

---

Minutes of the 7th Meeting: 12 November 2001

---

Present

CHAIRMAN

Sir Rodney Walker

MEMBERS

Gareth Davies  
Alastair Dempster  
Diana King  
Adrian Metcalfe

Zahara Hyde Peters  
Eric Saunders  
Gavin Stewart  
Des Wilson

CO-ORDINATING GROUP OF CHIEF OFFICERS

Richard Callicott	Chief Executive, UK Sport
Simon Clegg	Chief Executive, British Olympic Association
Eamonn McCartan	Chief Executive, Sports Council for Northern Ireland
Huw Jones	Chief Executive, Sports Council for Wales
Ian Robson	Chief Executive, sportscotland

UK SPORT STAFF

Jerry Bingham	Head of Strategy, Ethics & Research	(Council Secretary)
Yemi Adewusi	Finance Manager	
Roger Moreland	Director, UK Sports Institute	
Liz Nicholl	Director, Performance Services	
Neil Shearer	Director of Corporate Services	
John Scott	Director, International Relations & Major Events	
Michele Verroken	Director, Anti-Doping	

(Gareth Davies took the chair at the beginning of the meeting as Sir Rodney Walker was delayed)

### Apologies For Absence

- 1 Apologies had been received from Trevor Brooking, Tanni Grey-Thompson and Myra Nimmo (see paragraph 2 below)

### Minutes of the meeting held on 10 September 2001

- 2 The minutes of the meeting held on 10 September 2001 were confirmed as a true record.

### Matters arising

- 3 With reference to paragraph 5 of the minutes (Anti-Doping Programme for the Commonwealth Games), Michele Verroken reported that discussions were currently in progress with Manchester 2002 around an in-Games testing programme of between 850 and 1400 drug tests. UK Sport had been advised by M2002 that there was currently no agreement to undertake urine AND blood testing of all athletes competing at the Games: in this regard, Members noted that one blood test (£1500) currently costs around six times the cost of a urine test.
- 4 With reference to paragraph 10 of the minutes (UK Awards Panel: Exchequer review), Liz Nicholl reported that the Review document would be distributed to partner governing bodies in the week, with replies requested by early December. Performance Services Managers were also in the process of profiling relevant sports in order to determine their "significance".

### Revised 2001/2 Budget and outturn to September 2001 (UKSC 44 2001)

- 5 Members approved the revised budget for 2001, albeit noting the potential underspend position in respect of the UK Sports Institute and the Governing Body Modernisation Programme. Roger Moreland advised on several significant items of expenditure (eg Athlete Medical Scheme and World Class Coaching Conference) that would help offset the underspend position; Neil Shearer reported that it was intended to look at the overall situation in January with a view to deciding how best to manage the projected underspend. Zahara Hyde Peters asked for more detailed information on the "World Class Systems" line in the UKSI budget.

**Action: Neil Shearer/Roger Moreland**

## Funding Agreement 2001/4 – Progress Report (UKSC 45 2001)

- 6 Members noted the report, including revised proposals for carrying out a comprehensive WCPP athlete survey, which was not now intended to happen until November 2003. The ongoing athlete research process is currently being reviewed so as to develop a more accurate and rigorous representation of athlete views and to increase the level of consistency between monitoring and evaluation exercises for the different sports over time. Members asked for information to be sent to them on a regular basis in the future concerning athletes in the WCPP, medal winners and rankings.
- 7 It was also acknowledged that those targets relating to the Governing Body Modernisation Programme needed to be reviewed as they currently tend to confuse bona fide modernisation projects and initiatives to enable governing bodies to take on delegated authority for funding. It was confirmed that home country governing bodies are eligible to receive modernisation funds held and managed by UK Sport: further discussions are required to establish clear purposes and criteria. A full report on the modernisation programme will be made to the next meeting.

**Action: Jerry Bingham**

## UK Anti-Doping Policy (UKSC 46 2001)

- 8 Michele Verroken introduced paper UKSC 46 2001 by reminding Members that the anti-doping policy standards had originally been agreed by Council in March 2000 and remain unchanged: the document being presented had been refined to include the International Standard for Doping Control (ISDC) and to demonstrate that the UK policy is compliant with this standard.
- 9 The Chairman explained that the Government had confirmed that the policy would achieve the Government's objectives in this area and that it regarded the implementation of the policy as a high priority. Responses from the international community had been very encouraging. UK Sport had been asked by Government to seek agreement amongst stakeholders over the one remaining contentious issue – responsibility for managing the review function (ie that part of the process which determines whether a reportable doping infraction constitutes a case to answer) The procedure now encompassed all views whilst maintaining accountability.
- 10 Simon Clegg said that, in terms of the review process, the latest version of the policy is the most "sport-friendly" to date. He reported that few governing bodies wish to see another new body being set up to manage the review function and some are supportive of the idea of this responsibility being taken on by the Sports Dispute Resolution Panel (SDRP). Richard Callicott said that, although the policy was not predicated on this basis, it may not preclude such an arrangement being made if it met the ISDC standard. However, SDRP had no proven record in this area and no relevant medical or scientific expertise: it was therefore natural that UK Sport should have some reservations about the SDRP's competence in this respect. He welcomed the offer by the BOA to assist with the funding of SDRP's review.

- 11 In conclusion, Members agreed that UK Sport should proceed with **full implementation of the Anti-Doping Policy and achievement of the International Standard for Doping Control, and that officers should enter into open-minded assessment of whether SDRP is capable of taking on the review function, with appropriate modification**
- 12 Gavin Stewart asked that consideration be given to producing an athlete version of the Policy and Michele Verroken responded that this in process. Adrian Metcalfe proposed that UK Sport should be tougher on those governing bodies that are not moving to adopt the national policy, he argued that funding should be withdrawn or reduced. Council agreed that the sanction of funding should be considered. Additional support to those who were willing to improve their policies and protect their athletes might be obtained through the modernisation project and ultimately reduce the involvement of lawyers in sport.

### Reports prepared for the Sports Cabinet meeting of 31 October 2001

- 13 The Chairman reported on the outcome of the Sports Cabinet meeting of 31 October 2001, at which there had been a full discussion about the Government's commitment to support the undertakings of the previous administration about maintaining the level of funds available for the UK WCPP. A letter of comfort to this effect had subsequently been received from the Secretary of State (copy attached to these minutes), dealing with both the long-term and short-term position.
- 14 **It was agreed that the Chairman should reply, thanking the Secretary of State for this reassurance but also asking a number of detailed questions about the means by which funding stability would be achieved in the longer term.** In this regard, the Home Country Sports Council representatives expressed concerns that guarantees about the level of the UK Sport Lottery Fund should not affect the integrity of their own Lottery Funds.
- 15 Liz Nicholl pointed out that the Government's undertaking was at this stage geared only to current commitments and did not extend to supporting possible enhancements of the WCPP such as the mooted increase in Athlete Personal Award levels – a change which, without additional funds, could not be introduced until April 2003 at the earliest. Gavin Stewart proposed that the Council should look now to develop a funding strategy through to the Beijing Olympics/Paralympics in 2008 enabling it to be able to deal with such financial scenarios as might materialise between now and then.
- 16 It was noted that the report of the Elite Sport Funding Review Group ("the Cunningham Review") appeared to have been received favourably by both DCMS and 10 Downing Street officials and was currently awaiting the endorsement of the Prime Minister.
- 17 Adrian Metcalfe reported that a letter had also been received from the Secretary of State (copy attached to these minutes) in response to his own, sent on behalf of the Major Events Steering Group, about the implications for UK sport of the recent decision not to proceed with the development of the stadium at Picketts Lock for the purpose of hosting the 2005 World Athletics Championships. He reported that he had further replied, expressing concerns about the Government's suggestion that Sheffield might be considered as an alternative location for the Championships and emphasising the known priorities of the International Association of Athletics

Federations (IAAF).

UK Awards Panel: Report of the Meetings held on 24 September and 22 October 2001 (UKSC 50 2001)

- 18 **Members endorsed the following Lottery-funding recommendations of the Panel arising from its 20 July meeting:**

**British Gymnastics – Sports Acrobatics/Tumbling and related Gymnastic awards**

- 18.1 **that a programme award be made to British Gymnastics for the non-Olympic disciplines of Sport Acrobatics/Tumbling as follows:**

	2002/03	2003/04	2004/05
<b>Sports Acrobatics/Tumbling</b>	<b>£222,691</b>	<b>£222,691</b>	<b>£222,691</b>

subject to the following conditions:

- i) **that support for Sports Acrobatics/Tumbling be reviewed to reflect any IOC decision regarding inclusion as an Olympic sport for Beijing 2008;**
  - ii) **that should Sport Acrobatics/Tumbling not be accepted as an Olympic discipline for 2008, the award be reconsidered by the UK Awards Panel**
  - iii) **that the award remains affordable in the light of received Lottery income**
  - iv) **that athlete numbers which have reduced from 30 to 18 remain at around this level;**
- 18.2 **that a programme award of £28,000 be made to British Gymnastics for the non-Olympic disciplines of Sport Acrobatics/Tumbling for the period 1 February to 31 March 2002.**
- 18.3 **That a programme award be made to British Gymnastics for the Olympic disciplines of Women’s Artistic and Trampoline for the period 1 April 2002 to 31 March 2005 (“capped” at the 2002/03 figure), subject to affordability, as follows:**

	2002/03 £	2003/04 £	2004/05 £
Trampoline	138,181	138,181	138,181
Women's Artistic	313,850	313,850	313,850
Core Staffing	342,729	342,729	342,729
Overheads	84,214	84,214	84,214
<b>Total</b>	<b>878,974</b>	<b>878,974</b>	<b>878,974</b>

### Wheelchair Rugby

- 18.4 **that a programme award of £60,044 be made to the Great Britain Wheelchair Rugby Association for the period 1 January to 30 September 2002.**
- 19 It was also noted that the Chairman and Deputy Chairman had authorised a Lottery award of £10,000 to the British Bob Skeleton Association, through the British Bobsleigh Association, to provide additional sports psychology services to the Bob Skeleton World Class Performance Programme in the lead-up to, and at, the Winter Olympic Games.
- 20 **Members also endorsed the following Exchequer-funding recommendations of the Panel:**

### UK Athletics

**(Zahara Hyde Peters declared an interest in this item)**

- 20.1 **That a standstill award of £112,500 be made to UK Athletics for the period 1 January to 31 March 2002.**

### Wheelchair Basketball

- 20.2 **That an award of up to £60,000 be made to the Great Britain Wheelchair Basketball Association for the period 1 April 2002 to 31 March 2003 in support of the establishment of a central office for the governing body, associated running costs, and the employment of two members of staff (one part-time).**
- 20.3 **That a planning figure of up to £40,000 per annum be made to the Great Britain Wheelchair Basketball Association for the period 1 April 2003 to 31 March 2005 in support of the administration of the governing body, including the employment of staff.**
- 20.4 **That a standstill award of £5000 be made to the Great Britain Wheelchair Basketball Association for the period 1 January to 31 March 2002 in support of the women's and junior programmes and general administration.**

**Caving**

20.5 that a standstill award of £20,000 be made to the National Caving Association for the period 1 January to 31 December 2002, to be allocated to:

- Training, Equipment and techniques - £15,000
- Expeditions - up to £5,000 maximum

20.6 that the National Caving Association be permitted to retain an "underspend" at 31 December 2001, currently estimated at £3,300, due to difficulties caused by foot and mouth disease.

**British Blind Sport (BBS)**

20.7 that a standstill award of £21,000 be made to British Blind Sport for the period 1 January to 30 June 2002 subject to the following conditions of award:

- that the BBS participates fully in a review of its activities in the context of the priorities of funding emerging from the Exchequer Review
- that the BBS commits to the realignment of its activities to meet with the outcomes of the Review.

**National Sports Medicine Institute (NSMI) (see separate paper on Review)**

20.8 that a standstill award of £75,000 be made to the National Sports Medicine Institute for the period 1 January to 31 March 2002, with a further review being undertaken by the Council at a future meeting.

**Sports Disputes Resolution Panel (SDRP)**

20.9 that a core funding award of £100,000 per annum be made to the Sports Disputes Resolution Panel for the three year period 1 April 2002 to 31 March 2005.

**British Amateur Gymnastics Association**

20.10 that, following full assessment, an award of £362,500 be reconfirmed for the British Amateur Gymnastics Association for the year 1 October 2001 to 30 September 2002

21 Members also endorsed the following recommendations of the Panel in respect of the Modernisation Programme

**Swimming**

21.1 that a modernisation grant of up to £100,000 be made to the Amateur Swimming Federation of Great Britain for the period 1 December 2001 to 30 November 2002 for the development and implementation of a project contributing to project manager costs of £40,000; IT manager of £35,000; staff training and other costs of circa £40,000, with a sum of £20,000 ring fenced to support discreet elements of modernisation in Wales and Scotland, which are an integral part of the overall project.

- 21.2 **that a minimum modernisation grant of up to £50,000 per annum be made to the Amateur Swimming Federation of Great Britain on behalf of the home country swimming associations for years 2 and 3 of the project.**

### **Fencing**

- 21.3 **that a modernisation grant of up to £35,000 be made to the British Fencing Association for the development and implementation of project primarily concerned with organisational review.**

### **Equestrian**

- 21.4 **that a modernisation grant of up to £75,000 be made to the British Equestrian Federation for the development and implementation of a review of the governance and structure of the BEF.**

22 In connection with UK Awards Panel business, Members noted:

- 22.1 That there remain certain anomalies concerning the funding by the Home Country Sports Councils of UK-level athletes
- 22.2 That UK Sport officers are currently working closely with the new Board of the British Judo Association to resolve a number of issues. The need to support a full-time Chief Executive post has been identified. The UK Awards Panel had agreed that officers should progress this and that a formal award request would be made to Council at a later date.

### **UK Sports Institute (UKSC 47 2001)**

23 Members noted the report.

### **Report of Major Events Steering Group held on 3 October 2001 (UKSC 48 2001)**

24 **Members endorsed the following recommendations of the MESH on awards to be made from the World Class Events Programme:**

#### **2003 World Badminton Championships (Birmingham)**

- 24.1 **That an award of up to £283,381 be made towards the 2003 World Badminton Championships.**

#### **2003 Champions Trophy Hockey (Milton Keynes)**

- 24.2 **That an award of up to £185,636 be made towards the 2003 Champions Trophy.**

#### **2002 World Squash Doubles Championships Test Event (Manchester)**

- 24.3 **That in principle support be provided for this test event for the 2002 Commonwealth Games.**

## 2002 Commonwealth Games – Sports Development Impact Research

- 24.4 That an allocation of up to £120,000 be made towards the continuation of this research.
- 25 While indicating that there would be value in debating further the issue of roles and responsibilities around the Major Events programme, Members also endorsed the following recommendations of the MESH on amendments to WCEP policy:
- 25.1 That, regarding 'cash rich' sports, UK Sport should endeavour to take a role through its support services and advisory expertise. Funding of the bidding stage is acceptable, but should be clawed back if the event is secured and financially successful.
- 25.2 That showcase events do not fulfil 'elite' criteria. Whilst they cannot be supported financially, assistance could be given by UK Sport in the form of support services and advice.
- 25.3 That applications for new events shall be reviewed on a case-by-case basis. The key criteria would be the event's strategic relevance to the development of the sport, and how it fits with the World Class Performance Programme.
- 25.4 That all sports be required to have an events strategy in order to access funding: this requirement to be phased in over three years.
- 25.5 That UK Sport shall be involved in the preparation of any bid that would, in the future, be looking to access staging funds.
- 25.6 That an application which provides less than 18 months lead time to the staging of the event will not normally be accepted, unless under exceptional circumstances.
- 25.7 That only hospitality events, legal fees and prize/appearance money are to be deemed ineligible costs.
- 25.8 That the 35% rule be abolished.
- 25.9 That financial need be assessed on a pure cash basis.
- 25.10 That no award shall be made to a National Governing Body or other event organiser which fails a management audit and is deemed 'not fit for purpose for organising an event'.
- 25.11 That, where an event makes a surplus, UK Sport shall be entitled to receive 50% of such surplus, up to a sum equivalent to the total award paid by UK Sport. Any retained surplus shall be used for the benefit of the sports' development, as agreed with UK Sport. Where the event is run and underwritten by a commercial operator on behalf of an NGB, the remaining surplus will be split equally between the NGB and contractor.

Minutes of the Marketing & Media Panel held on 9 October 2001

- 26 Members noted the report.

## UK Sport Sponsorship Policy (UKSC 49 2001)

- 27 This item was deferred pending the receipt of further information from the DCMS about emerging Government proposals for identifying supplementary, alternative sources of funding for high performance sport.

## Any Other Business

- 28 The Chairman informed Members that Myra Nimmo had resigned from the Council: he paid tribute to the contribution she had made to UK Sport over the three years of her appointment. Ministers were in the process of confirming the reappointment of several Members whose term of office was shortly to expire, and considering the appointment of new Members to the several vacancies on the Board.

## Date of Next Meeting

- 29 Monday 14 January 2002 at 10.30 am in 40 Bernard Street WC1N 1ST