

DAPMID

<p>Perspective One</p>	<p>+ Top-down through ND Easier to control from the top (say so, they do it) Makes admin systems uniform so easier to manage All info contained in one bucket 'Overall ministry strategy' sets the parameters OAC is all one entity. Unified identity as OAC. 'Moving away from autonomous branches' 2008* 'Develop a national strategy for the ministry'* Nationalise the ministry (not just admin.)* Direct all leadership thru ND makes changes quicker</p>	<p>- Less flexible & responsive to the local context Harder to manage local admin nuances needed Over-rides local buckets/needs Over-rides local creativity/responsiveness/synergies Stifles local-specific synergies (OAC-centred). Stops multiplication/birth of new entities. Reduces local leadership, responsibility, skills. Over-rides the local where ministry actually happens: local relationships, networks, knowledge. One size fits all, winning formula franchise, loses sight of where Jesus is locally leading, prompting. All leadership via ND creates a single critical point. Disempowers others.</p>
<p>Perspective Two</p>	<p>+ Top serves local initiatives (within parameters) Empowers local initiative Empowers local leadership & teams Multiple local leaders = no single weakpoint Less arguments at national, freedom at local. Ministers' calling, listens to Jesus over org's plan. Responsive to local ministries' needs/synergies Starts with a way, finds mutually better ways later Tools mutually fit to purpose at local level Promo targeted to ministry context/goal, over org. is more effective. And more service-focused. Communication/support go two ways National systems serve local ministries</p>	<p>- Makes chaos, not organised* Insubordination harder to weed out Multiple local leaders is hard for national to lead Projects can be outside of OAC-specific activities OAC time paid for non-OAC activities Harder for national admin to manage Info in more than one bucket. Less centrally secured. Promo less on OAC dilutes awareness of OAC 2-way instructions creates arguments Local ministry access makes systems less secure</p>
	<p>Insights P2 is more resilient, vibrant, alive with the energies of more people. More likely to be spirit-led. Also more susceptible to egos. Potentially more chaotic although limited by local scale. P1 is more controlling, more likely to stifle local leadership, initiative and creativity. P2 does not exclude P1 (P2 is in the context of parameters set by P1) but P1 does exclude P2. So finding nuance/balance between the extremes of P1 and P2 essentially means P2.</p>	<p>Design Go with P2. Find ways to serve local that are mutually agreed by local and national levels. This may require some anomalies in national systems.</p>

* Contains a falsehood