
Section 1 (Preamble)
No comment

Section 2 (The Life we Share)

2(1) Is there sufficient acknowledgement of the inter-faith dimensions?
2(2) Are the Creeds sufficiently acknowledged? Lambeth Quadrilateral has more to say on them than what is represented here, i.e. reference to both Apostles’ Creed and the Niceo-Constantinopolitan Creed.
2(5) Does there need to be some comment on the recognition of ministries across the Communion and the associated questions?

Section 3 (Our Commitment to Confession)

3(1) Is the phrase “member churches” the most appropriate?
3(2) Should there be further clarity about guidelines for participation in Eucharistic Celebrations? What guidelines are already in existence?

Section 4 (The Life we Share with Others)

4 How does the vocation set out here differ from that of other churches?

Section 5 (Our Unity and Common Life)

5 What does the phrase our Common life imply? How is that expressed in this section? The section needs tightening.
5(2) What is the cash value of the phrases about the Instruments of Communion?
5(2) This text does not adopt the full recommendation of ACC-13 (Resolution 2) on the naming of the Instruments of Communion and the Focus for Unity.
5(2) How do you make “the bonds of affection” explicit here?
5(2) We need more of a link into the discussion of the Instruments of Communion.
5(2) III What does “guarding the faith” mean? Is this too broad a description of the episcopal role?
5(2) IV Is the role of the ACC being too confined here? It is the constitutionally enabled body to advise on inter-Anglican matters.

Section 6 (Unity of the Communion)
6(2) The draft needs to be clear about the use of “the Church” as a term, and how it is to be understood in the text.

6(4) “no juridical or executive authority”. Does the authority of the ACC need to be strengthened?

6(5) There is a need to avoid too much the language of “constitution” or “code” here. The Covenant cannot really be more than asset of aspirations. Each Province would have to articulate its own level of commitment to the Covenant.

6(5) Is this too prescriptive? Perhaps the text should end at the end of the introductory text of 6(5), and not include the bullet points or 6(6).

6(5) This is controversial – why is priority given to the Primates here? This text represents a very big step, because it describes the role of the primates in a more explicit way than before.

6(5) There isn’t enough on the co-operation between the Instruments, particularly between the Primates and ACC.

6(5) It is a reflection of the current reality, but the future development of the ACC is important in a family of Churches which think synodically. How do the Instruments liaise? This questions focuses attention on the JSC. Matters can’t just be left to the Primates. There is also the question of how this relates to the Provincial constitutions.

6(5)2 Given that the Lambeth Conference meets once a decade, does this imply too long a timescale, and inevitable delay in the process of discernment? Should consideration be given to the proposal in TWR that the Primates should be considered as the Standing Committee of the Lambeth Conference? Some sort of holding body, which can respond on a shorter timescale is needed.

6 Perhaps there needs to be a more detailed and separate schedule that clarifies procedures, since the covenant text suffers here from too great an involvement with specifics.

6 The difficulties with this section arise not with the points of agreement, but with the issues of accountability.

6(6) There is not enough material here which acknowledges the critical role of dialogue and debate. Discernment is a process which needs to be recognised.

6(6) Who is the “we” referred to here? There is no indication of how a decision would actually be made.

6(6) This last paragraph departs from the style of “each Church Committing”.

Section 7 (Our Declaration)

No comment