



Minutes of the Meeting: 10th November 2003 (held at Festival Theatre, Edinburgh)

Present

Chair Sue Campbell

Members

Nick Bitel	Connie St Louis
Alastair Dempster	Eric Saunders
Zahara Hyde Peters	Gavin Stewart
Anne Ellis	Adrian Metcalfe
Tanni Grey-Thompson	

UK Sport Staff

Richard Callicott	Chief Executive, UK Sport
Andrew Barnett	Head of Communications
Liz Nicholl	Director, Performance Services
John Scott	Director, International Relations and Major Events
Michele Verroken	Director, Drug-Free Sport
Neil Shearer	Director, Corporate Services

Observers

Huw Jones	Sports Council for Wales
Roger Draper	Sport England
Ian Robson	Sportscotland
Eamonn McCartan	Sports Council for Northern Ireland

Introduction

- 1 Sue Campbell welcomed members to the meeting. She explained that there was a new format to the agenda and encouraged members to review it, welcoming discussion at the end of the meeting to decide whether they liked the new format or not.
- 2 The Chair emphasised the importance of declaring conflicts of interest and leaving the room when appropriate to ensure that UK Sport meets the highest standards of ethical practice.

Apologies for Absence

- 3 Louise Martin and Laura McAllister sent their apologies as did Patrick Carter.

Minutes of the Meeting held on 8th September 2003

- 4 It was agreed that future minutes should be written in a non-attributable style.
- 5 The case of UK Athletics was discussed and it was explained that there were two major pieces of work. The first is the performance enhancing work in the build up to Athens and the second is plans for change from 2005-2009 linked to One Stop Planning and addressing all Sport England concerns and existing reviews. Terms of reference for the latter had been drafted for discussion with

=

Sir Andrew Foster who had agreed to lead.

- 6 The minutes of the Meeting held on 8th September 2003 were declared as a true and accurate record and signed by the Chair.

Matters for Decision

Modernisation: Following up Investing in Change (UKSC 97 2003)

- 7 Liz Nicholl introduced this item and advised members that the key decision is an increase in delegated power to officers so that decisions involving awards of £200,000 or more are approved by the UK Sport Council and decisions on awards of less than £200,000 are approved by UK Sport Performance Director, based on the agreed strategic principles contained within the liC report, with the agreement of a “virtual” panel of officers from each of the Sports Councils.
- 8 It was noted that fewer single issue applications and more complex reform programmes were anticipated following self assessment using the Investing in Change model therefore the average size of award is likely to rise and day to day decisions and advice will be required from officers during project development. UK Awards Panel members supported this recommendation as it would enable their time to be more focused on performance investment.
- 9 It was agreed that a ceiling total figure for the amount of delegated power should be set and this might be based on a proportion of spend that can be allocated without reference back to Council. It was suggested that broad policy guidance be put in place to cover this.
- 10 Members noted that there would be a need for an appropriate audit process bearing in mind that calculated risks would need to be taken with some modernisation investment decisions as outcomes might not always be clear or measurable for some time.
- 11 It was suggested that when carrying out the governance review other decision making needs and processes should be reviewed.

Major Events Budget 2004 - 2008 (UKSC 98 2003)

- 12 John Scott introduced the item and referred to the recommendation of the MESH that Council set aside a minimum of £1.6 million per annum for major events for the next 4 years. With only £664,000 in the current cycle remaining and a likely request for over £700,000 at the next two MESH meetings, it is vital that Council be a position to give support to those events planned and in the pipeline out to 2008. Visible support for Major Events is integral to the campaign to secure the Olympics for 2012 and any suggestion that support will not be forthcoming would damage the country's reputation and London's aspirations. Long term strategic planning is enabling UK Sport to judge requirements over a 6-10 year period and the MESH is prioritising within the current budget allocation of £1.6m per annum.
- 13 Questions were raised about the pressures that could be placed on other budgets if this money were to be ring fenced. Members noted that the size of budget was very small in comparison to our international competitors and at current levels could not meet the strategic needs of the NGBs. This reinforced the importance of long term planning and the need to build the case for additional resources to government.

=

- 14 Members noted the encouragement they had given to NGBs to plan longer term and the damage that could be caused if an area as important as major events were not to be supported at this minimal level.
- 15 Members agreed to ring fence £1.6m per annum for major events for the next 4 years and asked for a regular review of budget commitments and projections.

World Class Events programme (WCEP) – Views on Future Development (UKSC 99 2003)

- 16 John Scott introduced the item explaining that it was intended to help formulate a case to DCMS for an enlarged Major Events Programme building on the successes of the past 4 years. It addressed some of the changing landscape with new organisations being established to support events and the importance of retaining a sport focus for UK Sport's strategy. It was clear from dialogue with the new bodies that they were seeking a partnership with UK Sport but that their interest in sport events was much narrower with a focus on tourism generation and promotion opportunities for the region/country. Members focussed their discussions on items 17.1-17.6.
- 17 It was suggested that further promotion of the benefits of the Major Events Programme and the value added by UK Sport was needed to support the case to government.
- 18 Members reinforced the importance of working with the other stakeholders and agreed that a new strategy be developed reflecting the priorities outlined in paragraph 17.

Report of the UK Awards Panel Meeting of 27 October 2003 (UKSC 100 2003)

- 19 Liz Nicholl introduced this item by advising members that there were three awards recommended by the UK Awards Panel.
- 20 Members endorsed the following awards that were recommended by UK Awards Panel:

**20.1 British Gymnastics – Mens artistic
to offer WCPP funding to British Gymnastics for the discipline
of men's artistic of up to £188,816 for the period 1 January 2004
to 31 March 2005 (£44,586 for 2003/04 and £144,230 for 2004/05)**

Liz Nicholl introduced this item explaining that the results from the World Championships had proved disappointing with the squad not achieving the team target score finishing in 23rd position and failing to qualify any men's artistic gymnasts for Athens. She explained that there are up to 6 athletes in the group that have the potential to win on the Commonwealth, World and Olympic stage in the Beijing Olympiad and UKAP members felt that it would be inappropriate to cease funding now when WCPP funding had only been reinstated in September 2002. Gymnastics had been agreed as a UK wide One Stop Plan sport and investment decisions for 2005 – 2009 would be decided early in 2005. The recommendation is a reduction on the current award and a condition of award would be a review of the centralised men's programme at Lilleshall.

20.2 British Equestrian Federation – Dressage and show jumping

Dressage – to confirm WCPP funding to BEF for Dressage of up to

£150,000 in total for the current period 1 April 2003 to 31 March 2004 and up to £135,000 for the period 1 April 2004 to 31 March 2005 out of the existing 4 year award, with £15,000 re-allocated from existing Show Jumping WCPP funding for 2003/04 and £9,000 budgeted for 2004/05

Show Jumping – that from 1 December 2003 funding will cease to be WCPP funded and move to Exchequer funding with the offer of a grant to BEF of up to £66,666 for the period 1 December 2003 to 31 March 2005 (£16,666 for 2003/04 and £50,000 for 2004/05)

That as a result of the above, £111,666 of WCPP funding earmarked for Show Jumping be de-committed from the 4 year BEF award leaving a total year 4 WCPP budget of £725,000 and a revised year 3 WCPP budget of £859,334.

The British Dressage team had won the team bronze at the European Championships held at Hickstead and placed three riders in the top 15 which exceeded their targets.

Show jumping had not met performance targets for 2001, 2002 or 2003 and could no longer be classed as world class. There were however other strategic reasons for the proposed exchequer investment:

- Two individuals may yet achieve Olympic qualification and by the nature of the sport may have a chance of winning a medal.
- British riders have a limited number of Olympic calibre horses capable of winning a medal in Athens and these horses were at risk of being sold to competitor nations.
- Show jumping is a partner in the BEF modernisation project.

The following funding decisions were agreed in principal:

20.3 Scottish Athletics/Scottish Hockey Union and Scottish Swimming Association

To offer Modernisation funding to Scottish Athletics Ltd, Scottish Hockey Union, Scottish Swimming Association of up to £230,000 over a three year period.

The project funds three Marketing officers within each of the governing bodies which will work individually and collectively where appropriate developing membership schemes/benefits and generating income.

UK Awards Panel members had expressed concern about the commercial viability of the proposal and staffing issues and had commissioned a review by a sports marketing company. The consultant was selected by sportscotland and the report received concluded that the proposal stood up to scrutiny and there was good reason to be confident in the proposed outcomes.

Council agreed to the project but wanted assurance that the three post model was the most effective way of delivering this project. This was to be further considered by officers (with no expectation that this be referred again to Council having been considered by the UK Awards Panel twice). It was noted that the review document could be made available to members.

=

2003)

- 21 Neil Shearer introduced this item and explained that UK Sport had spent 42 percent of the cash budget. It was explained that a review of issues which will be affected by the reform agenda would take place. UK Sport was making cost savings as a result of reorganisation of the Performance Directorate including headcount reduction there and elsewhere. Movement between the Lottery and Exchequer had occurred due to the transfer of grants from the Lottery to the Exchequer programme spend. Total staff costs in the year to date were 9% of total costs. Lottery income for the first 6 months was £9.6 million. Major Events actual cash spend was low. Athlete Personal Awards are down and Modernisation spending has been higher.

UK Sport Equality and Diversity Strategy (UKSC 102 2003)

- 22 Richard Callicott introduced this item.

It was noted that the strategy contained numerous commitments that would need to be followed through with measuring systems and management information to support it that were not yet in place. An action plan had been developed and would be overseen by UK Sport's Equity Coordinator working through a cross directorate equality group.

The strategy was adopted.

For Discussion

Review of UK Anti-Doping Arrangements (UKSC 105 2003)

- 23 Michele Verroken introduced this item and explained that this paper had now been moved from a discussion paper to a decision paper.
- 24 Michele Verroken asked for comments on paragraph 16 onwards - Terms of reference of the review.
- 25 Council asked for points 14 and 15 to be revised as these two paragraphs seem to prejudge the outcome. These paragraphs outlined the advantages and disadvantages of setting up an independent body to control the Anti-Doping processes.
- 26 It was agreed that the paper would be revised and circulated again to members at the same time it was moved to tender.

International Relations – Views on Future Development (UKSC 103 2003)

- 27 John Scott introduced the item. Recognition of the importance of a pro-active international relations strategy had increased in recent months as decision makers appreciated the importance of this area to such projects as the London Olympic bid. DCMS had expressed strong interest in seeing a more ambitious international strategy and following discussions it had been agreed that a cross-government strategy should be submitted for the next spending round with the FCO, British Council and UK Sport as the prime delivery agents. Council was asked to consider the suggested components of UK Sport's strategy as outlined in the paper.

=

- 28 Members asked that consistent language be employed in any documentation eg. the Developing World be used rather than the phrase the Third World. It was acknowledged that certain cultural limitations would exist such as the degree of women's involvement in activities with the Arab world.
- 29 Members noted that this had been a severely under-funded area of activity in the past but the Chair was optimistic that extra resources could be secured through the coordinated approach being pursued with DCMS.
- 30 Council endorsed the objectives and suggested programme areas for a UK Sport strategy and looked forward to being updated on progress.

Proposal to amend the International Representatives' Grant Aid Programme (IRGAP) (UKSC 104 2003)

- 31 John Scott introduced the item. The paper reflected an independent review of the IRGAP carried out by Debbie Jevans Associates who had been commissioned to assess the effectiveness of the programme and make recommendations for the future. It was clear that a more focused approach was required if the UK was to achieve greater influence in the decision making of international sport. The paper proposed restructuring using existing resources but acknowledged that as part of the strategy discussed at item 8 of the agenda, additional resources were needed if the objectives of the programme were to be achieved.
- 32 Members discussed the paper and gave strong support to its conclusions. Council agreed to the implementation of the suggested changes with effect from April 2004.

For Information

Drug – Free Sport report on progress (UKSC 107 2003)

- 33 Michele Verroken introduced this item. She explained that the paper was intended for discussion rather than information. The Directorate were seeking comments from members about the policy standards proposed for the national implementation of the WADA Code in relation to the specific areas identified which were the responsibility of the National Anti-Doping Organisation. These standards had been reviewed by the Drug-Free Sport Advisory Panel and the views of Council members were now being sought.
- 34 Members noted the proposals for athlete registration and therapeutic use exemption. One member raised a concern about paragraph 7 Missed Tests Policy. The three strike approach was discussed. Clarification was asked for on what is a missed test? and what counts as a no show, also whether the proposals are realistic, better definition was required on what the three strikes comprised of. Michele explained that there was some guidance from WADA, however the NADO should be setting the standard of reasonableness. The primary and secondary address requirements for whereabouts information was also queried and the Chair suggested that members' understanding would benefit from a clear definition of terms, particularly what constituted compliance. In response to the question about who should be tested, members asked that more detailed information was available on the policies

=

being applied to each sport and agreed to review the public disclosure of information in line with the Code. A proposal would be forthcoming at the next meeting. Members noted the intention to provide a central clearing house for information on athletes who have committed doping offences and the support for voluntary provisional suspension.

Any other Business

- 35 Members expressed their contentment with the new format of the Council papers.
- 36 It was suggested that future Council meetings be synchronised with other meetings such as the Chief Officers meeting or the Sports Cabinet meeting so as to cut down on the amount of travelling incurred by members and even some away-days. The Chief Officers were asked to coordinate this.

Date of next meeting

- 37 Provisionally agreed for 29 January 2004, 10.00am, to be held in London.