

## 56. Memorials to the Conference

<b>Contact name and details</b>	The Revd Catherine Dixon Convener of the Memorials Committee memorials@methodistchurch.org.uk
---------------------------------	---

### Notes for the guidance of members of the Conference

#### 1. Introduction to memorials

Memorials are messages from Circuit Meetings and District Synods to the Conference. They suggest that the Conference takes action or makes a statement on an issue. The memorials listed in this report have been received since the last Conference. These memorials may help members of the Conference to judge the main concerns currently felt in the Connexion, and the strength of opinion they represent.

Each year the Methodist Council is required to appoint a Memorials Committee made up of representatives from Districts to aid the Conference in replying to each memorial. The replies to these memorials have been drafted by members of the Connexional Team and officers of other relevant bodies. They have been scrutinised by the Memorials Committee and amended where the committee felt it was appropriate.

The committee recommends to the Conference the replies printed in the Agenda under each memorial. The Conference binds itself either to agree each reply, to amend it, or to agree an alternative reply (see Standing Order 133(4), printed in the Rules of Procedure on page 13 of the Agenda).

In some of its responses, the committee makes no comment on the substance of a memorial, but indicates that the reply of the Conference is given in other resolutions of the Conference. This kind of response does not mean that the committee has not taken seriously the points made in the memorial. It means that another report deals with the issue more fully. Debate on that report gives the Conference an opportunity to discuss the issues raised by the memorial.

In addition to the memorials listed below, the Memorials Secretary received a number of memorials about marriage and relationships. Given the Council's decision that it was not possible at this Conference to vote on the provisional resolutions of the report *God in love unites us* to which those memorials refer, the Circuits concerned have been informed that the Conference will not deal with those memorials this year and have been invited to submit them to the Conference of 2021.

#### 2. Consideration of the memorials by the Conference

Any member of the Conference has the right to move an amendment to the reply recommended by the committee, or to propose that it is substituted by a different reply. Amendments to replies should be submitted in the form of a notice of motion. Members are urged to give notice of their intention to move an amendment as early as possible.

If the Conference rejects a reply, an acceptable alternative must, then or later, be put to and agreed by the Conference. In addition, any two members of the Conference may, by notice of motion submitted on the first day of the relevant session, propose that, instead of dealing with the committee's

recommended replies in the ordinary course of business, the Conference shall debate a resolution based on one or more of the memorials.

This year, the Memorials Committee has recommended to the Conference Business Committee that the replies to any memorials which relate to other items of business in the Agenda be taken at the same time as that business, and that the remaining replies should be placed in the *en bloc* business of the Conference, unless the Business Committee feels that they should be debated. Any recommended reply to a memorial which is the subject of an amending notice of motion will automatically be removed from *en bloc* business (see Standing Order 134A(1)(c), Agenda page 14).

Members of the Conference with questions on any matter affecting memorials and the procedures described above should consult the Memorials Secretary, Catherine Dixon. For example, if any member wishes to change the recommended reply of the committee, the Memorials Secretary would be happy to advise on how and when to propose either an amendment or the substitution of a different reply.

The Memorials Secretary will notify each Synod and Circuit of the reply the Conference has made to its memorial.

#### **M1 Leaders of Worship and Preachers' Homes (LWPHomes) and the Leaders of Worship and Preachers' Trust (LWPT)**

The Nene Valley (23/23) Circuit Meeting (Present: 28; Voting: unanimous), is concerned by recent changes within LWPT. In 2004, when LWPT was formed, it was intended that it would develop the Local Preachers' Mutual Aid Association (LPMA) work on preacher support to a wide ecumenical group, and LWPHomes was formed to take over the assets and liabilities of Mutual Aid Homes (MAH). This relationship between LWPHomes and LWPT was one of solid and prayerful respect and mutual understanding for over 12 years, as was the case previously between LPMA and MAH. Sadly, in late 2017, it changed swiftly when it became clear that LWPT Trustees, pursuing their wider ecumenical aims, saw a conflict of interest in the hitherto mutual, historic relationship between the two charities. As a direct consequence, joint LWPT/LWPHomes trustees and executive managers resigned from LWPT; LWPHomes and LWPT have now gone their separate ways.

Our concerns are that:

- LWPT has declined to provide LWPHomes with a secure copy of elements of a jointly owned database holding the Ichthus addressee list, making it impossible for LWPHomes to continue to maintain contact with its valued, traditional friends across the Connexion.
- The LPMA trustees (now the same personas as the LWPT trustees) have unilaterally implemented a bidding process for the LPMA monies, without reference to LWPHomes, whereby LWPHomes must bid for grants from LPMA restricted funds, alongside other applicants, which essentially comprises legacies to LPMA.

These concerns put LWPHomes in a difficult position which may impede its future work. The Circuit Meeting asks the Conference to seek information from LWPT concerning its position in respect of LWPHomes' access to the Ichthus addressee lists and its unilateral imposition of a bidding scheme for LPMA restricted funds. Further, the Circuit Meeting asks the Conference to request that LWPT explains to all of our churches and circuits why donations formerly made to LWPT (which were historically given to

support both LWPHomes and LWPT) are now being retained by LWPT for its exclusive use and are no longer also being automatically used to support LWPHomes and its Westerley homes in Westcliffe, Minehead, Woodhall Spa and Milborne Port.

## **Reply**

The Conference thanks the Nene Valley Circuit for its memorial and for reminding the Conference of the work of both LWPT and LWP Homes. The Conference recognises that the division of the two trusts in 2017 has led to some areas of confusion and misunderstanding and is mindful that the current relationship between the two trusts is currently the subject of discussion between them. The Conference shares the Circuit's hopes for a harmonious future relationship between two bodies which rejoice in a common heritage from LPMA. However, the Conference cannot entirely agree with the Circuit's analysis of the reasons for the difficulties that have been experienced and understands that the current arrangements were put in place by mutual agreement between the two trusts. Therefore, it declines the second request in the memorial.

The Conference notes that the Secretary of the Conference has met and plans to have further conversations with the Chair and Chief Executive of LWPT and will continue to explore these issues with them. The Conference, therefore, accepts the first request in the memorial without agreeing to the basis on which it has been framed and directs the Secretary of the Conference to have conversations with LWP Homes and LWPT and to report to the Council through the Ministries Committee on the current position.

## **M2 Internet Banking**

The Liverpool (North) (18/1) Circuit Meeting (Present: 26; Voting: 21 for, 0 against) which met on 3 March 2020, draws the Conference's attention to the subject of internet banking. The guidance available on the Methodist Church Website (downloaded 22/2/20) dated June 2013 refers to SO 012(1) which gives holders of Methodist accounts legal power to conduct banking via the internet. However, the meeting asks if any updated guidance is available, as the meeting has found banks allowing two stage authorisations for payments for new accounts cumbersome (with one bank requiring personal banking details of trustees) and branches increasingly reducing in number. Also, an increasing number of suppliers are asking for payment via BACS. The meeting has found a larger number of banks allow single stage authorisation for internet banking payments and asks if the Conference would allow this in the absence of any other reasonable alternative.

## **Reply**

The Conference thanks the Liverpool (North) Circuit for its memorial and raising this issue of internet banking which is faced by many across the Connexion.

It is necessary that local trustees have appropriate financial controls in place that are proportionate to their context. The current Standing Order (012) states that "Methodist money shall not be held in private accounts but in official bank accounts requiring the signatures of, or electronic authorisation by, two persons for withdrawals." The guidance from the Charity Commission on this point is very clear, as follows: "The level of risk arising from single authorisation online banking means that the commission

does not recommend this system is used by charities.”<sup>1</sup> The Standing Order is consistent with the position of the Charity Commission. It should be noted that some banks do facilitate dual-authorisation. For the sake of clarity, the Standing Order does not prevent the use of Direct Debits, BACS or credit/debit cards as a means of payment, but in all cases trustees should ensure that appropriate financial controls are in place consistent with the guidance provided by the Charity Commission.

The Conference, therefore, declines the memorial.

### **M3 Local Preachers and Worship Leaders Training Support**

The Hinckley (23/11) Circuit Meeting (Present: 46; Voting: unanimous) rejoices with those local preachers and worship leaders whom God calls and who are sufficiently academic and computer literate to grow through the new training course, *Worship: Leading and Preaching* (W:L&P). However, the Circuit also has experience of the great difficulties, and resulting stress and frustration, that some, older trainees in particular, have in accessing, using, and completing the new training course. This results in two concerns:

(1) The Circuit considers the size and academic standard of the course to be too great and that these factors are major disincentives to potential candidates whom God may be calling to preach or lead worship, the Circuit asks the Conference for an independent assessment of the academic demands of the course, and for a review in the light of this assessment.

(2) Flexibility and support are available to trainee local preachers and worship leaders with “Additional Needs” ie those with a disability or impairment who struggle, in some way, to access the multi-media training materials and/or submit assessments in electronic form. The Circuit asks the Conference to make provision for such access arrangements to be made available, on the recommendation of the Circuit Local Preachers’ Meeting, guided by the local tutor, to individuals who have clearly identifiable difficulties but who lack a formal diagnosis of a condition or disability.

### **Reply**

The Conference thanks the Hinckley Circuit Meeting for its engagement with this important issue in our worship and witness. In reply, the following background may be useful:

The W:L&P course is designed to equip worship leaders and local preachers with the skills and competencies they need for the wide range of contexts in which they will exercise their ministry in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. It is also designed to be accessible to people with a wide range of educational backgrounds and preferred learning styles. Its structure as a blended learning programme delivered primarily online is specifically designed to enable this. The learning resources provided cover a wide range of ability levels, and the student-centred structure of the programme means that students can select the resources that are most appropriate to them and their context. No student is expected to read all the material offered, and sometimes students may need help from their tutor in deciding which material is most appropriate for them to engage with. The Board of Studies oversees the implementation and development of the

---

<sup>1</sup> Internal financial controls for charities (CC8)

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/internal-financial-controls-for-charities-cc8/internal-financial-controls-for-charities#s5-4>

course. The Board is made up of those with significant experience in adult education, online learning, and local local preacher and worship leader formation from all across the Connexion. As part of its ongoing work it will be embarking on a comprehensive review of the contents of the course during 2020. An independent review of the academic demands of the course, to ensure that the balance of material is appropriate for students of all abilities, is a helpful part of that process, and will be included in it

During the development of the course, great attention was given to ensuring that accessibility for those with additional needs was provided where possible, in consultation with an Additional Needs Consultation Group established for the purpose. Facilities such as audio transcription and screen contrast controls were built in and an Additional Needs Guide is available, together with specific advice from members of the Additional Needs Consultation Group if required.

Progressive development of the course website has provided simpler facilities for printing of materials for those who need printed copies, and enhanced, clearer screen presentation for those who prefer to work at the screen. It is recognised that simplification of the assessment processes, including the complexities of portfolio submission, is a priority and the Board of Studies is working on a new approach to assessment to address this problem.

It should be noted that students can already present material for assessment by their tutors in audio or video form, and that Learning Network Officers are able to provide advice to students and tutors regarding the possibilities. The Conference welcomes the suggestion that specific help and support should be provided to those with particular needs, and the Local Preachers' Office is happy to continue to work with a team of specialist supporters across the Connexion who are able to advise and guide circuits, students and tutors regarding their specific needs.

The Conference, therefore, declines the memorial, but notes that the Board of Studies already plans to incorporate an independent academic assessment into the review which is already under way. The Conference further recognises the ongoing work being done on learning support and forms of assessment, which is already addressing the second issue raised.

#### **M4 Ethical Concerns with Pension Funds**

The South Worcestershire (5/16) Circuit Meeting (Present: 39; Voting: 35 for, 1 against) is disturbed to hear that Methodist Pension Funds may be being invested outside the principles of our Ethical Investment Advisory Committee. If this is so, this is a particular matter of concern as Methodism moves away from investment in fossil fuel companies who have contributed so much to the climate emergency, and the Central Finance Board launches a 'green investment fund', a development much to be welcomed. As they consider such issues local churches may wish to make use of the new 'Money Makes Change' study material recently launched by the Ecumenical Council for Corporate Responsibility (ECCR).

While being most grateful for the work of the Connexional Treasurer, pension staff and pension trustees, we ask the Conference to request most urgently that ministers' and lay employees' ethical concerns be better supported by applying ethical principles along the lines of those advised by the Joint Advisory Committee on the Ethics of Investment (JACEI) to the arrangements for investing employee and employer pension contributions.

## **Reply**

The Conference thanks the South Worcestershire Circuit for highlighting this important issue.

The Conference notes that it is the Trustees of the Methodist Ministers' Pension Scheme who are responsible for the investment decisions that relate to the Scheme. Some of the trustees are appointed by the Conference, and some are themselves pension fund members who are elected by the whole membership.

In 2019 the Conference adopted a motion that offered the view that it would seek to ensure that the Scheme's investments stay under the management of the Central Finance Board, thus ensuring that the JACEI ethical principles remain at the heart of any investment decisions. In accordance with this motion and other associated decisions of the Conference, the Connexional Treasurer and relevant members of the Team continue to meet regularly with the Trustees of the Scheme.

The Conference also notes that following consultation with lay employees, the Pension and Assurance Scheme for Lay Employees of the Methodist Church was closed to future accruals in 2019 due to future unaffordability of the final salary scheme offered to staff through this Scheme. After a comprehensive tendering process, a defined contribution scheme was opened with Royal London, which is a 'mutual society' (an organisation run for, and owned by, its members).

The tender process, and subsequent implementation, ensured that all employees have easy access to pensions with a variety of ethical investment options, but legal advice also made it clear that the default scheme, into which employees have to be enrolled unless they choose otherwise, must be one that provides the best possible long term investment return. As an employer the Methodist Church is prohibited from giving investment advice.

The Royal London Scheme offers staff the opportunity to choose to invest their pension funds in an ethical scheme and both the Connexional Team and Royal London have made and continue to make this clear to staff. It must be stressed that any investments made into pensions with Royal London are owned by the employees themselves and not by the Methodist Church. Available options with Royal London will continue to be discussed, along with the investment principles promoted by JACEI, to ensure that ethical options are available to staff.

Therefore, the Conference declines the memorial.

## **M5 Listed Buildings**

The Cheshire South (11/8) Circuit Meeting (Present: 53; Voting: unanimous) notes that there are a great number of buildings owned by the Methodist Church that have full or partial Listed Building Status. While this can provide opportunities for mission and engagement with those in local communities interested in historic buildings, it also imposes burdens on the Managing Trustees of such buildings: for example, any Building Project will tend to be more complex and expensive, and the costs of maintaining and preserving a Heritage Asset - both in terms of people's time, and money - are often considerable. This can lead in some cases to hard conversations about whether a congregation remains viable in such a building - and where it is not, this can leave Circuits having to maintain a Listed Building where a society has closed, sometimes for years, until a sale can be made. Despite this, there is often little

additional support for those seeking to manage, maintain and develop such buildings and engage in mission and outreach from them.

We ask the Conference to assist Managing Trustees of Listed Buildings in the first instance by providing a forum for information sharing - possibly under the direction of Methodist Heritage or some other suitable body. The aims could include the sharing of ideas and best practice in day to day running of these buildings from across the Connexion, details of building projects completed to provide guidance and inspiration to others, and the creation of a directory of specifically Heritage-focused Grant Making Bodies.

## **Reply**

The Conference thanks the Cheshire South Circuit Meeting for the memorial.

The Conference recognises that the listed buildings of the Methodist Church have played a central role in their communities through centuries of history, and are cultural assets that deserve to be conserved in their own right. It is also grateful for the work of the Listed Buildings Advisory Committee and the work that they do. The Conference is also aware that a listed church is more than bricks and mortar. It is part of a people called by God to love and praise God for the sake of the world. The Conference recognises that the listing of our buildings can impose restrictions and added burdens on Managing trustees in terms of the additional costs of repairs, and also in terms of finding qualified and suitable contractors to carry out the often highly specialised works to conserve them.

Currently support and advice is offered to Managing Trustees by the Connexional Conservation Officer, who works alongside volunteers to support them as they navigate their way through the relevant legislation set out by central government. It is acknowledged that more resources are needed and the Connexional Team are looking at ways to provide further assistance to ensure more help can be offered. They have also been working at national level with colleagues from other denominations on Government initiatives, such as the Bernard Taylor Pilot Review. This is examining ways in which we can provide more assistance to Managing Trustees on both a fabric repair and community development perspective.

The Connexional Team is also involved in national discussions about the provision of further funding for urgent repairs to our historic building stock, and looking at ways in which we can dispose of our buildings without unnecessary delays, which cause an additional burden to Circuit Trustees. In addition, it is hoped that the team can develop a strategy for our listed buildings over the next couple of years, particularly as our building stock gets older and our portfolio becomes more concentrated with listed and traditional buildings.

There has also been work done on the Conservation Section of the Methodist Church website to provide advice and guidance on making alterations to our listed buildings, and identifying grants and training available to enable trustees to do this on behalf of their church. This includes links to Heritage focused grant making bodies. Already included on these pages are inspirational stories and examples of best practice that will be of interest to your church. Indeed, further work on this area is being carried out by the Property Support Officer who is developing general property pages which will include further examples of works carried out to our traditional and historic properties. It is felt that there is much merit in creating a more structured forum for the sharing of ideas and the Connexional Team will continue to look into ways in which we can do this and report back to the Council on progress in due course.

The Conference accepts the memorial.

## **M6 Global Climate Emergency**

The Gloucestershire (7/7) Circuit Meeting (Present 75; Voting: 74 for, 1 against), recognising that the global climate emergency is a crisis for God's creation, and a fundamental injustice, and following the resolution of the Methodist Conference 2019 that there is a climate emergency:

(a) calls upon all parts of the Methodist Church, at local church, circuit, district and connexional level, to work to achieve measurable 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) calls on each District to address progress toward net zero emissions every two years.

### **Reply**

The Conference thanks the Gloucestershire Methodist Circuit for its memorial. A programme to achieve net zero emissions across the Methodist Church will involve many areas of our mission and practice across the Connexion and warrants greater attention that can be provided at this Conference. The Conference, therefore, refers the memorial to Methodist Council.

## **M7 Israel and Palestine**

The Leeds North and East (27/2) Circuit Meeting (Present: 46; Voting: 37 for, 2 against) believes in the equal Human Rights of all Palestinians and Israelis, supported by International Law and UN Resolutions. Given that the US and Israeli governments' proposed 'Peace Plan' explicitly rejects this belief, now is the time for a different approach from all those campaigning for a just settlement. We therefore call on the Conference to review and reassess its approach and specifically to request JACEI (Joint Advisory Committee on Ethical Investments) to urgently consider again disinvesting in all companies that profit from activities in illegally occupied areas, as a matter of ethical and economic justice.

### **Reply**

The Conference thanks the Leeds North and East Circuit for raising concerns with respect to Palestine. The Conference has long maintained a position first outlined by the 2001 Conference, *"recognising that peace and security can only be achieved when international judgements are respected and justice is done, and"* that *"a return to the borders of 1967 and a status for Jerusalem as a place for two nations and three faiths, with parity of esteem, is the real basis upon which trust could be built up among the different communities. The desire for a lasting peace can only be based on trust, security and freedom from fear for all people in the area"*. (Notice of Motion 17 (2001))

The Methodist Church recognises that the questions around a future status of borders, and sovereignty must be determined through negotiation.

The Conference encourages Methodists to continue to pray with respect to justice for Palestine and Israel and, in the light of a challenging international environment, to be active in working for justice

throughout the world. The Conference highlights opportunities for Methodists to engage with Palestinian, Jewish and other groups through visits or pilgrimages to the region, around which the Methodist International Liaison Office in Jerusalem can offer advice. As the Conference is unable to give the requests on investment policy an appropriate level of engagement and coverage in 2020, the Conference refers the memorial to the Methodist Council.

### **M8 Israel and Palestine**

The Leeds South and West (27/1) Circuit Meeting (Present 54; Voting: 40 for, 1 against), notes with concern that Methodist statements on Israel Palestine all assume that a two-state solution is the way to resolve a situation that is growing increasingly dire for Palestinians in the West Bank and Gaza. Following the US declaration that America does not consider Israeli settlements in the West Bank to be illegal under international law, and President Trump's Middle East Peace Plan, which involves the annexation and incorporation of large parts of the West Bank into the state of Israel, the Palestinians will be left with only fragments of territory, which would appear to make an independent Palestinian state virtually impossible.

In the light of this situation, we call upon the Conference to review the 2016 investment policy (prepared by the Joint Advisory Committee on the Ethics of Investment) as a matter of urgency, and ask that the Central Finance Board cease investment in all companies which profit from Israel's Occupation of Palestine. In view of the fact that Israel is the party with power on the ground, and has the capacity to give equal human rights to Palestinians and Israelis, we urge the Conference to give Israel every encouragement to do this.

### **Reply**

The Conference thanks the Leeds South and West Circuit for raising concerns with respect to Palestine at this critical time and adopts the same reply as to M7.

### **M9 Israel Palestine**

The South Worcestershire (5/16) Circuit Meeting (Present: 39; Voting: 31 for; 6 against) notes with deep concern the deteriorating situation for Palestinians in the West Bank and Gaza, due to the Israeli Occupation. Within the last year the political situation has further reduced the chance of an independent, viable Palestinian state. Implications for Palestine include the cutting of funding to UNRWA from US, a statement that the US no longer deems West Bank settlements inconsistent with international law, and the recent Middle East Plan announced by President Trump at the end of January. The Israeli electrical company has recently reduced the supply of electricity to Palestine resulting in extensive power cuts. In addition economic prospects are looking bleak for Palestinians.

In the light of this situation we urge the Conference to encourage Methodists to continue to pray and work for a viable, independent Palestinian state, or a single state of Israel/Palestine with equal citizenship for all communities, and in the meantime to adopt the same policy as the Quakers not to invest any funds in companies profiting from the Occupation of Palestine, therefore requesting the Joint Advisory Committee on the Ethics of Investment (JACEI) to commend this policy with all urgency to the Central Finance Board.

### **Reply**

The Conference thanks the South Worcestershire Circuit for this memorial, welcomes the encouragement of Methodists to continue to pray and adopts the same reply as to M7.

## **M10 Investment**

The Bradford South (27/33) Circuit Meeting (Present 40; Voting: unanimous) welcomes the work conducted by the Central Finance Board (CFB) and the Joint Advisory Committee on the Ethics of Investment (JACEI) following the motion on divestment passed at the 2017 Conference, which called for divestment from oil and gas companies whose business investment plans are not aligned with the Paris Agreement target of 'well below 2 degrees Celsius' by 2020.

It notes:

- the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) report emphasising the importance of limiting global average temperature rises to 1.5 degrees Celsius, and the need for global carbon emissions to fall by 45% by 2030 in order to reach this goal.
- the intention of the major oil companies to spend hundreds of billions of pounds on exploration and extraction of new fossil fuel reserves, and to *increase* production of fossil fuels over the next decade (by 38% in the case of Shell and 20% in the case of BP by 2030), which is incompatible with the 1.5 degree target of the Paris Agreement.
- that there are several times more known fossil fuel reserves than can be burned if we are to meet the Paris Agreement goals, as highlighted by Carbon Tracker and former Bank of England Governor, Mark Carney.

It notes the Notice of Motion 2016/206 passed at the Conference requesting further work to move towards limiting global temperature rises to 1.5 degrees Celsius, and the recognition of the climate emergency by the 2019 Conference, and therefore requests that the Methodist Council oversees a process, in company with JACEI, with a view to issuing robust advice that the Methodist Church divest from oil and gas companies that have either failed to clearly set out plans to align with the Paris Agreement targets or have failed to agree to bring to an end exploration for and extraction of new fossil fuel reserves, and consider completing this process before the UN climate talks in Glasgow (COP26).

It notes the introduction of the Epworth fund excluding investment in fossil fuel companies and welcomes the initiative of the CFB to increase investment in renewable energy and clean technologies, in order to accelerate the transition to a net-zero carbon economy.

## **Reply**

The Conference thanks the Bradford South Circuit Meeting for its memorial and recognises the important role of investors in directing capital towards a transition to sustainable economies with net zero emissions being the ultimate goal.

The Conference draws attention to the report of the Joint Advisory Committee on the Ethics of Investment (JACEI), "Climate change and fossil fuels: response to Memorial 32 (2017) and Conference reply". This report sets out the range of criteria that will be used to assess fossil fuel companies.

The methodology employed to assess companies is set out by JACEI in the report to the Conference in 2018 titled "Climate change and fossil fuels: an update". It includes:

- an examination of a company's current and recent exposure to different fossil fuels;
- the incorporation of climate change concerns in company strategy and governance;
- positive steps to transition to a lower carbon world; and
- performance in decreasing emissions.

This assessment ensures that investments managed by the Central Finance Board of the Methodist Church (CFB) are directed towards companies that have set out plans to align with Paris targets and are making credible and measurable progress in this respect as is requested by this memorial. On the basis of this assessment, JACEI has reported to the Conference its advice to the CFB with regard to oil and gas companies that should be excluded on investment grounds and those that merit further engagement.

The CFB analysis reviewed by JACEI also takes into account companies' capital expenditure on exploration of fossil fuel reserves with the expectation that this will decline over time. However, in this aspect, the approach taken differs to that directed by the memorial. Therefore, while endorsing Bradford South Circuit Meeting's encouragement of ongoing work in this area in advance of the Glasgow COP26 summit, the Conference declines the memorial.