

## Annex C Questions and Answers

### 1. Credibility & Leadership

- Why should fans believe this scheme can succeed where the Trust and other supporter bodies have struggled?

It is not a scheme. It is a service provided by the fans to the fans for the fans. It will not depend on resolutions at an SAGM once a year but the opportunity for the Celtic supporters globally to put their concerns forward and to get answers in the spirit of dialogue which depends on trust but is a step towards building trust issue by issue. It will include supporters with shares and those without shares and so will have a much wider reach than the fragmented groups but it would not be a replacement for them and would work with them in a spirit of unity to fulfil the purpose of Celtic.

### 2. Structure & Governance

- How would the membership scheme be structured to avoid the infighting and stagnation we've seen in other supporter organisations?

The Membership Service would be funded by supporters at as low a monthly cost possible to provide the resources to deliver the kind of service supporters would want to subscribe to. It would be set up as a not for profit service and if there is any profit an amount service users would agree to would go to charity with The Foundation the obvious but not only one.

### 3. Accountability & Transparency

- Who would oversee the funds, and how would members be reassured that money is being used responsibly and transparently?

As a not for profit but funded organisation there would be a regular book keeper an occasional auditor and a set of accounts to be agreed by members and an office manager responsible for the smooth running of the service. The cost would be a factor in the membership subscription. Basically it would adhere to best practice for a not for profit organisation. Folk with experience of such standard practice could advise on that set up.

### 4. Funding & Reach

- You've spoken about members subscribing. Realistically, how many supporters do you think would sign up at launch, and what's the minimum number needed for the scheme to have real impact?

Since it intends to reach all the support and if it delivers what they want and when, they would set that figure at 40,000, 20k from match goers and 20k from the Celtic diaspora. There is a what if business model to establish the cost of Membership depending on the actual numbers.

## 5. Relationship with Existing Groups

- How would this scheme work alongside the Celtic Trust, ARCSC, and the Green Brigade etc — and would you actively seek to unify them under one banner?

All of them would be part of identifying issues along with the Membership Service staff and deciding what needs to be taken to Celtic to address. There is rudimentary model for how that can be done. If the formal bodies and bloggers engage, those who are on social media could move from talking about issues without making any difference to being facilitators of change.

## 6. Legal & Practical Power

- Beyond making statements, what practical levers of power would the scheme give supporters over the PLC? Would it be legal, financial, or purely public pressure?

Much would depend on the PLCs response to The Service. Since they accept communications need to improve the independent Service would be a means of doing that. However, if there was an issue where Celtic were seen as uncooperative the service would allow for funding of a law firm on a retainer to either advise on the formation of a resolution that complies with Company Law if that is their area of expertise or refer to a firm that has. It need not be a resolution to The Board it may be a letter to the police to question any action on their that has caused supporters problems. Or to City Council to complain about pavements that need repair. There is nothing like a letter with a reputable law firm heading at the top to open doors. It certainly did with Resolution 12. In some case having a large membership speaking for the support means Celtic need not be involved at all. A sum for such a retainer is in the model although all the assumptions used there need to be checked realistic.

## 7. Resistance from the Board

- Celtic PLC have a track record of ignoring or deflecting supporter concerns. How would you stop this scheme from being brushed aside as just another protest movement?

In a word **NUMBERS** no more meetings in silos with different groups where what is true at one meeting is no longer true later. Recognition that supporters are capable of understanding how things work and why they don't and have something of value to add to the dialogue.

## 8. Long-Term Vision

- What is the ultimate goal: boardroom influence, fan ownership of shares, or simply forcing greater transparency and dialogue?

A House united around a common purpose not one where division is rife. Agreement on what the purpose of Celtic is and everything that is done meets that purpose.

## 9. Inclusivity

- How would you ensure the scheme is accessible to all Celtic supporters — including those abroad, the unwaged, and fans who feel alienated from current structures?

Via technology by bringing together the disparate groups blogs , podcasts etc and using them to agree common issues and take them to Celtic.

#### **10. Risks & Pitfalls**

- What are the biggest risks of launching this scheme — and how would you prevent it from collapsing into the same issues of division, apathy, or boardroom resistance that have blunted past efforts?

By having a feasibility study to identify the risks and take steps to reduce them. This would need a small start up group and crowd funding to pay for the study.