020 meeting.</p> <p><b>22-03-2020:</b> The marking and scoring process was reviewed and discussed. It was decided first to deal with the marking process, and later develop a marking system. FL and PJR would choose a particular round and send the committee a marking sheet with which to try the developed scheme.</p> <p><b>Action: On going</b></p>	29-09-19	PJR & FL	High	<b>Ongoing</b>
<b>No 29-09-2019-4</b>	<p><b>Feedback report due diligence</b></p> <p><b>29-09-2019:</b> PJR solicit ideas from other committee members, and to liase with HP and bring a proposal to the spring 2020 Management Committee meeting.</p> <p><b>22-03-2020:</b> not discussed due to time.</p> <p><b>Action: On going</b></p>	29-09-19	PJR & HP	High	<b>Ongoing</b>
<b>No: 29-09-2019-5</b>	<p><b>Review of Award and Pitcher Criteria</b></p> <p><b>29-09-2019:</b> PJR, RM &amp; HJJ to produce recommendations prior to the spring meeting for the committee to review and discuss at the next meeting.</p> <p><b>17-03-2020:</b> Included in Agenda for 22/03/2020 meeting for discussion</p> <p><b>22-03-2020:</b> Most of the proposals were accepted as is.</p> <p>The Alex Pitcher award promoted a lot of discussion. The outcome of the discussions was that the following changes were agreed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) the limit of 2 applicants per expedition should be lifted and any number of applicants should be able to apply.</li> <li>2) the proposal of 50% up front and 50% on receipt of a feedback report was rejected and</li> </ol>	29-09-19	PJR , RM, HJJ	High	<b>22/03/2020 Ongoing</b>

	<p>100% of the award will be given up front.</p> <p>3) the Committee thought that it would be worth investigating the possibility of individuals applying for Alex Pitcher awards but within or as part of an expedition application; the sentiment being it would remove potential bias from the expedition leader, and encourage people to apply for the award. PJR would develop a process in consultation with HP and bring a proposal back to the Committee for agreement.</p> <p>These changes have been actioned by additional action points (see later).</p> <p><b>Action:</b> Closed</p>				
<b>No 29-09-2019- 6</b>	<p><b>GPF Thank-you Email to CC clarification helpers</b></p> <p>29-09-2019 PJR to send out thank you emails on behalf of GPF.</p> <p>10-10-2019 PJR on reflection thought that these people had already been thanked at the time of the application and no further action was required.</p> <p><b>Action:</b> Closed</p>	29-09-19	PJR	Med	10-10-19
<b>No 29-09-2019-7</b>	<p><b>Encouragement of suitable candidates to apply</b></p> <p><b>29-09-2019:</b> Once the new Active Expedition Caver Member application process is live, committee members are encouraged suitable candidates to apply. At Hidden Earth PJR gave a talk about GPF with one of the main items being this new application process, which was sadly very poorly attended by both committee members and younger expedition cavers that GPF are seeking to attract.</p> <p><b>21-02-2020:</b> The new AECCM application process went live on the GPF website and was tested by an individual.</p> <p><b>26-02-2020:</b> Committee informed that the new AECCM was online and committee members should encourage people to apply</p> <p><b>22-03-2020:</b> Four applicants has applied via the new system of which 2 were chosen, the rest to be kept on file.</p> <p><b>Action:</b> <b>On-going</b></p>	29-09-19	ALL	High	<b>On-going</b>
<b>No 29-09-2019- 8</b>	<p><b>Selling of final Robin Gray Painting</b></p> <p>RM indicated one buyer was playing hard to contact and had not paid or taken the painting. Rm to consider whether to re sell the painting on Ebay.</p> <p>10-03-2020 RM indicated that final painting had finally be sold and a cheque for £75 would be given to PI at the meeting</p> <p><b>Action:</b> Closed</p>	29-09-19	RM	Med	10-03-20
<b>N° 29-09-2019-10</b>	<p><b>Selling of Descent Magazines</b></p> <p><b>29-09-2019:</b> RM to investigate ways of selling the Descents and report back to the committee via Email.</p> <p>10-03-20200 RM indicated this was still on going</p>	29-09-19	PJR	RM	<b>On going</b>

	<b>Action: On going</b>				
<b>No 29-09-2019-16</b>	<p><b>Organise Expedition Science Workshop</b></p> <p><b>29-09-2019:</b> PJR indicated that PJR and MB has started a organising an expedition science weekend for late March/ April. The weekend would feature a number of session on different topics. A cave link workshop would also be conducted during this weekend.</p> <p><b>17-03-2020:</b> A weekend has been planned for the 27/28th weekend but may fall victim to Covid-19 and need to be rescheduled.</p> <p><b>22-03-2020:</b> PJR informed the committee that the weekend had been planned by PJR and MB (with a programme on the website etc ) and was set to go ahead at the TSG Derbyshire on the 27-28th March 2020 with 7 lecturers involved and 18 people registered (not including lecturers) Clashes of a number of events, is believed to have potentially reduced numbers significantly. Unfortunately due to Covid-19 the weekend has had to be postponed.</p> <p><b>Action: Virused!! and postponed until later in the year.</b></p>	29-09-19	PJR & MB	High	Virused!
<b>No 22-03-2020-01</b>	<p><b>Action 22-03-2020-01 Contact MEF and inquire about their future meeting Schedule.</b></p> <p>PJR to send an email to ask about the timing of MEF meetings, and relay back to the committee so a date of the next Spring 2021 meeting can be determined.</p> <p><b>25-03-2020:</b> PJR will wait until after the MEF committee have meet and informed GPF of their grant allocations to the two GPF expeditions forwarded to MEF.</p> <p><b>01/04/2020:</b> PJR received email on the 31/04/2020 indicating grant allocations. PJR responded with a thanks and a question about the scheduling of the next MEF meeting.</p> <p><b>Action: Raised</b></p>				Raised
<b>No 22-03-2020-02</b>	<p><b>Update of website with new rules and criteria.</b> PJR to liase with HP and ensure the new grant rules and criteria are added to the GPF website.</p> <p><b>Action. Raised.</b></p>	22-03-20	PJR	High	Raised
<b>No 22-03-2020-03</b>	<p><b>Revision of Standing Orders with new rules and criteria.</b> PJR and NW to review the current standing order and highlight any changes required in parallel with a similar <b>Action 22-03-2020-06 Criteria changes for Capital Pot.</b> (see below)</p> <p><b>Action. Raised.</b></p>	22-03-20	PJR	High	Raised
<b>No 22-03-2020-04</b>	<p><b>Application for Alex Pitcher by Individuals:</b> PJR and HP to develop a proposed method to allow individuals to apply for the award but within or as part of a expedition application.</p> <p><b>Action. Raised.</b></p>	22-03-20	PJR	Med	Raised
<b>No 22-02-2020-05</b>	<p><b>Trial run of Application Marking Scheme.</b></p> <p>PJR and FL to send the committee a marking form to mark a chosen application round.</p> <p><b>25-03-2020:</b> Form developed and sent to committee members, and the round chosen was Spring 2019</p>	22-03-20	PJR	Med	25-03-20

	<b>Action: Closed</b>				
<b>No 22-03-2020-06</b>	<b>Criteria changes for Capital Pot:</b> Spending: PJR and NW to produce a proposal including the required changes to the Standing Orders and to circulate prior to the next committee meeting for review <b>Action: Raised.</b>	22-03-20	PJR	Med	Raised.
<b>No 22-03-2020-07</b>	<b>Notification to applicants of AECCM results.</b> PJR to send the 4 applicants an email on the decision of the committee <b>25-03-2020:</b> Emails sent to the 4 applicants. <b>Action: Closed</b>	22-03-20	PJR	High	<b>25-03-20</b>
<b>No 22-03-2020-08</b>	<b>New AECCM access to Committee Pages.</b> PJR to give Phil Walker to Access to the committee pages and send the Introduction information for new members. <b>25-03-2020:</b> Phil Given access and information sent. <b>Action: Closed.</b>	22-03-20	PJR	High	<b>25-03-20</b>
<b>No 22-03-2020-09</b>	<b>Email to Hidden Earth Committee:</b> PJR to send email to the Hidden Earth Committee, indicating that if Dave Gough's view was that of the Hidden Earths committee then GPF apologies profusely and also suggest that any future donation comes with specific criteria to the donation e.g. for immediate distribution or to do as GPF see fit etc so that there will be no mis-understanding in the future. <b>25-03-2020:</b> Email sent. <b>Action: Closed</b>	22-03-20	PJR	Med	<b>25-03-20</b>
<b>No 22-03-2020-10</b>	<b>Publicising of the availability of the Cavelink system.</b> PJR to make this fact know on the GPF website. <b>Action: Raised</b>	22-03-20	PJR	Med	Raised