

RESTRUCTURING DISCUSSION

*Provided by Nick Wallingford
7 April 1993*

These notes were from the Planning Meeting in 1988. They came in response to the circulation of Allen McCaws paper describing a new structure comprising an industry council, with representatives of the various specialty groups. I thought the Exec might still find these notes relevant. Those taking part were:

AMc Allen McCaw, President
SG Steuart Goodman
GW Gavin White
KH Keith Herron
PB Peter Bray
TR Ted Roberts
AM Andrew Matheson

AMc: Alter election system to have wider representation, the working executive. But also BIC with reps from sub-groups. One meeting of BIC for planning, one at Conference. Some of these stronger than others. Funding could be on 50:50 basis with NBA. Exec to still manage, etc. Possibly part time paid President. A number of advantages, as listed in discussion paper. Workload has been poorly spread, so some of the ideas behind paper are selfish in origin.

SG: Would change administration. Changing admin structure does not change caliber of people involved.

AMc: Does most of the work so there are not 6 reference points to consider.

SG: On Planning Paper should refer to individual Nat Exec members, rather than President having to do it all.

GW: Need to delegate more.

SG: Onus on Exec to volunteer, too.

KH: Other members don't always have all the information to do the work, as the President does.

PB: Biggest problem is communication, distances involved.

AMc: Often decisions would be better with more direct input from other organisations.

GW: Individual members could still be assigned to various organisations, keeping track of what they are up to.

PB: Too few capable people able and willing to do the work. Add many more 'wallies' and it becomes more unworkable.

GW: Area representation may not allow good members to be able to be elected together.

TR: Approach hasn't come through the MBO process; really needs to come from an identified need for a direction for the NBA.

AMc: With wider representation, could spread the workload, and perhaps involve some of those without time to devote fully to Exec.

GW: Not one phone call in four years to criticise or query.

TR: Already have committee structure, which are branches.

AM: Not all, or many, are involved in the specialist groups.

TR: The groups mentioned are all very small in active beekeepers.

KH: Weak members of industry are clinging to strong. If \$1 per hive, some of stronger will say 'the hell with these weaker, I'll go do my own thing'.

AM: Day to day management and policy tend to get mixed up. One of benefits of proposal would give Nat Exec the first, and then the BIC would look at the bigger issues. With larger group may have too many people for decision making.

AMc: Would like to see more effective use of trust fund, as time, money and resources are used simply to tap into them.

SG: Administrative structure with Nat Exec, Exec Secy and President. With changes in Presidents, activities have increased drastically. Should beekeepers really be brought into 21st century?

KH: Dangers in becoming businessmen rather than beekeepers.

AM: Need to be positive and further decrease numbers of beekeeper who just want to live with their head in a hive.

PB: Getting best price, right products, brings them all into reality.

AMc: Perhaps restructuring on its own won't solve problems, might be more of a communication problem.

TR: Probably quickest way of results is present structure, while getting capable beekeepers to take more active role in branches and Exec.

AMc: Contacts and information make it worthwhile to be involved on Exec.

AMc: Would like to see more of specialist groups telling Conference what they are doing on a more formal basis.

SG: With massive change of Exec, within 12 months little would be done.

KH: Is work generated the same as results?

SG: Foodtowns of this world don't really care if beekeepers have to go to wall. If you want to survive as more than a cottage industry, what Allen is trying to achieve is a must.

AMc: Must focus more in future on people who are really doing it. Perhaps less time worrying about 1-500 hive beekeepers are doing, and concentrate on those where its really happening.

TR: NBA could have role in business management education. Capable at beekeeping, but not at business practices. Job of Exec to make sure that the go getters can still go and get.

PB: No one really volunteers for branch jobs.

TR: Before AGM make sure all positions have nominations etc, so people are not really afraid to show up and be railroaded.

AMc: Dairy industry has been effective due to communication of daily morning chats.

PB: Comes back to training manual for branch secys, and getting the right one for the job.

GW: Branch secretaries have too much power, while president should have better idea of correspondence, etc.

PB: Two branch meetings a year: put up remits and vote on them; all others are for special talks, etc.

SG: Hard to get good motivation without pay.

PB: What is sufficient monetary motivation to get people to do the job?

PB: Could perhaps best be done through branches.

TR: SW Districts needed only getting the right team in place; not financially motivated. Field Days one of the best ways to get branches active and generate money.

AMc: Need to actively encourage right people into job if restructuring doesn't take place. Active branches not a problem; need to make it occur in more areas. Personal feeling that specialist groups to continue in their activities. Too much concentration on making sure all come along; need to encourage those doing the job (8-10 of the 50 in the Packers, for instance).

AMc: Polln groups all trying to do about the same things in their areas. Queen breeders newsletters full of value.

TR: Strict membership control from pollination groups very important.

AMc: No real conclusions from this discussion. Is there any possible?

KH: Leave structure question open until present funding problems solved. This is third year talking about it.

TR: Convinced option 2 will be acceptable to Minister.

AM: Leave current system in place, but make sure people are approached beforehand.

Perhaps need to tag the restructuring to remind us to look at it again.

SG: Need to have movers and shakers, and they need extra support to get elected.

TR: If you want something done well, ask a busy person.