Where We Stand is a five-part series setting out what the BFCISA sees as good, long-term stewardship of Burnley Football Club. Each part takes a value from our Constitution and Statement of Values, and draws on members' views, what the Football Governance Act 2025 and the Independent Football Regulator (IFR) expect of clubs, and guidance from the Football Supporters' Association (FSA). This is part three and the full series can be found on our website here.

Accountability is one of the three principles in our Statement of Values, which commits us to "advocate for transparency and accountability within Burnley Football Club". Part two looked at who the club ask, and when. This part looks at what the club does with what fans tell them.

The club's only formal consultation channel is their Fan Advisory Board (FAB), whose members the club select. The IFR does allow appointed boards, but says they need processes that make sure "appointed representatives are accountable to fans". At Burnley, with no published terms of reference or terms of office, fans can see no such process.

The IFR's Licensing Guidance gives a clear starting point, though. Its fourth principle says fans should be "empowered to hold the club to account for both the processes and outcomes of fan consultation", and asks clubs to show how fans can question decisions and how fan views have influenced them. This gives us three questions to measure accountability. Who decided, and when? How was it communicated? How did the club respond to feedback?

Apply these three questions to the biggest change of recent years, the closure of the Ormerod Yard exit to home fans and the switching of home and away sections in the Cricket Field Stand, and the process falls down on all three fronts.

First, the decision came before the consultation. The change was presented to the FAB in July 2025 as one of the "Club Proposals", with the club "committed to have every decision shaped by consultation and a deep respect for supporter culture". Yet the same proposal stated that the home and away sections "*will* be switched", and the summary refers to "ongoing communication and feedback opportunities planned for supporters throughout the implementation". Both the FSA and the IFR say fans should be consulted before a decision is made, not during implementation.

Second, the fans most affected, season ticket holders in the Cricket Field Stand, were neither told first nor consulted directly. Instead, the club promoted the changes as a better matchday experience, promising improved catering and atmosphere, DJ booths and 'content-creator pods'. With no sign of these improvements 12 months on, we asked the club for an update and were told they depend on Premier League money and are on hold for now. Fans only know this, however, because we asked.

Third, we questioned the change at the time and, through various channels and in particular our representative on the Safety Advisory Group, asked for changes to ease the congestion members told us about, including moving the away team coaches and opening another exit. The club deserve credit for listening at that stage, but by then the bigger decisions had been made without asking the fans they affected.

Members have raised other matchday changes made without asking them, from the return of goal music to the removal of the player boards. The Football Governance Act 2025 lists matchday issues among the things clubs must consult fans on, which we hope will give the club a clearer framework in future.

Sponsorship is a longer-running example, and the FSA lists sponsorship principles among the topics clubs should consult fans on. In January 2021, Chairman Alan Pace promised fans that the club's gambling sponsorship "will be reviewed". Since then, the club have signed a run of betting partners, including W88 and 96.com on the front of the shirt. In May 2025, the Gambling Commission wrote to Burnley and four other clubs about the risks of promoting unlicensed gambling sites, after the company behind 96.com left the British market. We can find no public report of any such review.

More recently, the Finotive One shirt deal ended after 42 days. The club's statement said they had "acted decisively to protect the Club's interests" but gave no reason. The Chairman's apology came later, in a closed FAB meeting, and fans read it in a summary published weeks afterwards. The club deserve credit for offering refunds and exchanges, but fans have still not been told what went wrong or how the deal was signed off.

The 2026/27 season ticket review came closest to getting all three right. An initial 3-5% rise was floated, plus auto-enrolment for cup games, and the FAB was given a month to go out to supporters' groups and respond. The outcome was a 2.9% increase and free tickets for the first home cup ties. But fans weren't told how the consultation would run or which groups the FAB would ask, and the consultation period was only made public after it had closed. The FSA's test for good consultation, the Gunning Principles, ends by stating that responses must be "conscientiously taken into account", yet there is no published record of what the FAB recommended, or how it changed the outcome.

The same questions apply to what has happened since the takeover in December 2020. Before then, the club had no debt and a reported £80m in the bank, and we were in our fifth straight Premier League season, having played in Europe in 2018. Since then, we have built up some of the largest debts in English football, been relegated three times in five seasons and now sit at our lowest league position in a generation. These are real concerns for members and fans, and they deserve proper answers.

In September's FAB summary, Alan Pace said he "would never knowingly take decisions that he believed would harm the long-term future of Burnley FC". He also named three areas where mistakes had been made and lessons learned: sporting structure and football operations; succession planning and managerial continuity; and recruitment and player development. Intentions matter, but the IFR's fourth principle asks for something fans can check. We would ask the club to set these lessons out in public, with a long-term plan showing, for each one, what went wrong, what is changing and how fans will know it has worked. That would turn "lessons learned" into accountability.

We believe fans should be able to check any decision that affects them against the same three questions: who decided and when, how it was communicated, and how the club responded. The solution to some of these issues is already out there, and is being called for right across the game. The FSA's guidance shows clubs how to consult while decisions can still change, supporter groups have told the IFR they want "you said, we did" reporting, and the IFR's guidance says a club's annual reporting should include "evidence showing how fan views or input have influenced decisions". If the club start reporting this way, it will be good for Burnley FC, and BFCISA will be the first to welcome it.

None of this works, however, if these things happen behind closed doors. Next week, in part four, we look at Transparency: how the club show their working.