

## **Review of Tours Policy**

A paper by the DPCS

### **Background**

This year the Tours Policy (also known as the Environmental Policy Appendix D) will lapse. Furthermore, since it was last passed many of the factors taken into account have evolved to create different circumstances. Importantly, the zoning concept of the policy took into account the increasing prevalence of low cost airlines that were causing much pollution but still providing often the most affordable option.

Given that this policy sits within the environmental policy, the idea behind zoning was to incentivise Clubs & Societies to take the most environmentally friendly route as well as encouraging them to get out and do something beyond what they ordinarily do.

At the last CSB we had a productive discussion about the Policy and where we thought it might be good to take it and what things were worth keeping. A summary of points are as follows, but more can be found in the minutes of the meeting:

- There should be tighter/clearer definitions of what counts as a tour vs trip
- Suggestion of capping number of tours
- Declaration at the beginning of year of going on tour in what tour periods
- The cheaper airline flights have a smaller burden on the pot, and therefore mean that there is more to go around.
- The current method doesn't take into account length of stay (eg. accommodation costs), or merits of the trip eg. outreach.
- It's a balance between funding and also trusting that clubs are choosing the cheapest, reasonable options eg. not 5\* accommodation.
- Updating the form for more questions so that only the clubs that are serious fill it in.
- Suggestion of a minimum spend per individual which would mean that the cost of more expensive and prohibitive tours could be brought down more as it is more possible to save for £200-500 through the course of the year, but £1500 is a different ball park.
- Changing the zoning because now that the cheap airlines are so cheap, it's still cheaper to fly than go by more environmental means with the subsidy.

### **Matters for Discussion**

1. What is the fundamental reason this Board believes, that we should award tours funding?
2. What should the definitions of a tour be?
3. Would Clubs prefer to see a objective (eg. algorithm, current method) or subjective approach (eg. budgeting rounds to a certain extent)
4. Out of the prepared models which look to be the most reasonable or worth taking forward?

## **Appendix 1 – Current definition of a Tour vs Trip**

### **1. Trip**

- A mainstream generic club activity, for example a match, a weekend at the Mountain Hut, a regular visit or excursion.
- This should be budgeted for in the budgeting round,
- Examples could include “30 away matches” or “5 weekends at the Mountain Hut”. The costs for each individual trip should be comparable and as such budgeted for in bulk.

### **2. Tour**

- A tour should be a period of (usually residential) time spent by members of a club or society away from the geographical locality of their mainstream club activities, supplementary to their normal practises.
- The purpose of a tour should be to further the aims and objectives of a club or society, supporting their activities as defined in the club's or societies' constitution, beyond which can be achieved through usual day-to-day, week-to-week operations. The prime activity while 'on tour' should be the club activity.
- Geographical locations of tours should be chosen to make use of opportunities (natural, man-made, competitive, cultural, influential etc..) that would normally be unavailable. Locations of tours should be areas not otherwise visited by a club or society.
- A tour should have a clear aim or objective against which success or failure can be judged.
- A tour may not be purely or primarily social in its aims and objectives.

## **Appendix 2 – Current zones used for determining funding levels**

**Proposed subsidy zones**

