Replacing the Central Council Decisions

Tim Barnes



Five Areas

1. Recap of our mandate

How we applied the mandate's elements:

- 2. Permissive
- 3. Simple
- 4. Maintain historical continuity
- 5. Responsibility of the Executive



1. Mandate

- Replace the CC Decisions with a descriptive framework that is permissive and simple, and which maintains historical continuity
- The publication and maintenance of the framework will be the responsibility of the Executive



2. Permissive

 Increasing permissiveness is the continuation of a process that's already well under way



2. Permissive (cont.)

- Norms and disclosure approach to performances
- 2. More than one cover bell recognized
- 3. Side by side ringing recognized
- 4. No limits on the number of consecutive blows in the same place



2. Permissive (cont.)

- 5. A method can have a single lead in its plain course
- 6. Rotations of methods can be separately named
- 7. Dynamic methods recognized
- 8. Identity change recognized
- 9. Jump changes recognized



3. Simple

- Single definition of truth for all stages and all lengths:
 - A true touch comprises zero or more extents, and zero or one partial extent
 - These rows can occur in any order in the touch



- Unified treatment of cover bells:
 - If a bell rings in the same place in every row, it's *excluded* when determining truth
 - Otherwise it's included when determining truth



• Standard performance lengths for all stages:

• Quarter peal: 1250 – 2499 changes

• Half peal: 2500 – 4999 changes

• Peal: 5000 or more changes

Long length: 10000 or more changes



- Single set of requirements for naming a new method:
 - Ring the method in a performance of at least 1250 changes; or
 - Ring an extent of the method



- All terms used in the framework are defined
- Examples and explanations included throughout the framework



4. Historical continuity

- Framework will not change anything for the vast majority of ringers ...
- ... unless they'd like to take advantage of any of its new features



4. Historical continuity (cont.)

One question on method classification:

<u>Method title</u> = <u>Method name</u> + <u>Classification</u> + <u>Stage</u>

Plain Bob Minor

Cambridge Surprise Major

Tenpo Differential Little Surprise Maximus

4. Historical continuity (cont.)

- Option 4A classifications mostly unchanged
- Option 4B some simplifications to make classifications more tightly defined and easier to understand ...
- ... but this means the method titles of 2-3% of the 21,000 methods in the library will change



5. Responsibility of the Executive

- Much time spent in full Central Council meetings over the past 125 years discussing the Decisions
- Reports that members often weren't fully clear on what they were voting on



5. Responsibility of the Executive (cont.)

- Better approach to delegate responsibility to a technical group via the Executive to maintain the framework going forward
- Council members then oversee this process at a higher level, rather than voting on every change



Wrap up

- No free lunch some may want to ask more questions before agreeing to take part in a peal
- Permissive approach more open to abuse. But current Decisions can be abused and ringers don't – they can be trusted to self-police



Wrap up (cont.)

- No one framework solution will achieve anywhere near unanimous support
- But we think the new framework we've drafted is on the right track, and it will be improved by the consultation



Consultation

- A consultation on the new framework with the ringing community is under way:
- cccbr.github.io/method_ringing_framework
- Section 16: Consultation



Thank you



Q & A

